



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

# Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in the Federated States of Micronesia

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

Funded by the Global Environment Facility and  
Implemented by the United Nations Development Programme

## Terminal Evaluation Report June 2012



Prepared by Peter Thomas – Team Leader  
*TierraMar Consulting Pty Ltd*

## **Disclaimer**

This report has been commissioned by UNDP MCO Suva, Fiji and the Global Environment Facility. It is solely for the use of these parties. TierraMar Consulting Pty Ltd does not accept any responsibility to any other party to whom this report may be shown or into whose hands it may come. No representation or warranty (express or implied) is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in this report, and, to the extent permitted by law, TierraMar Consulting Pty Ltd, its members, employees and agents accept no liability, and disclaim all responsibility, for the consequences of you or anyone else acting, or refraining to act, in reliance on the information contained in this report or for any decision based on it. The information provided in this report is based on the best information and documentation available at the time of preparation. The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the UNDP or Government of the Federated States of Micronesia.

## **Acknowledgments**

The Terminal Evaluation Team would like to thank the large number of people who have contributed to the Evaluation through interviews, discussions, email correspondence and telephone conversations. In particular I would like to express my sincere and grateful thanks to the following people without whose help and support the Evaluation would not have been possible:

In the FSM National Government, Palikir, Pohnpei, Andrew Yatilman, Director, Office of Environmental and Emergency Management, Cindy Ehmes, Assistant Director, Environment and Sustainable Development Unit and Beverly Sadole-Susumu, SLM National Coordinator. In Yap State, Ryan Talken, Department of Agriculture and Forestry, in Kosrae, Blair Charley, Kosrae State SLM focal point KIRMA,, in Chuuk State, Julita Albert, Chuuk SLM focal point, Chuuk EPA and in Kolonia, Pohnpei, Henry Susaia, Pohnpei State SLM focal point, Pohnpei State EPA.

The willing assistance and support of Floyd Robinson and David Lumutivou in the UNDP MCO, Suva, Fiji is also gratefully acknowledged.

## List of Acronyms

AG	Attorney General
ANR	Agricultural and Natural Resources
CCS	Chuuk Conservation Society
CIA	Caroline Interisland Airline
COM	College of Micronesia
CRE	Cooperative Research and Extension
CSP	Conservation Society of Pohnpei
DFA	Department of Finance and Administration
DLF	Detailed Logical Framework
DREA	Department of Resources and Economic Affairs
DSAP	Development of Sustainable Agriculture in the Pacific
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ET	Evaluation Team
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FMRs	Financial Management Regulations
FP	Focal Point
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
GAA	Global Aid Agencies
GIS	Global Information System
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ISTOP	Invasive Species Taskforce of Pohnpei
IWRM	Integrated Watershed Resource Management
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KCSO	Kosrae Conservation and Safety Organization
KIRMA	Kosrae Island Resource Management Authority
KWA	Kosrae Women's Association
LDC	Least Developed Countries
LOA	Letter of Agreement
MCT	Micronesia Conservation Trust
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

MSP	Medium Size Proposal
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non Government Organization
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
OEEM	Office of Environment and Emergency Management
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change
PIF	Pacific Island Fund
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Pacific Survey Company
SALT	Sloping Agriculture Land Technology
SD Unit	FSM Sustainable Development Unit
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SOPAC	South Pacific Applied Geo-science Commission
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
SWM	Solid Waste Management
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TPR	Tripartite Review
TOR	Terms of Reference
UFO	Unon, Fongen and Ongoch Communities
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UOG	University of Guam
USFS	United States Forest Service
VF	Venezuela Fund
WQMP	Water Quality Monitoring Program
YDAF	Yap Department of Agriculture
YELA	Yela Environment Landowners Authority
YINS	Yap Institute of Natural Sciences
YapCAP	Yap Community Action Program

## Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary .....	7
1.1	Brief Description of Project.....	7
1.2	Context and Purpose of the Evaluation .....	7
1.3	Main Conclusions .....	8
1.4	Recommendations .....	9
1.5	Lessons Learned.....	11
2.	Introduction.....	12
2.1	Goals of the Project.....	12
2.2	Purpose and Goals of the Evaluation .....	13
2.3	Key Issues Addressed .....	13
2.4	Methodology and Structure of the Evaluation .....	14
	Table 1 FSM In-country travel and activity itinerary 15 – 29 June 2012.....	15
3.	The Project and its development context.....	16
3.1	Project Start and Duration.....	16
3.2	Problems that the Project Seeks to Address .....	17
3.3	Objectives the Project .....	18
3.4	Main Stakeholders .....	18
	Table 2 Summary of Stakeholder Groups.....	19
3.5	Results Expected .....	19
4.	Findings and Conclusions. ....	20
4.1	Project Formulation .....	20
4.1.1	Implementation Approach .....	20
4.1.2	Country Ownership and Drivenness .....	21
4.1.3	Stakeholder Participation .....	22
4.1.4	Replication Approach .....	22
4.1.5	Cost Effectiveness.....	23
4.1.6	UNDP Comparative Advantage .....	23
4.1.7	Linkages Between Project and Other Interventions with the Sector.....	24
4.1.8	Indicators.....	25
	Table3 Assessment of Progress against Measurable Indicators .....	25
4.1.9	Management Arrangements.....	27
4.2	Implementation.....	29

4.2.1	Financial Planning.....	29
Table 4	Percentage of Inception Budget Allocated to Outcomes and Project Management.....	31
4.2.2	Monitoring and Evaluation.....	32
4.2.3	Execution and Implementation Modalities .....	32
4.2.4	Management by the UN Joint Presence Office in FSM .....	32
4.2.5	Coordination and Operational Issues.....	33
4.3	Results .....	34
4.3.1	Attainment of objectives. ....	36
4.3.2	Sustainability .....	42
4.3.3	Contribution to Upgrading of Skills of Staff .....	43
5	Recommendations .....	44
5.1	Actions to Follow Up or Reinforce Initial Benefits of the Project.....	44
5.2	Proposals for Future Directions Underlining Main Objectives. ....	45
6.	Future Project Strategy .....	45
6.1	Corrective Actions for the Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Project ..	45
7.	Lessons Learned.....	46
7.1	Best and Worst Practices in Addressing Issues Relating to Relevance, Performance and Success.....	46
ANNEX 1	Terms of Reference FSM SLM Terminal Evaluation Team Leader .....	48
ANNEX 2	Itinerary and Work plan for Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP /GEF Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in the Federated States of Micronesia .....	56
ANNEX 3	List of Persons Interviewed/Field Sites Visited .....	60
ANNEX 4	Summary of Site Visits and Meetings .....	64
ANNEX 5	List of Documents Reviewed.....	74
ANNEX 6	Questionnaire Used and Summary of Results.....	76
ANNEX 7	Overview of Co-financing and Leveraged Resources.....	80
ANNEX 8	Summary of Evaluation Findings .....	82

# 1. Executive Summary

## 1.1 Brief Description of Project

With a view toward sustainable community-based livelihoods, gender equality, sustainable land use and the improvement of ecosystem services through conservation, the Federated States of Micronesia continues to work toward effective land management and natural resource use. It does so in the context of the ongoing activities and factors affecting sustainable land management: deforestation, unsustainable agriculture practices and unplanned infrastructure development, coupled with severe weather patterns, and advancing alien invasive species. Assistance with these land management and socio-economic goals is provided through ongoing on-the-ground projects in partnership with the European Union, the Food and Agriculture Organization, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission, New Zealand International Aid and Development Agency, the Venezuela Fund, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Important guiding frameworks included the National Environment Management Strategy (NEMS 1993), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 2002), the FSM Sustainable Development Plan (SDP 2004), the FSM Protected Area Network (PAN 2006), and the Micronesia Challenge (2007) This impressive range of projects and activities provide a focus on encouraging a participatory and collaborative approach to problem solving which will allow for the continued improvement of the quality of life for the people of Micronesia. This Project aimed to complement this work and continue the institutionalization of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in local, state, and national government agencies, non-government organizations, and with community groups and resource users through the investment of incremental funds provided through a Medium Sized Project (MSP) partnership with the United Nations Development Programme and Global Environment Facility.

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

The operational phase of the project was originally 3 years but after a slow start and following a Mid Term Evaluation which recommended an 18 month extension, the project was extended to 4 years. The total project cost of the SLM MSP was US\$1,433,300, and consisted of a GEF contribution of US\$500,000 (including PDFA funding of \$25,000) and Co-financing of US\$933,300.

## 1.2 Context and Purpose of the Evaluation

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

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

Final evaluations such as this are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. They look at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. They also

identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

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

### **1.3 Main Conclusions**

As a result of the analysis of written documentation and a fifteen day in-country mission which included visits to all four States of the FSM, meetings, discussions and interview with an extensive range of Stakeholders and field visits to active demonstration sites, the Terminal Evaluation was able to draw the following conclusions on the overall impact of the MSP:

- 1) That despite a slow start the FSM SLM project has gathered momentum and with the benefit of a one year extension, has completed a high proportion of the 69 activities to be implemented across four States and at the National Level.
- 2) That the SLM project has succeeded in raising awareness, building capacity and improving the baseline understanding of SLM at the individual, institutional and systemic levels in FSM and laid a sustainable foundation for on-going work on SLM throughout the States.
- 3) That the SLM project has improved and enhanced the capacity of FSM and its State Governments and communities to sustainably manage its precious land and coastal ecosystems and unique biodiversity they harbour thus contributing to the on-going health and socio-economic well-being of the country and its people and indirectly strengthening FSM's contribution to an improved regional and global environment.
- 4) That the project has made only small gains in mainstreaming SLM into the FSM development processes, in part due to the relative short time frame to achieve these ambitious goals suggesting that systemic enabling framework goals require more time to succeed. However, this aspect of the project is perhaps its weakest and needs further attention and national priority.
- 5) That some aspects of the project such as SWM particularly recycling, have demonstrated outstanding examples of sustainability and replicability in the context of a small island developing state and indeed FSM is possibly the Pacific leader in these areas.
- 6) That the FSM SLM project is an institutional model which could be replicated for the delivery of other GAA type projects to the four States of the Federated States of Micronesia but only if several fundamental improvements were to be made to its delivery mechanisms.
- 7) That as the project has matured the stakeholders have become more familiar with the institutional model and its management mechanisms resulting in improved project delivery and performance in the project extension period.
- 8) That the SLM project has been very successful in promoting, forging and strengthening Government/NGO/community stakeholder partnerships for project implementation and has fostered an improved mutual understanding of the relative strengths and capacity of the participating organisations both intra and inter State, including the importance of including NGO's in project planning and implementation.
- 9) That although some gains have been made with mainstreaming SLM principles into FSM development planning and land management strategies, there remain a number of important



outcomes still to be achieved which warrant consideration of further GAA development assistance in this important area.

## 1.4 Recommendations

Building on these conclusions and with a view to sustaining the impact of the project and improving possible future FSM/UNDP-GEF projects the following recommendations are offered for consideration:

**Recommendation 1.** That consideration be given by UNDP and FSM government to identifying future project options to build on the momentum and interest which has been generated by the SLM project in FSM in order to further the mainstreaming of SLM principles into the development and resource management processes, bring to fruition activities and outcomes which remain valid but require additional time and resources and to take advantage of the familiarity of stakeholders with the project operating modalities, including the stakeholder implementing partnerships which have been formed and have proved to be effective vehicles for activity implementation.

**Recommendation 2.** That priority be given to the completion of joint activities with SPREP to improve and incorporate SLM principles into each State's draft EIA guidelines thus ensuring that the momentum and work to date results in approved EIA guidelines in all States and a possible model for mainstreaming SLM into the EIA process for use by other Pacific Island Countries .

**Recommendation 3.** That SPREP be appraised of the suspension of the UNCCD NAP and investment strategy process in FSM pending the development of Pacific country template for alignment of NAPs with the UNCCD 5 year Action Strategy and requested to elevate the FSM in priority for technical assistance for completion of these tasks within 12 months.

**Recommendation 4.** That in view of the capacity issues leading to the failure to implement climate proofing components effectively, any new project which may be instigated under recommendation 1. above gives strong consideration to building capacity in climate change adaptation planning and mitigation within the FSM through demonstration projects and targeted training and mentoring activities

**Recommendation 5.** That the FSM government consider hosting further internal learning exchanges similar to that undertaken in partnership with JICA between Kosrae and the mayors/Governors of the other three States which demonstrated the benefits of the Kosrae Municipal Waste management programme, with the purpose of supporting the replication of successful SLM activities such as the Sokehs Municipality watershed demarcation process in Pohnpei in other States.

**Recommendation 6.** That despite the completion of this Terminal Evaluation, each State Focal point should prepare a close out report based on template to be developed by UNDP and the PMU and aimed at identifying the stakeholders views on what worked, what didn't work and why and pointing to priorities for any future project which may be developed. These should then be used to support a final close out meeting of Focal Points, PMU and principal NGO's to help inform future priorities.

**Recommendation 7.** That development of a web based mechanism be considered to support the establishment of a FSM Sustainable Land Management learning network with the objectives of providing a means of keeping the stakeholders of the SLM project networked and engaged in dialogue on SLM principles, providing a forum for sharing experiences and lessons learned, identifying new project and funding opportunities and sources of technical support, and providing a vehicle for non FSM based professionals to network with the national stakeholders.

**Recommendation 8.** That a full report and joint presentation by the UN Joint Presence Office and the Office of Environment and Emergency Management on the goals, outcomes and benefits of the SLM

Project be given to (i) members of the FSM Congress and (ii) the heads of SLM related government agencies. The presentation would help increase understanding of SLM principles, provide responses to technical questions and promote strengthened governance and stewardship for land resources amongst the countries leaders and should be undertaken within three months of the conclusion of the operational phase of the project i.e.by end September 2012.

**Recommendation 9.** That strong consideration be given to maintaining the momentum achieved under the FSM SLM project and building on the successful site based demonstration activities by further strengthening national capability in sustainable resource management through the design of a project which focuses on:

- developing the National and State policy, legal and planning framework for integrated watershed and coastal management planning including climate proofing;
- developing management capacity including technical capability, for integrated watershed and coastal management planning and implementation;
- identifying and supporting at least one integrated watershed and coastal management project per State;
- promoting project implementation through a coalition of State agencies, NGO,s, and CBO's , especially women, youth, school and church groups.

Further, that funding for the development and implementation of the project be sought under GEF 5 with co-financing from other relevant regional programmes and organisations such as the proposed USAID Community Climate Adaptation regional programme, SPREP and SPC.

**Recommendation 10.** That with the agreement of the FSM government and in order to overcome the reported delays with payments, avoid multiple approval processes and issues with financial reporting, a dedicated project grants officer/finance manager position be established within the FSM National Finance Management system whose sole job is to expedite project payments and reports. Where more than one UNDP project is being executed in FSM consideration could be given to expanding the scope of this position to cover both or multiple projects with costs shared accordingly. Alternatively, consideration could be given to an institutional and operational model which allows a more direct pipeline of funding to the implementing stakeholders be they State agencies or NGO's. This could include contracting a reputable grants management organisation such as the Micronesian Conservation Trust to handle finances or utilising the SPC sub regional office for this purpose or the financial management could be delegated from Suva MCO to the UN Joint Presence Office with strengthened capacity in that agency to undertake this task if necessary.

**Recommendation 11.** That in future projects budgetary transparency is achieved so all implementing stakeholders are aware of funding allocations and keep appraised on revisions and reallocations of funding with approval being sought or at least consultation taking place before budget lines are reduced or reprogrammed.

**Recommendation 12.** That in future projects the costs of ensuring the efficient functioning of the Project Management Unit and the effective discharge of its full range of responsibilities, particularly its on-going project monitoring and evaluation functions, be clearly identified with sufficient funding allocated to a separate budget line in a transparent way. These costs would include at least 2 monitoring and evaluation visits to all States per year by the Project Coordinator, support costs to a TAG and Steering Committee, Project Coordinator travel to approved national meetings, supplies, consultation costs etc.

**Recommendation 13.** That the institutional arrangements of the Expedited Project Document be carefully assessed, particularly the provisions for Steering Committee, Technical Advisory Group and

Tripartite Review teams against funding availability and logistical practicalities and be budgeted for accordingly within the PMU budget line recommended in 11 above.

**Recommendation 14.** That the provisions of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan in the Expedited Project Document which follow standard UNDP/GEF protocols, be implemented expeditiously with progress being jointly reviewed at least annually by the PMU and UNDP MCO, with programme staff from the MCO undertaking at least one FSM specific mission to coincide with and engage in the M&E visits to States recommended in 11 above.

**Recommendation 15.** That future project designs build in a strong learning and knowledge management component to take advantage of the power of shared experiences and learning exchanges to rapidly advance the understanding, capacity and capabilities of stakeholders with funding being allocated to a separate budget provision to support travel, field inspections and regular meetings of key stakeholders around core implementation themes.<sup>1</sup>

**Recommendation 16.** That the design process of any new projects in FSM or for that matter, anywhere in the region, embrace the inclusion of key NGO representatives, especially where their organisations are expected to be actively involved in project implementation

**Recommendation 17.** That strong attention should be paid to alignment with respective state development plans, existing activities as well as NGO strategies and work-plans, so that, to the extent possible and reasonable, project activities are in line with and compliment, existing development activities and priorities, rather than adding new or additional projects for state organizations.

## 1.5 Lessons Learned

- 1) That the decentralized implementation of a complex project across the four States of the FSM poses significant institutional and operational challenges. In this regard the project delivery model developed for the FSM SLM project has proved to be largely effective and with some tweaking of the financial disbursement and M&E components and improved funding for the PMU, is a good model for the delivery of UN and other GAA Development Assistance to the Federated States of Micronesia.
- 2) That the effective implementation of a complex project involving all four FSM States requires the application of adaptive and flexible management practices, especially in relation to budgets where the underperformance of one or more States affects quarterly expenditure across all four States thus inhibiting FSM's efforts to request replenishment funding under UNDP rules. However, it is important that where adaptive management is undertaken, the effect on State allocations be clearly communicated to all affected States in a timely fashion.
- 3) That the process of inclusion of key stakeholders in the project formulation, design and inception stages significantly improved the alignment of the project to existing activities and State priorities but that it could be further improved by ensuring the engagement of representatives of key implementing NGO's.
- 4) That linkages with existing State development priorities and to other initiatives with strong local backing significantly enhances the potential sustainability of project elements.
- 5) That the development of strong programmatic linkages with regional agencies such as SPC, SPREP and regional tertiary institutions greatly strengthens the capacity of the project to achieve its objectives especially those relating to capacity building.

---

<sup>1</sup> Where FP's and other key stakeholders are present at the same meetings these can also be utilised by the Programme Coordinator to monitor and review progress against work plans and budgets.

- 6) That the power of learning exchanges, field visits and networking amongst peers in building capacity should never be underestimated and should be a prominent feature of any project with capacity building as a primary objective.
- 7) That in a multi level, complex project such as this the regular proactive monitoring and evaluation schedules are an essential management tool for ensuring transparency, supporting adaptive management and for strengthening the sense of collective ownership of the project and its outcomes. Conversely, neglect of monitoring protocols creates uncertainty, confusion and frustration as State stakeholders are in the dark over budgets, funding and other decisions.
- 8) Continuity of personnel in key positions such as the Project Coordinator and Focal Points and good communication channels strengthens project management and coordination but the converse also applies.
- 9) That forging strong partnerships with NGO's can significantly improve prospects of effective implementation especially where community based activities are involved.
- 10) That consulting with and securing the support and active participation of traditional leadership for SLM field activities such as the demarcation of watershed boundaries and the, reforestation of savannah is vital to achieving successful outcomes. Similarly, the active engagement of women's groups, youth and parent organizations has been shown to significantly enhance the delivery of project outcomes in a number of areas including organic food production, mangrove rehabilitation and awareness raising in schools and across the broader community.
- 11) That too many activities involving small sums of money create the potential for frustrating delays and hold ups in the implementation of activities. Wherever possible activities should be lumped rather than split as should the funding to ease the financial and administrative burden on FP's and PMU staff.
- 12) In the same vein opportunities should be developed to bring States with common activities such as the development of themed guidelines together so they can develop one template for subsequent adaptation to specific State needs

## **2. Introduction**

### **2.1 Goals of the Project**

The overall Goals of this project was to enhance and develop the individual, systemic and institutional capacity in the Federated States of Micronesia for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) while also mainstreaming SLM considerations into national development strategies and policies. Supplementary goals were to improve the quality of project design and implementation in the overall development arena and to develop a National Action Plan for SLM, as well as a medium term investment plan, while ensuring that all relevant stakeholder views are reflected and integrated into the process.

These were ambitious goals for a three year project given the special implementation considerations required by the unique Federal and State Government political and institutional structure of the Federated States of Micronesia. As was pointed out in the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) the five implementing entities (National government and four State governments) posed challenging logistical and systemic conditions which have impacted on the overall delivery of the project and attainment of its broad goals.

The Project has also been designed with the targets of FSM Millennium Development Goals (MDG's) in mind including as a long term goal "the achievement of FSM targets under the MDGs and specific socio-economic and environmental objectives established by the people and government of the Federated States of Micronesia through the achievement of the SLM objectives"

In the Revised Project Logical Framework (annex 4 of the 2009 Inception Report) these Objectives are broadly described as being:

"Strengthened capacity of people and institutions and an enabling environment established and conducive for sustainable land management, more effective participation by stakeholders, and better utilisation of scientific and socio-economic data and enhanced capacities to address priority land degradation issues'

The suite of activities identified in the Revised Project Log frame are designed to help build this capacity over time by engaging the national and state environmental and natural resource and development management agencies, NGO's, communities and community groups in partnerships for the implementation of a wide range of project activities which demonstrate the principles of SLM in practice. At the same time the project aims to strengthen the enabling conditions for SLM and develop supporting linkages with regional and international agencies such as SPREP and SPC.

## **2.2 Purpose and Goals of the Evaluation**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

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

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

## **2.3 Key Issues Addressed**

The SLM project in FSM has had a somewhat chequered implementation history which has been influenced by the long delay in initiating activities in 2008/2009. This was caused in part by delay in key staff recruitment. The recruitment of a Planner for the Sustainable Development Unit who was also initially designated as SLM Project Manager took longer than anticipated as did the recruitment of the Project Coordinator. The cumulative effect was the 10 month delay in operationalising the project which contributed to the eventual request for an extension to the project to provide sufficient time to complete a number of project activities. In June 2011 a 12 month project extension was granted (June 2011 – June 2012) and a key issue to be addressed is whether the additional time has

been well utilised and contributed positively to the overall impact and success of the project. Related issues are whether the additional time has helped the project mature institutionally and led to the improvements in project delivery mechanisms based on the very specific recommendations of the MTE team in its report of June 2011.

These recommendations were aimed at performance improvements arising from the key issues which emerged from the MTE which were:

- Absorption capacity at the state level
- Sustainability of the SLM activities over time
- The SLM Project as a new kind of framework and therefore a steep learning curve
- Coordination between stakeholders within each of the FSM States
- Financing and payments to the states from the National government
- Level of co-financing and commitment that exists
- Overall recognition of key achievements (or lack thereof)
- Reporting and financial management capacity
- Information-sharing
- Monitoring and evaluation

These issues proved to be as valid for the Terminal Evaluation as they were for the MTE as, in the space of 12 months and despite the recommendations of the MTE, it emerged from discussions with the many stakeholders that efficiency of delivery and achievement of results has continued to be affected by the following issues:

- Coordination and communication between stakeholders within each of the FSM States and between the Project Management Unit and State Focal Points (although in both cases there has been an improvement during the project extension period).
- Financing and payments to the States from the National government (a major issue)
- Reporting and financial management capacity and transparency
- Insufficient Information-sharing and learning opportunities
- Irregular monitoring and evaluation schedules and M&E specific State visits

## **2.4 Methodology and Structure of the Evaluation**

This Terminal Evaluation commenced on 30 May 2012 on the signing of the contract between the Terminal Evaluation Consultant and UNDP Multi-country office in Suva, Fiji. The schedule for completion of the Evaluation was extremely tight as the FSM in-country phase leading to the completion and presentation of a draft report and findings is required to be completed before the termination of the extension phase of the project, on or before 30 June 2012 a final Terminal Evaluation report to the FSM Government and UNDP MCO by 16 July.

The following three phase methodology was proposed and followed throughout the Terminal Evaluation.

*Phase 1: Work plan development information gathering, document preparation and logistical arrangements.*

This phase included the acquisition of project inception reports, UNDP and GEF project documentation, annual and midyear reports, midterm evaluation, budgets, work plans and other associated project documentation. This material was assessed and analysed to help the Evaluator to develop a strong understanding of the key aspects of the project, including its scope, its intended purpose, its intended and unintended operational and implementation modalities and the resulting project outputs and outcomes. In addition a Skype meeting was arranged with UNDP MCO Project management staff in Suva to gain further insight into the project and its management since inception.

*Phase 2 In-country State visits, activity assessments and interviews*

The in-country visits to each State is the critical component of the Evaluation methodology and each visit followed the basic pattern of:

1. Meet with principal SLM Focal point to confirm meetings and field visits
2. Convene a SLM project stakeholder meeting to review progress and achievements related to project outputs
3. Make field visits to inspect projects being implemented (where possible).
4. Conduct separate interviews with relevant implementing stakeholders
5. If time permits convene Stakeholder Meeting to provide overview of findings and opportunity for initial feedback.

The ability of the FSM SLM Project Staff and the consultant to organise Stakeholder meetings and interviews in the States in the limited time available for the FSM country visit was critical to the success of the Evaluation. In this regard and given the tight planning timeline the fact the Evaluator was able to visit each State and meet with so many project stakeholders is a measure of the overall level of interest and support enjoyed by the project in the FSM. Table 1 below provides a summary of the in-country phase activities

*Phase 3 Report finalisation*

Additional feedback arising from the in-country presentations and written comments were incorporated into the final terminal evaluation report which was submitted to the UNDP Multi Country Office by COB July 16, allowing for up to 2 weeks for stakeholder review and additional comments to be assessed and incorporated where applicable.

Table 1 FSM In-country travel and activity itinerary 15 – 29 June 2012

<b>Date</b>	<b>Travel days</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Activities</b>
Friday 15 June Saturday 16 June	1 - 2	Guam	Work on State visit itinerary and questionnaire/Draft report
Sunday 17 June	3	YAP	Work on State visit itinerary and questionnaire/Draft report
Monday 18 June Tuesday 19 June	4 -5	YAP	Meet with DAF and EPA staff. Meet with YINS and USFS Rep. Conduct Field visits to demo sites/nurseries. Meet with community groups

Date	Travel days	Location	Activities
			Work on Draft report
Wednesday 20 June	6	CHUUK	Travel to Chuuk Meet with Chuuk SLM Focal Point to discuss project outcomes and issues
Thursday 21 June Friday 22 June	7 -8	CHUKK	Stakeholder meetings and discussions. Wrap up discussions in Chuuk with focal point Travel to Kosrae
Saturday 23 June Sunday 24 June	9 - 10	KOSRAE	Work on draft report
Monday 25 June Tuesday 26 June	11 -12		Meet with Kosrae SLM Focal Points Arrange and undertake demo site visits Travel to Pohnpei
Tuesday 26 June Wednesday 27 June Thursday 28 June	13 -15	POHNPEI	Pohnpei State and National Level stakeholder meetings Presentation of main findings and draft report Travel to Guam / Cairns
Friday 29 June			Cairns to Brisbane

### 3. The Project and its development context

#### 3.1 Project Start and Duration

The project officially commenced on 15 April 2008 following endorsement of the PDF A by the FSM GEF Operational Focal Point in June 2006. This is not an unusual length of time for initiation of a project of this type. It was designed with 3 year duration and an original completion date of 15 April 2011. The National Office of Environment and Emergency Management (OEEM) was designated as the FSM Government executing agency.

Although the project document was signed in April 2008 the FSM did not actually start implementation until 10 months later in February 2009, when the SLM Coordinator was finally hired. The MTE noted<sup>2</sup> that this late start eventually necessitated in OEEM seeking an extension to the project in April 2011. The delay in starting was caused by a combination of a delay in procurement by the OEEM and the lack of suitably qualified and/or interested candidates for the position in FSM. Regardless of the

<sup>2</sup> Subsequently confirmed by the Terminal Evaluation consultant in discussion with the Project Co-ordinator.



reason, as this initial period of delay became longer and longer, it should have elicited a stronger response by both the OEEM ( in regard to the search for a suitable candidate) and the UNDP MCO in regard to a solution to the procurement issue.

The impact of this initial delay was the loss of a year of implementation activity leading to the commissioning of MTE in June of 2011 and instructions to the MTE team to assess and make a recommendation regarding the possible extension of the project. The MTE concluded that on the basis of progress to date and in the interests of completing a number of activities which were either already underway or had potential to be completed in an extension phase, that an extension of 18 months was warranted. A decision was made by UNDP to limit the extension period to 12 months with the operational phase of the project concluding on 30 June 2012.

The MTE recommendation was also accompanied by a number of recommendations aimed at addressing the key issues affecting project implementation and improving the efficiency of project management and delivery in the final 12 months of its life. During the course of the Terminal Evaluation efforts were made to assess the degree to which these recommendations had been embraced by the implementing agencies and their impact on the project.

### **3.2 Problems that the Project Seeks to Address**

The ecological health and environmental integrity of land and coastal ecosystems on small islands such as those which make up the States of the FSM is fundamental to the social, economic and cultural sustainability of the people and communities of the islands. As the population of FSM has grown and pressure for economic growth increased greater demands are being made of the land resources of the islands, especially the forest and near shore coastal systems. These critically important natural systems especially the interior forests, mangroves, lagoons and coral reefs are widely acknowledged as being under considerable threat of being lost or degraded by deforestation for building and firewood, disturbance for construction, burning and land clearing for agriculture, pollution, sedimentation, coral dredging and destructive fishing practices.

Despite greater awareness of these problems at government and local level and changing attitudes through concerted government and NGO campaigns and activities over the past 20 years or so, land degradation resulting from deforestation, unplanned development, unsustainable and shifting agriculture and extreme weather events has been identified as a significant issue affecting FSM's ability to achieve its sustainable development goals<sup>3</sup>. Of particular concern is the decline in the ability of the environment to provide essential ecosystem services especially clean water which results from deforestation and watershed disturbance due to unsustainable agriculture involving the clearing of large trees and agro-forest areas for cash cropping.

The growing public and official recognition of these problems has led to interest in Sustainable Land Management and associated principles and practices as providing a solution. However, FSM does not have a strong enabling legislative or regulatory framework to support SLM and as noted in the MTE report, its objectives and principles have not been adequately mainstreamed into policies, regulations, strategies, plans and the educational systems.

Neither is there sufficient capacity to strengthen awareness, articulate SLM principles and solutions and encourage behavioural change amongst stakeholders while at the same time reconfiguring the policy and regulatory frameworks to embrace and mainstream SLM at national and State levels. With its focus on capacity building the SLM project aims to help narrow these capacity gaps by addressing capacity issues at four levels: i) individual level –lack of technical capacity (district level and community level for implementation); ii) institutional level – financial and human resources, monitoring capacity for enforcement of its rules and regulations); iii) lack of baseline data state and

---

<sup>3</sup> FSM's First National Report to UNCCD

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

### 3.3 Objectives the Project

The project objective for the FSM MSP SLM project is “strengthened capacity of people and institutions and an enabling environment established and conducive for; sustainable land management, more effective participation by stakeholders, better utilisation of scientific and socio-economic data and enhanced capacities to address priority land degradation issues.”<sup>4</sup>

More specifically the project Logical Framework identifies five Outcomes to be achieved through project implementation:

Outcome 1: National and State-level sector policies and strategies have SLM principles and objectives mainstreamed into them

Outcome 2: Capacity for SLM enhanced at the systemic, institutional and individual levels

Outcome 3: FSM National Action Plan (NAP) developed, promoted and implementation supported

Outcome 4: Medium Term Investment Plan (MTIP) developed and used to support implementation of the NAP

Outcome 5: Effective management and lessons learned (*achieved and identified*)<sup>5</sup>.

These in turn, are supported by eleven project outputs and 74 specific activities shared between the Sustainable Development Management Unit of OEEM and the four FSM States (Yap, Pohnpei, Kosrae and Chuuk). Several activities are identified for implementation in all 4 or in some cases 3 States and in these instances, implementation would have benefited from a coordinated, collegial learning approach.

### 3.4 Main Stakeholders

The main stakeholders of this project are, of course, the people and communities of the FSM who will ever increasingly rely on their natural environment to continue to provide them with the essential ecosystem services on which their livelihoods, well being and culture are dependent. The sustainable management of land resource is fundamental to this goal and in this regard, both government and community based organisation (CBO) leaders have a direct and important responsibility to support and encourage sustainable land management practices within their areas of jurisdiction be that at the national, state, municipality or village level.

Within the narrower focus of the project and its implementation considerable work has gone into identifying the primary implementing stakeholder group. These are a mix of both government and non government organisations and the project’s emphasis on engaging this broad base representing widely diverse expertise, experience, knowledge and interests in its implementation is to be strongly commended strengthening as it does the project’s aim to build capacity at all levels.

---

<sup>4</sup> Annex A Logical Framework for the SLM in FSM, Expedited Medium Sized Project Proposal.

<sup>5</sup> Evaluator’s amendment

Table 2 below identifies the organisations involved as implementing Stakeholders and summarise the detailed Annex D Stakeholder Involvement Matrix contained in the Expedited MSP Proposal.

Table 2 Summary of Stakeholder Groups

<b>State EPA's</b>	SLM Focal Points – one identified staff member from each
<b>State Divisions of Agriculture and Forests</b>	One or two representatives in each State usually responsible for demonstration projects and or technical expertise ( e.g. GIS)
<b>Educational Institutions</b>	State campus' of College of Micronesia (Land Grant)
<b>State Based NGO's</b>	State based organisations are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Society of Pohnpei</li> <li>• Pohnpei Farmers Association</li> <li>• Island Food Community of Pohnpei</li> <li>• Chuuk Conservation Society</li> <li>• Unon, Fongen and Ongoch ( UFO) Communities</li> <li>• Kosrae Conservation and Safety Organisation</li> <li>• Yap Community Action Programme</li> <li>• Yap Institute of Natural Science</li> </ul>
<b>Local Community Based Organisations</b>	e.g. Chuuk Women's Association ( SWM (litter) campaign) Kosrae Women's Association ( tree planting – SWM )
<b>National Government(OEEM)</b>	Project coordination and management staff
<b>Regional/International policy and development support agencies</b>	SPREP,SPC,UNFPA,USFS, JICA, Venezuela Fund

### 3.5 Results Expected

This is an ambitious project with ambitious expected results. These are best expressed by summarising the core objectives as being to enhance and develop the individual, institutional, and systemic capacity for Sustainable Land Management, to mainstream SLM considerations into the national development strategies and policies, to improve the quality of project design and implementation in the development arena including a National Action Plan and associated medium term investment plan , and ensuring the integration of relevant stakeholder views – including women and youth into the process through engagement in activities and consultation.

Looking more broadly the long term results expected are improved and sustainable management of land resources leading to healthy natural environments and the sustainability of critical ecosystem services, including water and soil quality. A reduction in pollution through improved waste management systems, public awareness and technology will assist in this process as will the demonstration of both traditional and introduced techniques for managing, rehabilitating and improving soils on steep lands. The value of good soil management and the reinforcing of traditional agro forestry and organic gardening techniques which have been with FSM communities since time immemorial will encourage and result in a new respect for and interest in, organic food production with positive results for FSM food security. Last but not least, emphasis on SLM practices will further

raise official and public awareness of the scourge of invasive plant species and will strengthen the commitment and support for those government and volunteer groups tackling this menace.

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

### **4.1 Project Formulation**

The sentiments of stakeholders interviewed during the State meetings in relation to the project formulation process were generally positive. Those who were directly involved in the development of the project proposal pointed to the early state wide planning meeting held in Kosrae in 2006 and the Project Inception Workshop in Chuuk in 2008 as important events in the formulation process.

There was a belief expressed that a genuine attempt had been made to and incorporate the views of the State and NGO implementers which was reflected in the emphasis placed on establishing demonstration sites in association with communities. Further, interviewees responded positively to the question on relevance with several saying the project linked well with work their organisation should or was doing.

However, while generally finding that project formulation was planned relatively well, particularly through the use of the Logical Framework which tied outcomes, outputs and activities together very well, the MTE commented that Project formulation would have been better served had the SLM framework been more closely linked to national and state development strategies and plans as well as NGO action plans, thus complementing and strengthening on-going operational and structures and priorities. Although this sentiment did not emerge clearly the TE, in the short time frame between the evaluations, it is not unreasonable to conclude that given the longer time available and more intimate knowledge of FSM Government policy of the MTE team that finding is still relevant.

#### **4.1.1 Implementation Approach**

The MTE reached the basic conclusion that the Implementation Approach to the project was challenging for all concerned but that the approach was generally a good one. It noted that the approach required coordination at multiple levels and between the many stakeholders and placed a significant burden of responsibility on the State Focal Points who were the intermediaries between the national government project management structure, the State implementing agencies and the CBO's and NGO's also involved in implementation. This view is shared by the TE which also notes that with some improvements, the overall implementation approach of working through State focal points and engaging multiple stakeholders is a useful model for consideration for application to other multi- state development assistance projects involving community implementation which may be entered into by FSM and international development agencies.<sup>6</sup>

It is clear from the TE discussions with stakeholders that a major challenge for all concerned has been grappling with the complicated funding disbursement and reporting procedures which require Focal Points and implementing agencies to request funding and payments through the PMU to a National Government finance system which operates differently from the State Government systems they are used to dealing with. Without exception issues with funding and budget transparency were raised and in some cases strongly, during each State stakeholder meeting and this was the single most contentious implementation issue the TE came up against.

---

<sup>6</sup> e.g. the proposed 5 year USAID Pacific Region Coastal Community Adaptation Programme currently under development.

Assessing the issue objectively, it is clear that communication and coordination between the Focal Points and the PMU needed to be strengthened with far more regular discussion of budget and activities based on the Project Logical Framework and budget taking place. This would have ensured all parties had a clear, shared understanding of funding spent, funding available and the time frame for expenditure. It was particularly important that this dialogue took place regularly in the early stages of project management when people were learning the new system and bedding down the implementation approach.

Another factor which may have strengthened the implementation approach was to place more emphasis and allocate funds for exploiting shared learning and output development opportunities. This was successfully achieved under the EIA training activity (2.4.3) but in the course of stakeholder discussions it is clear that this type of learning approach was popular and there were several common activities being undertaken by two or more States, where a similar approach could have been employed effectively. These include:

- Activity 2.1.4; Nursery management and replanting with indigenous species
- Activity 2.4.4; School activities to promote SLM
- Activity 2.4.6; GIS support to SLM
- Activity 2.4.9 Designing a coastline protection plan
- Activity 2.5.2 Developing Integrated Watershed Management Plans

Finally, as was also noted by the MTE, the range of activities and the associated management and technical inputs presented a significant challenge to the limited capacity of the key implementing agencies over a relatively short time 3 – 4 year time frame. It is to their credit that so much has been accomplished however, it is clear that in the technical areas of guidelines, management plan and policy development outputs have proved difficult to achieve. The MTE concluded and the TE concurs that on the technical side, greater attention could have been given to aligning the activities to existing SLM related activities, or reducing the number of activities and /or increasing the amount of time available to implement actions. The TE would add to this the need to provide information on and funding for sourcing professional assistance to work alongside the implementing agencies on technical activities such as coastal planning.

#### 4.1.2 Country Ownership and Drivenness

The TE found that the inclusive project formulation process had been instrumental in creating a sense of ownership which is reflected in the wide range of stakeholders involved, particularly the NGO's, the emphasis on community consultation and engagement through demonstration projects and the fact that many of the activities have been linked to the specific conditions in each of the States. The obvious conclusion is that overall the project has been seen as one which has added a new and useful dimension and value to the work of the stakeholders. Clearly early efforts made to ensure an inclusive formulation process have paid off and the lesson here is that time and money spent in laying this positive foundation pays beneficial dividends throughout the project life.

It is however important that the inclusive approach is maintained throughout the project life to ensure that a sense of alienation does not creep in. In this regard the MTE noted that the project had also elicited alternative feelings: that it had foisted additional responsibilities on government employees who already had full-time responsibilities; that FPs and stakeholders sometimes felt like "middlemen" due to the management and administrative arrangement of the project; that because of the new approach being used in this case, it felt driven from outside. The MTE concluded that respective states need to have the flexibility to be creative in achieving the outputs, and especially to be able to

further support projects that are being implemented successfully in order to create a greater sense of ownership.

#### 4.1.3 Stakeholder Participation

On the face of it the stakeholder participation in the project has been strong and an essential component of the project's overall success. This is especially so with the engagement between State government agencies and State NGO's. Obviously the degree of engagement has varied from State to State, which was noted by the MTE. However, overall from the TE perspective, based to a degree on experience with other Pacific island development and conservation projects, the stakeholder component of the project has been successful. In particular the projects' role in linking NGO's, communities and State Government together around a resource management theme as important as SLM, has been an indirect but positive outcome through raised awareness of the issue and appreciation of the advantages of joint cooperation in tackling the problems locally. A good example of the latter has been the Government/NGO/Community cooperation on SLM and Conservation Action Planning activities in the UFO communities on Fefan Island in Chuuk

The MTE noted and the TE concurs that the stakeholder participation could have been further improved by earlier and more direct involvement of the NGO's in the entire process from planning and formulation to implementation. Further that the problems with financial transparency had prevented some stakeholders being adequately informed about available funding and pending activities. Both these issues call for strengthened communication and coordination at the State level perhaps structured around a formal quarterly SLM project meeting.

Overall the conclusion here is that identified by the MTE - full participation from a wide variety of stakeholders from both government and the civil sector is essential in assuring best practices and successful implementation of projects. When the NGO and CBO presence is fully integrated into the implementation process is where projects tend to work well, especially in terms of impact.

#### 4.1.4 Replication Approach

One of the true tests of any development project is the legacy it leaves behind in terms of impacts at scale and the precursor to this is the degree to which the project activities have been designed with replication in mind and its approaches and models/pilots widely adopted. In this regard the design of the SLM Capacity Building Project can be judged an overall success and a good model for other similar projects. As with other successful aspects of the design of the project, the foundation for good potential replication was laid at the original design workshop where the State stakeholder groups shared information on their preferred activities and priorities and these and collectively lumped into activities for inclusion in the proposal. As commented on by the MTE, the inherent beauty of the SLM project is that it was designed not only for States to implement similar projects within the framework of 12 Outputs, but that best practices and successful projects could be shared. The example quoted by the MTE is Activity 2.3.4 relating to enhancing capacity to minimise negative impacts of solid waste on land resources. This activity which has focussed on recycling was successfully implemented in Kosrae and as a result, has been replicated in Yap and is now underway or being considered for adoption in Pohnpei and Chuuk. Implementation and technical support from UNDP, JICA and SPREP has also been instrumental in this success.

Other examples of potential replication can be seen in activities related to sustainable agriculture practices on sloping lands, the promotion of organic production and the development of methodologies to monitor soil erosion and implement mitigation options. Similarly, the uncompleted Activity 2.4.9; design of coastline protection plans and the associated 2.4.12; selection of construction types and methods to be used has enormous replication potential.

Important to the successful replication of outcomes is the opportunity to share information and learn from peers. In this regard learning exchanges, workshops and joint development of generic guidelines suitable for modification to the special conditions of a State are essential tools in promoting replication and improving the efficiency of project delivery. This was clearly demonstrated in the approach to strengthening EIA capacity but was lacking in other areas of the SLM project. The finding is that more attention should have been paid to identifying and maximising these learning opportunities and allocating appropriate funding.

#### 4.1.5 Cost Effectiveness

The consensus of stakeholders attending the State stakeholder meetings and responding to the questionnaire is that the project has indeed been cost – effective. Certainly in terms of the activities completed and inspected at State level, this view is shared by the TE. The example of Savannah reforestation in Yap where some 6,000 trees have been raised in the Agriculture Division nursery and planted out in three demonstration areas for an outlay of approximately \$6,000. The potential benefits from this project if successful, in terms of demonstrating improved soil conditioning, opportunity for increasing productive land and perhaps identifying suitable land for re-settlement of climate change refugees, is enormous. The MTE also identified Activity 2.3.4 relating to recycling where for a limited commitment of funds (\$6,500) a highly effective and sustainable solid waste recycling system has been established (Kosrae) and replicated in two states (Yap, Pohnpei). Another example of a low cost high impact activity was seen on Yap at the Gilman Elementary School sustainable agriculture garden.

At another scale, that of policy development and mainstreaming SLM principles, an excellent example of the cost effectiveness of a modest investment is to be found in the EIA training for all State EPA leads and key staff at the Kosrae workshop in 2010 followed up in [February](#) 2012 with a national workshop and a series of state EIA guidelines workshops held from May 14 to June 8 2012 covering all four states.

These workshops in particular the latter at the state levels brought stakeholders together with state EPAs (KIRMA in Kosrae, and EPAs in Pohnpei, Chuuk and Yap) and engaged them on drafting state EIA guidelines covering the state EIA framework and its basic requirements; the priority SLM measures that should be considered when conducting EIAs and the management of development impacts and priority measures for climate proofing development projects against their vulnerabilities to the effects of short and long term climate change impacts; and the finally goals for strengthening the overall EIA system with a follow-up timeline and M&E process. The in-state arrangements for these workshops and drafting of EIA guidelines were funded under the SLM project with additional funding support are provided by other sectors in some States with significant co financing from SPREP.

#### 4.1.6 UNDP Comparative Advantage

The MTE defined comparative advantage as meaning the ability of something to fulfil a need best where it exists. It found that the UNDP brought a comparative advantage to the SLM project. It cited examples where without the UNDP commitment to the project activities in the various States would not have been funded under normal operational budgets and concluded that the SLM Project has been relatively effective in bolstering ongoing operational activities of the stakeholder institutions, particularly at the state level. These included in Kosrae, the FSM SLM Project was able to fund specific solid waste and coastal management activities for the state that otherwise would not have been funded in the KIRMA budget for Fiscal Year 2011 (October – September). Similarly, in Chuuk and Pohnpei, the UNDP has created a comparative advantage in filling certain gaps in the purchase of certain tools and equipment to conduct SLM

Perhaps more importantly, as the GEF IA with a long history of project development implementation and management in the Pacific region, together with its physical presence in FIJI and FSM (through the Joint Presence Office) the UNDP was well credentialed to undertake its oversight functions in the FSM. The decision to recommend and successfully seek an extension to the project is an example of the comparative advantage of UNDP and its understanding of the issues of project implementation in the region and the need for flexibility and adaptation. The presence of the Joint Presence Office in FSM is another indicator of comparative advantage. However, this comparative advantage could be further strengthened through increased dialogue and partnership with both government and the regional (NGO) mechanisms in place (e.g. SPC, Micronesia Conservation Trust, Micronesia Small Grants Program, etc.).

#### 4.1.7 Linkages Between Project and Other Interventions with the Sector

Linkages with other interventions have been a significant and successful component of the design and actual implementation of the SLM Project. In fact, as noted by the MTE, the SLM Project in FSM would have been almost impossible to implement without these linkages.

This imperative to develop partnerships and linkages was emphasised in the Expedited Project Proposal where it was noted that the SLM project would significantly assist the FSM to address land degradation related issues within the context of UNCCD and to assist with progressing elements of the NBSAP. In these respects the work associated with strengthening EIA regulations and enabling frameworks by mainstreaming SLM principles (greatly assisted by SPREP though its regional UNCCD mandate) together with the practical results of work such as the savannah rehabilitation in Yap, the water quality monitoring of Nimpal Channel MCA and integration of the work of State invasives species task forces are illustrative of these linkages. Similarly, the identification by the NCSA of capacity gaps in the environmental and natural resource sector in FSM helped to focus the capacity building emphasis of the FSM SLM project and the identification of key stakeholders likely to benefit from the intervention.

As envisioned when the project was developed for the FSM in 2006, and at the inception workshop, a range of regional and international funding and technical assistance organisations had committed to assisting the project. These commitments can actually be considered co-financing or better yet, leveraged resources for SLM. They include:

- SPREP and SPC. Assistance with mainstreaming SLM into EIA processes
- JICA. Assistance with SWM planning and recycling
- Venezuela Fund Co – financing for numerous activities
- SPC/SOPAC Assistance with IWRM project Pohnpei.
- COM (Land Grant). Assistance with sustainable agriculture and organic food production
- FAO. Assistance with sustainable agriculture and organic farming
- USFS Assistance with technical expertise on veg mapping, land rehabilitation etc.
- State NGO's and CBO's Assistance with activity implementation and community consultations.

The TE concludes the identification and linkage with other related interventions is a demonstrated strength of the FSM SLM project without which some of its activities would have been significantly reduced in impact. The TE concurs with the view of the MTE that incorporating these linkages into the design of a project such as this, integrates the SLM work with other ongoing work in the sector and works as a natural coordinative mechanism for the many interested/vested international organizations and objectives in the region. This part of the design of the SLM Project was actually well-conceived and has been well-implemented, from the National level on down to the community level.



4.1.8 Indicators

The project indicators are reasonable and SMART. They provide a good guide to the success or otherwise of the project in terms of its outputs. The Table below was developed by the MTE and is used to update progress over the extension year.

Table3 Assessment of Progress against Measurable Indicators

<b>Measurable Indicators from Project Log frame</b>	<b>MET Assessment on Status</b>	<b>TE Assessment of Progress</b>
<p><b>Output 1.1</b> At least four National and/or State sector policies and strategies incorporating SLM principles by end of project life.</p>	<p>In Kosrae, there is a newly passed Climate Change legislation, a Draft Solid Waste Management Plan, as well as a Protected Area Act; Pohnpei has a Recycling Bill currently in the Legislature and a State Agriculture/Forestry Plan(the State wide Assessment of Resources Strategy); at the national level there is a Draft Solid Waste Management Plan and a Draft Food Security Policy – all of these have SLM principles as their foundation and central theme.</p>	<p><i>All States have draft SWM plans currently being updated with OEEM assistance. Pohnpei recycling Bill has passed and is in force. IWMP was not created in final year in Kosrae (for Yela and Olum Watersheds).</i></p>
<p><b>Output 1.2</b> At least four major projects will have EIA's that incorporate SLM principles in the planning and development process by end of project.</p>	<p>Not enough information at this point.</p>	<p><i>Follow up FP workshop held in Feb/Mar 2012 leading to EIA workshops in all 4 States May/June 2012 to develop EIA guidelines including mainstreaming of SLM principles. Highly successful outcome of project –needs ongoing follow up</i></p>
<p><b>Output 2.1</b> State government agencies, NGO's and at least one community in each state able to collaborate, prioritize and use technical guidelines to identify and rehabilitate degraded land areas.</p>	<p>Chuuk is the state that has committed to developing these guidelines (Activity 2.1.5); to date, guidelines have not been developed, but a Draft Outline has been developed; it is expected that once finalized, it will be shared with the other states.</p>	<p><i>Chuuk has not developed Guidelines to Rehabilitate Degraded Lands due to Landslides and Climate Change or progressed the draft outline. However some mangrove restoration with UFO communities undertaken. Yap State has also undertaken degraded land (Savannah) rehabilitation but has not produced guidelines.</i></p>
<p><b>Output 2.2</b> At least two demonstration sites established in each State that demonstrate sustainable agriculture practices, a guide for sustainable agriculture on sloping land developed and made available to all States, and a minimum of 30 farmers – 50% of which should be women – in both target States benefiting from practical training</p>	<p>Each state does have at least two demonstration sites established; SALT guideline not yet developed (this is a Kosrae activity); as far as the # of farmers, not enough information at this point.</p>	<p><i>Kosrae has not developed its SALT Guidelines but has changed this activity to enhance nurseries and organic composting. Pohnpei has established sustainable agro-forestry demonstration site and held successful field days 50+farmer including some women. Chuuk has done some demonstration work with UFO communities including women. Good invasive species capacity and projects developed in Pohnpei and mangrove restoration work in</i></p>

		<i>Kosrae, Yap and reportedly Chuuk and savannah rehabilitation in Yap – no guidelines produced.</i>
<b>Output 2.3</b> Solid waste management plan developed for at least two States, at least one training activity implemented in the two States to promote waste minimization and public awareness raised on the negative impacts of illegal dumping of waste.	Kosrae is the only state to develop a SWM Plan; other states are currently interested in reviewing it as a model for potential replication; SWM Workshop conducted in Kosrae in October 2010 where all states were represented; awareness-raising as yet to be fully implemented.	<i>All States have completed a draft SWM plan which are being reviewed and updated with help from OEEM. Yap has secured Japan funding for implementation.</i>
<b>Output 2.4</b> Capacity at the individual level is enhanced through the issuance of at least one scholarship for each state in a field related to SLM, with returning students being employed within relevant government organizations in the FSM by end of project.	Yap has issued six scholarships and submitted three contracts for three college interns to work with Yap SLM stakeholders (EPA and Agriculture & Forestry) on raising awareness on SLM; Kosrae and Chuuk have not, but are in the process of doing so (one for each state); Pohnpei has recently submitted the name of one awardee.	<i>All four States have performed well in the extension period. Yap has been very successful in awarding its scholarship money to 9 students and 4 interns. Chuuk has a candidate identified and funding has been requested; Kosrae has successfully identified students and allocated its funding as has Pohnpei.</i>
<b>Output 2.5</b> Watershed management plans incorporating SLM principles are planned and developed in at least two States involving a wide range of stakeholders, including women and youth.	Pohnpei has established the Watershed Forest Reserve Boundary around most of the island and is using SLM funds now to extend it to the Sokehs watershed; Kosrae has plans for YELA and KCSO to develop IWMPs for the Yela and Olum watersheds; participation of women and youth needs to be improved	<i>Kosrae (YELA and KCSO) will need to begin the process of developing and/or finalizing their IWMPs starting in July-August 2011. This was not done but remains a work in progress. Pohnpei (CSP) has successfully focused its attention on securing Sokehs Municipality where women and youth were widely consulted and is planning on replicating in Nett Municipality.</i>
<b>Output 3.1</b> National government and stakeholder representatives in all States participate in the development of the NAP.	Consultant has been engaged but the process has been severely delayed; full stakeholder participation has yet to be instigated, especially at the state level, but Initial consultations were made through the NCSA project during the SLM Inception Workshop in Chuuk (2008) and the EIA Training in Kosrae (2010).	<i>NAP Draft will need to be finalized by July 2011 and circulated for full input from all stakeholders over the following 3-4 months. NAP has not been completed due to decision to postpone further development pending the production of template for alignment with UNCCD 5 yr. Action Plan by SPREP</i>
<b>Output 3.2</b> NAP document completed, endorsed by State and National Governments and submitted to the UNCCD Secretariat.	This has yet to be completed.	<i>Draft NAP not completed (see comments above).</i>
<b>Output 4.1</b> Training of trainers carried out on the development of a	Some work by other donors has assisted – TNC, SPC, MCT and MSGP have all	<i>The IFS (part of the NAP) should assist in this aim beginning in July 2011; MCT should be requested to</i>

resource mobilization strategy and stakeholder representatives from each State trained in ways to develop resource mobilization strategies, project management and development of project proposals.	conducted trainings in proposal development and project management in each of the states.	assist in this area ASAP.  <i>Has not progressed due to decision to postpone work on NAP ( see above)</i>
<b>Output 4.2</b> Medium Term Investment plan and resource mobilization plan completed, endorsed by Government and used as a guide in development of government and NGO work plans and project proposal development.	This has yet to be completed.	This will be included as part of the NAP and will follow accordingly.  <i>(See comments above)</i>
<b>Output 5.1</b> One mid-term review, one final review, one financial evaluation and three annual audits conducted.	One mid-term review has been completed; one annual audit has been completed.	<i>Final Terminal Evaluation (final review) completed. Second audit conducted in 2012.</i>

#### 4.1.9 Management Arrangements

It is the area of project management arrangements and their execution that has received the most forthright comment from stakeholders throughout the evaluation. Clearly this is a contentious subject with all stakeholders agreeing that while theoretically sound the multi layered management structure has left a lot to be desired. The issues raised have stemmed from the initial delay in recruiting the Project Coordinator and the difficulties arising from the delays experienced as a result of the complicated financial disbursement and reporting procedures. For example, the TE was informed of several instances where vendors have not been paid by the project and have refused credit for further work or purchases until paid. The MTE referred to instances where requests for payments outside the strict parameters of the budget had been forwarded to UNDP MCO in Suva only to be denied. There is a strong sentiment expressed that the channelling of funds through the National Government and UNDP processes is unnecessarily complicated, and inflexible, and should be simplified. This view is shared by the TE and was also consistent with the findings of the MTE.

It has been suggested at every meeting that for future international development projects involving all four States and the National government, strong consideration should be given to a structure which bypasses the National Government system and provides for direct accountability by the States and implementing NGO's to the Development Agency or through an independent intermediary such as SPC, SPREP or, in the case of FSM, the Micronesia Conservation Trust. In this regard consideration should be given to the model developed for PACC whereby SPREP directly funds the programme work in Kosrae State.

There is also a sentiment that although working well at times, the communication and co-ordination of the project between the States and the PMU could have been more efficient and effective and that at times has led to frustration and uncertainty with regard to implementation decisions and actions at the State level. In this regard, the TE has found that the PMU has been insufficiently funded to provide the staff, particularly the Co-ordinator, with the resources to be fully proactive in this role across a difficult multi-layered project with numerous State and NGO/CBO partners and 69 activities for implementation. In particular money for regular travel by the Coordinator to the States and for at least

annual programme, work plan and budget review meetings of all Focal Points (and desirably key implanting partners) should have been budgeted for, especially in the first year or 18 months of the project when the management arrangements and systems were still being bedded down and everyone was on a steep learning curve. At some point, perhaps six months after the Inception workshop and the taking up of duties by the Project Coordinator, a further focused training course on the project management systems could have been held as a follow up and would have ensured a better understanding of the project's management systems from the outset.

With hindsight regular (at least twice yearly) meetings or even more frequent teleconference calls between the Co-ordinator and State FP's could have helped overcome the perceived lack of budget transparency and uncertainty of funding allocations which have been persistently raised by Stakeholders. It would also have strengthened the sense of collegial management needed to help to build capacity and understanding of the SLM project. It was surprising to learn that in Kosrae at least, the Mid Term Evaluation report had not been shared with some the Focal Points<sup>7</sup>. In this regard, use of the Project Log frame to structure these meetings and identify and help reconcile implementation issues and track budget and expenditure, while providing for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of progress, and would have been valuable.

Funding for the PMU and related activities such as the MTE and TE's is drawn from the \$500,000 GEF contribution and this reduces funding available for implantation activities. It is recommended that a realistic and transparent programme management budget which provides identified funding additional to implementation funds for regular travel, review meetings and other forms of conferencing and networking be included in any new SLM or similar project for FSM

Finally it is noted that the management structure of the project also included oversight by a Project Steering Committee and technical support from a Technical Assistance Group (TAG). It does not appear that these groups were ever constituted or met to fulfil these functions. This seems most unfortunate given the management problems which have emerged, and the difficulty experienced by State FP's in sourcing technical assistance with the development of shoreline and integrated watershed management plans. Again, it appears part of the reason for this oversight relates to insufficient funding.

The MTE drew the conclusion that though the current arrangement was working – in some cases, very well – it could be improved with a more direct approach. The TE suggested that an arrangement to have funds administered through an existing sub-regional organization such as SPC and the UN Joint Presence Office in Pohnpei should be instigated and facilitated through the FSM National Government, likely through some kind of MOU or other facilitating mechanism. It made the point that doing so would eliminate the long distance to Fiji in terms of the overall management arrangement and localisation would better serve implementation. In this respect this TE notes that the original management structure provided for project oversight and work plan and budget revisions to be delegated to the UN Joint Presence Office in Pohnpei but this never happened, possible because of insufficient capacity to administer funds in that office. In another iteration of this project this option should be re-visited.

In addition, both Evaluations have noted that SLM steering committees, which were initially established at the outset of the SLM Project (Inception Workshop in February 2008), have not been functional. Possible reasons for this are that the Steering Committee as originally constituted, was perhaps too large, comprised members who found it difficult to attend and were remote from the project and the cost of convening these meetings.<sup>8</sup> However both the MTE and the TE consider the

---

<sup>7</sup> Kosrae, Chuuk and Pohnpei FP's reported not having seen the final report although this was not the case for Yap.

<sup>8</sup> Reasons suggested by the Project Coordinator in interview 25 June 2012.

role of a Steering Committee as being important in the oversight and facilitation of a complex project like this and recommend that any future SLM project of a similar structure include a Steering Committee with members representative of not only senior FSM National Government but also the State agencies and NGO's close to implementation.

A similar situation has occurred with the Technical Assistance Group (TAG). Again, although in the original management structure the TAG was never constituted or convened. However, after hearing the difficulties experienced by State Focal Points in accessing expertise to assist with the drafting of guidelines and development of plans e.g. coastal protection plans, degraded lands rehabilitation guidelines and integrated watershed management plans, an effective TAG with membership representative of key technical supporting organisations may have provided much needed help in this area. Accordingly it is also recommended that a TAG be established with appropriate budget to assist any future SLM or similar project in FSM.

On a final note, the value of the initial regular<sup>9</sup> UNDP MCO missions to FSM including senior level representation has been emphasised by the Project Coordinator who found these both reassuring and extremely helpful in term of understanding the operating parameters of the UNDP financial system. It is unfortunate that these did not continue after early 2010 and it is clear that this form of regular dialogue between UNDP MCO, FSM Government and the PMU is a valuable asset to project management and should be maintained in any future SLM project.

## 4.2 Implementation

### 4.2.1 Financial Planning.

The financial planning behind the development of the SLM Programme work plan and budget has been thorough and transparent with the exception referred to above in 4.1.9 where the costs of the PMU and associated national level activities such as the EIA workshops and SWM outputs were not clearly identified or articulated as being costs on the overall project budget with the originally promised States allocations to be reduced accordingly. This needs to be rectified in the planning of any future SLM project and all costs and budgets should be transparent with clear accountability assignments and as recommended in 4.1.9, budgeted separately.

Table 4 below provides a summary of the detailed project budget planning and allocations decided on at the Inception Meeting. Commendably strong emphasis was given to funding the large suite of activities to be implemented by the States under Outcome 2: Capacity for Sustainable Land Management enhanced at the systemic, institutional and individual levels with 65.5% (and 70% of GEF funding) of the total budget allocates to these activities. The allocations for Output 1 National and State policy development and mainstreaming (4.2%) and for the development (4.3%) and funding plan (4.0%) for the UNCCD National Action Plan were considerably smaller with only 2.3% of the GEF funding. Given the importance placed on policy and mainstreaming it and the development of the NAP as key project activities perhaps more funding could have been allocated to these activities in this early planning stage.

A total budget allocation of 4.35% (\$62,000 or 11% of the GEF funding) was provided from GEF funds to support the M&E elements of the budget. Of this almost half (\$26,000) was allocated to be spent on the inception workshop with another \$18,000 for travel/meetings, \$10,000 for annual audits and only \$1,000 each for the MTE and TE. There was no allocation to support a TAG, Project Steering Committee or Tripartite Review (TPR) as required in the Project Document.

A total of \$224,737 or 15.8% of the total Project budget was allocated to support the PMU with \$68,737 (12% of the GEF funding) being provided by GEF funding and \$156,000 as co-financing

---

<sup>9</sup> June and December 2009 and February 2010 Project Coordinator Interview 25 June 2012.

primarily from the FSM government. The combined M&E and PMU budget allocations totaled 20.15% of the entire project budget and consisted of 12% of the GEF funding. In view of the fact that some key elements of the project institutional structure and M&E plan were not able to be implemented there would appear to be a need to either increase the budget allocated to these activities and align these with accurate budget planning.

There is also a significant co-financing component to the project with 60% of the total project budget being contributed from a variety of sources the most significant being the National and State governments of FSM. Annex 7 provides an overview of the effectiveness of co-financing and the project's ability to leverage resources.

It is noteworthy that as the project has progressed it's the State based implementers believe its delivery has slowed down due to the time consuming financial approval process of the National Government Department of Finance. However the PMU commented that most payments are made on time except for those requests submitted by the States where the vendor is located overseas or when the States request for goods and services that have been obtained or performed already within the States without the approval of Project Management. Thus, these have to be processed through the National AG's office and are assessed against the accepted practice is the submission of 3 quotes from 3 vendors. The States are aware of this but some evidently continued to submit improper invoices. Additionally, the Project encourages the use of community groups for catering during consultations. However, some States continued to solicit hotel caterers that charge up to \$1000 for 3 days. Any food requests processed through National Government that exceed \$1000 are processed through the AG's office.

There may be good reasons for these delays but on the face of it requirements such as this hamper project financial planning and management. This was the single most consistent complaint at all stakeholder meetings and the consistent message was that the project would have been much more efficient if it had been possible to allocated funds directly from UNDP to State Finance Departments and implementing NGO's all of whom have accredited financial accounting and reporting systems and are subject to annual audit. Another alternative which was advanced in the MTE is for UNDP to channel funds through regional organisations (SPREP, SPC) which have efficient, flexible procurement, financial and accounting systems in place and experience with the delivery of multi party projects in the region.

However, the MTE also notes that two important caveats need to be kept in mind in the case of this eventuality: 1) the need for government(s) to continue to be able to build capacity in financial and project management, and 2) the legality and process by which international institutions (UNDP) are able to work through sub-regional institutions (SPC) vis-à-vis the relevant Financial Management Regulations.

The final point to be made under this component of the evaluation is that despite the issues identified above, the financial planning for the project has had an important element of flexibility and adaptive management about it. This is best illustrated in the reprogramming of funds which has taken place, particularly in the extension year. Although initially not as transparent as would be desirable e.g. the initial reprogramming of funds to support EIA outcomes, the flexibility of the PMU in this respect has significantly assisted the expenditure of funds in the extension year to the point that almost all funding has now been or is programmed to be spent. This in turn has added to the value of activities which are well supported by stakeholders and are ongoing and most likely to be successful which are broad criteria used to evaluate reprogramming decisions.

Table 4 Percentage of Inception Budget Allocated to Outcomes and Project Management

OUTPUT	GEF	Co-financing	Total	% Total Budget
<b>Outcome 1: National and State level sector policies and strategies have SLM principles and objectives mainstreamed.</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>52,000</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>4.21</b>
Percentage GEF Funding budgeted for Outcome 1	1.41			
<b>Outcome 2: Capacity for Sustainable Land Management enhanced at the systemic, institutional and individual levels</b>	<b>396,795</b>	<b>536,300</b>	<b>933,095</b>	<b>65.49</b>
Percentage of GEF Funding Budgeted for Outcome 2	70.16			
<b>Outcome 3: FSM NAP developed, promoted and implementation supported</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>62,000</b>	<b>62,000</b>	<b>4.35</b>
Percentage of GEF Funding budgeted for Outcome 3				
<b>Outcome 4: Medium Term Investment Plan developed and used to support the implementation of the NAP.</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>53,000</b>	<b>58,000</b>	<b>4.07</b>
Percentage of GEF Funding budgeted for Outcome 4	0.88			
<b>Outcome 5. Effective Management and lessons learnt</b>				
<b>Output 5.1 FSM SLM Project effectively monitored /evaluated</b>				
5.1.1 Mid-term Evaluation (if necessary)	1,000	-	1,000	
5.1.2 Final Evaluation	1,000	-	1,000	
5.1.3 Annual Audits	10,000	-	10,000	
5.1.4 Inception workshop and report	26,000	-	26,000	
5.1.5 Field visits/TPR Meetings costs/Regional & International Meeting	18,000	-	18,000	
5.1.6 Project M&E reporting costs	6,000	-	6,000	
<b>OUTCOME 5: Sub-Total</b>	<b>62,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>62,000</b>	<b>4.35</b>
Percentage of GEF funding budgeted for M&E	10.96			
<b>Project Management Unit</b>	<b>68,737</b>	<b>156,000</b>	<b>224,737</b>	<b>15.77</b>
Percentage of GEF Funding budgeted for PMU	12.15			
Total	540,532	859,300	1,399,832	
<b>PDFA</b>	<b>25,000</b>		<b>25,000</b>	<b>1.75</b>
Percentage of GEF Funds budgeted for PDFA	4.42			
<b>Full Project Budget on Inception</b>	<b>565,532</b>	<b>859,300</b>	<b>1,424,832</b>	<b>100.00</b>

#### 4.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation

The finding of the MTE was that the overall monitoring and evaluation of the project is deficient and could be improved. This finding is shared by the TE. The Expedited Project Proposal included a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, several elements of which do not seem to have been actioned. These include a detailed schedule of project review meetings, timeframes for Tripartite reviews Project Executive Group meetings, Steering Group meetings and related M&E activities (other than the NTE and TE). The MTE noted that PMU had stated that it had to cut back on the physical monitoring and evaluation component of the SLM Project due to the a reduction in that budget category due to the overall costs of the FSM SLM Inception Workshop held in Chuuk in 2009.

As noted in 4.1.9 above the resulting reduction in field visits to the states and to specific projects has impacted the collegial learning and evaluation process so important for the efficient and effective implantation of a multi- State project like the FSM SLM project. Instead, due to budget shortage, the PMU has relied on conference calls and other types of electronic communication and the Project Management has capitalized on National meetings as a way to conduct side meetings with State Focal Points to review progress. Clearly M&E is essential in promoting coordination amongst stakeholders, information sharing, resolution of issues and assisting in the continuous forward movement of a project, particularly for the unique situation presented by the FSM with such disparately separated states. Consequently it must be adequately resourced as an integral component of any further iteration of the SLM or similar multi State project.

#### 4.2.3 Execution and Implementation Modalities

The MTE found that capacity in FSM is such that when government staff in key positions – SLM Coordinator, State FPs, Project Manager – are either out of the office, or have transitioned to other positions, subordinate staff is not able to effectively carry out ongoing SLM Project needs. State FPs, for example, are busy government employees with a host of responsibilities and travel needs and these often hamper timely and consistent follow through on SLM activities. In the case of the SLM Coordinator, there was a prolonged period of absence for health reasons and this may have led to some delay in implementation of the project, simply for the finding outlined above.

Although only raised by one group of State stakeholders, this issue is clearly one which will impact on the execution and implementation of the project. It is difficult to overcome and indeed is a region wide problem where inevitably in most government agencies, the too few experienced or qualified staff are asked to handle a multitude of tasks and responsibilities. The MTE concluded that in the future design and implementation of UNDP projects consideration should be given to appointing dedicated (funded) SLM personnel at each of the States to ensure a singular focus on implementation. Further that given the importance of consistency in staff (no turnover in key decision-making positions) to effective implementation, where possible, subordinate staff should be well-informed on SLM Project activities and be able to cover for the primary FPs when they have to attend to other duties at home and abroad. Furthermore, a specially designated SLM Administrative/Accounting Assistant could potentially be recruited and housed at the FSM PMU, should the need be required.

#### 4.2.4 Management by the UN Joint Presence Office in FSM

With the exception of commenting on the Terms of Reference and on the draft report, and attending the final in-country presentation of the draft TE, the UN Joint Presence office representative in Kolonia, Pohnpei had no direct involvement in the TE. Consequently it is a little difficult to comment on this component of the Evaluation. This was a deliberate decision on behalf of UNDP anxious to ensure the integrity and independent nature of the evaluation was not compromised and to ensure that interviewees could openly discuss their views with the Evaluator, which may not have been the case in the presence of UNDP representatives.



As noted earlier, the original project management structure as described in the Expedited Medium Sized Project Proposal authorised the “UNDP Resident Representative in FSM” to effect a changes to the Project Document where UNDP GEF and stakeholders agree and have no objections<sup>10</sup>. This would indicate an active role was envisaged for the UN Joint Presence Office representative or a failure to understand the joint UN representative role of that office. For reasons that are unclear but might include the lack of financial administration capacity in this office, this more active role in project oversight did not eventuate.

However, the MTE noted number of instances in relation to the commissioning of that evaluation where the assistance of the UNDP office in FSM was particularly helpful. This level of involvement occurred primarily because both the team leader and national consultants for that evaluation were residents of Kolonia, Pohnpei where the UN Joint Presence Office is located. This made close cooperation on the MTE commissioning process which involved a high level of inter action with the UNDP MCO in Suva Fiji logical. Given the location of the Joint Presence Office in Kolonia and close to the OED and PMU, it is suggested that should another SLM or similar project be developed, strong consideration be given to designating a more proactive project management role for this office as was envisaged in the Project Document. This could have the positive effect of streamlining the UNDP management and communication chain and links to the PMU. This may require strengthening the financial/grant management staff capacity of the Office but the additional cost may significantly assist overall project delivery.

#### 4.2.5 Coordination and Operational Issues

The MTE found that the roles of various key stakeholders should have been made more clear from the outset, particularly for the NGOs, who appear to have come a little late to the game, but are now actively involved in each of the FSM states – and nationally, as in the case of SPC and SPREP – in implementation of key activities. The TE has found that there is now a very good understanding amongst the stakeholders of the respective roles and responsibilities of all parties and those implementation partnerships between NGO's and Government implementing agencies have matured along with the communication and coordination. This bodes well if there is to be a further SLM project which would be well placed to take advantage of the relationships forged under the current SLM.

Another coordination issue identified in both the MTE and TE is the need for more regular contact and follow up through regular conference-calling between the SLM Coordinator and the four FPs in order to share lessons learned and update on successful activities within each state, as well as the call for quarterly implementation updates to be transmitted from the PMU to the FPs. The TE is more explicit in identifying the importance of regular calls and preferably meetings between the SLM Coordinator, FP and key NGO implementers. These are valuable learning and sharing opportunities vital to the building of capacity and knowledge amongst these key stakeholders, and importantly, as a form of incremental monitoring of project outputs and finances based on regular review of the Revised Project Log frame, work plan and budget.

The MTE also identified as an operational issue at the state-level the fact that some of the SLM activities were new and capacity to undertake them limited, thus a result is either very slow or non-implementation.<sup>11</sup> The TE found this still to be the case and compounded by the difficulty FP's reported they had in identifying experts with the required backgrounds and experience to assist them with the preparation of guidelines and management plans, in particular those for Coastal Protection and the SALT guidelines mentioned above. Contrast this with the progress made with SWM planning

---

<sup>10</sup> Para 143 Expedited Medium Sized Project Document for Capacity Building, Policy Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management.

<sup>11</sup> The SALT activity for Kosrae is a good example of this. In retrospect, it may have been an overly ambitious activity designated from Kosrae.

and integration of SLM principles into EIA where highly competent expertise was made available to support these rather difficult policy/legislative initiatives. The conclusion which can be drawn is that new and technically challenging initiatives will ideally be linked with partnerships with agencies which specialise in the required field and can assist with expertise. Alternatively where that expertise is not to be found in-country funding is available for the hiring of outside professional for realistic timeframes.

The operational issue of the difficult finance process through national government and its impact on slowing the implementation of field activities is addressed above in 4.2.1

One other finding by the MTE relates to the consistent and active direction and support by the Project Manager (OEEM) to the SLM Project Coordinator. The MTE notes that this was in fact a close working relationship that had continuous inputs in regard to the day-to-day implementation. Further it noted that the operational and coordination challenges of the project were compounded by at least one extended absence of the SLM Coordinator within the Project Management office during the first two years of implementation, which may have contributed to delayed implementation.

This TE shares the conclusion drawn by the MTE that though these issues existed, the SLM Project gained momentum as it matured and as capacity increased it is apparent many of these recognized issues became less important and would perhaps be overcome in another iteration of the SLM project provided the project is designed with the lessons of this project in mind, including the need to improve communication and coordination mechanisms, strengthen the management structure with Steering Committee and TAG and undertake regular reviews of work plan and assessments of progress against the Log Frame.

### **4.3 Results**

The recommendation of the MTE to extend the project by 18 months was accompanied by a work plan based on the information shared and available to the team in the course of the evaluation. Although it included most of the ongoing or outstanding activities in the Revised Log Frame, it was offered with the caveat that it should be amended to suit the needs of the FP's and other stakeholders. It recognised that not all activities would be successfully implanted and urged that several be prioritised due to their ambitious scope and the length of time needed to effectively implement them. The list of priorities for the extension period included:

- SLM-related Scholarships
- Integrated Watershed Management Plans
- Environmental Impact Assessment integrated into master and coastal zoning plans
- Guidelines to Rehabilitate Degraded Land due to Landslides and Climate Change
- Solid Waste Management Plans
- Sloping Agriculture Land Technology field demonstration
- Soil erosion mitigation
- School-based activities to promote SLM-related career opportunities
- Supporting management of existing protected areas
- Community consultations and field training in rehabilitation of degraded lands
- Coastline protection plans and construction/implementation

During the course of the TE efforts was made to determine the value of the extension period in terms of improved outputs and outcomes. There was little doubt that the extension was indeed significantly beneficial and it is noteworthy that this was helped considerably by the MTE process which helped States take stock of where they were in the Project and importantly, what still needed to be done and

the funding support still available. The recommended extension period of 18 months was eventually reduced to 12 months. On the assessment of this TE the additional 6 months would have made little substantial difference to the implementation of field activities in the States, most of which were either completed within the final 12 month time frame. Those which are outstanding will not be completed and for a variety of reasons will require a longer time frame than even the 18 months would have provided to complete. Thus the incremental benefit of the additional 6 months over and above the 12 months granted in terms of outcomes would have been minimal. However, where the additional six months would have made a difference is to the orderly wrap up of project. In particular, it would have provided time to complete the end of project close out reports by FP's recommended by the MTE which could have then fed into the TE process. It would also have allowed final payments to be actioned within the project period and enabled a final and clear financial accounting of the project.

Overall the results of the SLM project in FSM have been mixed with some highly successful outcomes such as those associated with:

- Solid Waste Management activities which were undertaken in collaboration with JICA and local NGO's and women's groups;
- mainstreaming of SLM into EIA legislation and regulations in strong collaboration with SPREP and the FSM government;
- support for students in SLM related activities and the demonstration and awareness projects associated with organic production and sustainable agriculture in which collaboration with the COM Land Grant program and State campuses was an important factor in success<sup>12</sup>.

The latter case provides a good example of the leverage and replicability potential of the SLM project. Due to COM's success in promoting organic production to a wide array of stakeholders and most importantly in engaging at least 71% of those in the business district of Chuuk, JICA is now entering into a partnership with COM for JICA to provide individual and institutional capacity on composting. Most recently, the SLM project procured a small chipper to shred organic residues to be incorporated as dry litter in a piggery demonstration farm on Pohnpei. The pilot farm run by COM –Pohnpei in partnership with the Piggery Council of Pohnpei, will be engaging farmers on dry litter training. Draining of Waste water from Piggeries into rivers and streams is a major problem that has caused increasing cases of Leptospirosis in rural areas. The dry litter method is a sustainable alternative for farmers with potential for widespread replicability.

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

Conversely those themes where the project has not performed as well as would have been expected have been new technical and policy/planning initiatives such as coastal protection planning, Sustainable Agriculture on Sloping Land Techniques where technical expertise to assist in developing capacity to implement and sustain such activities has been difficult to find. The lesson here is that in planning activities, especially ones which fall outside the "business as usual" paradigm, it is essential to identify the sources of support needed for success from the outset.

#### 4.3.1 Attainment of objectives.

Under 3.3 above the general objectives of the programme were identified as is “strengthened capacity of people and institutions and an enabling environment established and conducive for; sustainable land management, more effective participation by stakeholders, better utilisation of scientific and socio-economic data and enhanced capacities to address priority land degradation issues.”<sup>13</sup>

More specifically the project Logical Framework identifies five Outcomes to be achieved through project implementation:

Outcome 1: National and State-level sector policies and strategies have SLM principles and objectives mainstreamed into them

Outcome 2: Capacity for SLM enhanced at the systemic, institutional and individual levels

Outcome 3: FSM National Action Plan (NAP) developed, promoted and implementation supported

Outcome 4: Medium Term Investment Plan (MTIP) developed and used to support implementation of the NAP

Outcome 5: Effective management and lessons learnt.

These are very ambitious objectives and outputs for a project of this timeframe and levels of funding and particularly so when applied in the State and National Government system of the FSM with multiple layers of approval to be negotiated. The core objectives of building Capacity, Mainstreaming environmental and sustainable resource management and integrating and respecting the views and agendas of multiple stakeholders has proved very difficult to achieve over a short-time and is a major challenge in the less developed countries of the Pacific region. As is noted in the MTE, the concept of ‘sustainable land management’ while traditionally embedded in Micronesian culture which respects the need for proper stewardship of natural resources. However in the modern context it is not a simple concept and it involves the application of a whole range of techniques depending on the specifics of different situations<sup>14</sup>.

The FSM situation and probably that of the other Pacific island countries involved in the regional project is such that any project that can point to incremental progress across this nexus of capacity building, mainstreaming and strengthened stakeholder participation must be viewed as a success. In this respect the SLM project within the FSM has clearly had some significant success to date in building capacity and mainstreaming of SLM principles, most notably at the individual and institutional levels. In some instances it has achieved sustainable impacts and there has been some mainstreaming of processes such as watershed demarcation activities in Pohnpei and the SWM planning and activities which will result in replication and are sustainable. There are others and the foundation has been laid to build on more substantive success in other areas such as mainstreaming SLM principles into EIA Regulations which is well advanced and could be finalised under a further iteration of the SLM or similar project.

It is also apparent that capacity for implementation and understanding of SLM principles across all four States has been significantly increased and the overall capacity levels are improving at a notable rate. For example at each stakeholder meeting there was consensus that the project had improved capacity of stakeholders in different ways. Abilities to coordinate and work together on joint SLM related activities had improved, local community understanding of grass roots principals of recycling including composting and replanting had improved as had the capacity to undertake these activities.

---

<sup>13</sup> Annex A Logical Framework for the SLM in FSM, Expedited Medium Sized Project Proposal.

<sup>14</sup> UNDP/GEF Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in Samoa, Mid-term Evaluation, Final Report Draft – Dr. David J. Butler, 28 February 2011.

In some technical areas such as GIS targeted training and improved equipment and resources and strengthened this capacity in all States as had involvement in the various EIA workshops improved participant's ability to understand and contribute to that mainstreaming process. To highlight both the successes and challenges, each of the 12 primary Outputs of the FSM SLM Project are presented below in terms of the specific methodological ET findings<sup>15</sup>. These were originally developed by the MTE and the TE has focussed on identifying progress in the extension year and the final status of each outcome.

***Output 1.1: SLM principles integrated into National and State policies, strategies and development planning procedures.***

Most of the activities under this output have been delayed and are unlikely to be completed. It is largely a national activity to coordinate however the assumption that master zoning plans exist and are used in decision making is throughout FSM is incorrect and was a fundamental constraint on the achievement of this activity. Without a workable existing land use or master zoning plans the Activity was always going difficult to implement. It should be noted that Kosrae State does have a land use plan but it is not actively implemented. Activity 1.1.1 -1.1.2: *Engage consultant to draft guidelines for mainstreaming SLM into land use and master zoning plans*, The original consultant contract has lapsed and not been renewed for the reasons outlined above and consequently related subsequent Activities 1.1.2 – 1.1.4 have not been actioned but some progress was made with 1.1.5<sup>16</sup>

Overall this objective has not been attained although successful completion of the review of the EIA regulations and integration of SLM principles will make significant advances in this area. However SLM principles still need to be the subject of further targeted institutionalizing into development policies and procedures, including the need to integrate them into any meaningful reviews of the various State and National Land Use Plans that are in existence

***Output 1.2: SLM principles incorporated into EIA used in planning and decision-making processes for land-based investment and infrastructure development***

There are three activities for this output. Activity 1.2.1 – *Identify and engage consultant to review EIA procedures*, was completed in 2010, with technical assistance from SPREP, on Kosrae, with all state jurisdictions in attendance. Activities 1.2.2 – 1.2.3, *Plan and conduct workshop and use of EIA guidelines incorporating EIA principles*, and *Promote EIA guidelines to stakeholders through public awareness activities* were also completed through coordination with the PACC project and SPREP which ran a national EIA Drafting Workshop February 27 – 10 March 2012 and a series of State drafting workshops May 10 – June 8 2012 . Although the final product has still to be completed, the foundation is now there for the States to complete their revisions. This is one of the “mainstreaming and capacity building successes of the project and the Objective has been attained although it may take some time before the measurable indicators of 4 major projects having EIA's that incorporate SLM principles is a reality as there are not too many major projects in the pipeline in FSM.

***Output 2.1: Institutional and individual capacity enhanced to identify and rehabilitate degraded lands***

Under this output there are 11 activities. Under 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, *Resource person identified and practical training planned and implemented in the identification and mapping of areas degraded due to impact of invasive species*, and, *Field based practical training undertaken on methods to eradicate invasive species on degraded lands*; Pohnpei was the only state with activities funded by GEF in connection with invasive species. These two activities had a positive outcome, with training in

<sup>15</sup> Findings here are largely taken from the stakeholder meeting summaries, field visit summaries (**Annex D**), and the notes from the ET.

<sup>16</sup> SPC North Pacific Office (ET meeting with SPC occurred on May 5, 2011) has indicated a willingness to provide the technical assistance required to undertake this, sometime in the latter part of 2011.

herbicide application completed and awareness materials printed. In an example of leveraged activity, the SLM project partnered with the FSM Department of Resources and Development which funded an extension of the field based training to Chuuk and Yap. There is a very good co-financing for all four States by Government and various NGOs. By having the Invasive Species Taskforce of Pohnpei (iSTOP) (formally PIST) in place the project will be sustainable. These two activities can be rated as highly successful.

At the time of the MTE some activities under this output were delayed. In Pohnpei these are activities 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 - *Practical training undertaken on measures to reforest and restore natural habitats, Training in establishing nurseries for replanting of indigenous species, and, Plan and establish an agro-forestry demonstration site using SLM principles, with successes shared.* The TE has been informed that this work has been successfully completed. For Yap it was 2.1.8, 2.1.10 and 2.1.11 - *Development of a guideline for replanting of savannah areas degraded due to past fires, Training in methods for monitoring savannah areas that have been reforested, and, Public awareness activities and consultations with community and public partners.* The TE inspected replanted savannah areas and concluded that despite the continuing lack of formal guidelines excellent results have been attained and for all intents and purposes the activities are completed. For Kosrae it was 2.1.4 - *Training in establishing nurseries for replanting of indigenous species.* According to the State Focal Point and Stakeholders this activity has been completed in the past 12 month extension period. For activities 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 2.1.9 (*Training in reforestation of savannah areas caused by fires*), all are forestry-related activities in Yap and have had a positive achievement. There are some good school gardens and nurseries established although one of these in Gilman, is in danger of falling into disrepair with the transfer of the Agricultural teacher. There has been good co-financing from the Agriculture Extension Service and the Elementary Schools.

Some of the activities for Chuuk, 2.1.5, 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 - *Guidelines developed for rehabilitation of land disturbed due to landslides/natural disaster/coastal erosion, Community consultation carried on use of guidelines and identify practical rehabilitation measures, and, Field training in use of appropriate rehabilitation measures,* are related to rehabilitation of land. There were substantial funds unspent at the time of the MTE and concern expressed by the ET that the outcome will not be achieved within the next 10-12 months. According to the Chuuk State Focal Point and other stakeholders at the TE meeting funds have been used to undertake community consultation and rehabilitation planning with the UFO communities on Fefan Island with co-financing from the community. Guidelines for this work have not been produced anywhere so the activities are rated as partially complete and the overall outcome largely achieved.

***Output 2.2: Sustainable agriculture practices on sloping land and appropriate technologies promoted and demonstrated.***

Under this output there are nine activities; most of the GEF funded activities have been implemented in Pohnpei

Under activities 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 - *Plan and establish an agro-forestry demonstration site using SLM principles, with successes shared, Conduct field day and farmer training activities at the demonstration site, Establish practical demonstration site on composting, and, Promote organic production through awareness raising activities.* On Pohnpei agro-forestry demonstrations, nurseries, demonstration sites on composting and promotion of organic production have been successfully conducted. By stakeholder accounts these activities have proved popular with communities and stakeholders informed the Evaluator that plans are in place to continue/replicate this work through a COM and DAF partnership. The Agro forestry component is also run by local a Pohnpei NGO – Island Food Community of Pohnpei, famous for their promotion of local foods in the country. Pohnpei is also the location for SPC and a branch of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA-

NRCS) which has been providing technical assistance (Agricultural / Piggery ) to farmers and communities alike.

There is much co-financing for these activities from Pohnpei State Agriculture (Multipurpose farm, compost site) and from Pohnpei State Forestry and the project is sustainable because Pohnpei Agriculture and others will continue these activities after the SLM project is completed.

Both Kosrae and Chuuk had some GEF funded activities to promote organic production through awareness raising activities (2.2.4). In both states good achievements were made. These activities have good co-financing from the COM and Agriculture in Chuuk and from Agriculture and KIRMA in Kosrae. It is sustainable because the activities will continue beyond the scope of the SLM Project.

Activities 2.2.7 to 2.2.9 cover Sloping Agriculture Land Technology (SALT) activities in Kosrae. Although the MTE reported that some money had been spent it appears this was primarily on awareness raising campaign materials. No SALT guidelines or demonstration sites have been developed. The FP reported that a request had been made to re-programme these funds to support mangrove reforestation activities but it was too late to take advantage of the narrow July/August planting window. These activities in Kosrae have not been achieved.

***Output 2.3: Capacity enhanced to minimize negative impact of solid waste on land resources***

Under this output there are eight activities. There are some extremely successful projects in SWM. Yap and Kosrae are a step ahead of Chuuk and Pohnpei by having a regulation in place to collect \$ 0.06 for each can and plastic bottle and pay back \$ 0.05 to the collector. The result of this regulation is that all cans and plastic bottles are collected. Pohnpei had just started its programme at the time of the TE and Chuuk reported have plans to use the same system. In Yap the Recycling Facility was to be relocated using some SLM funding. The new site, which is located at the dump, is much better than the old site at the seaport. For the completion of the new building there is much co-financing required and at the time of the TE visit it did not appear that this was going to eventuate. Nevertheless continuing to operate from the original site in the interim does not pose a problem.

In Pohnpei, the Mayor's office received GEF funding for SWM activities (2.3.4). At the time of the TE visit Pohnpei was just implementing its can recycling regulation. Like Yap and Kosrae, Pohnpei State is collecting cans from school children and recycling them for export. This is a sustainable project with a good co-financing from Kolonia Town and Pohnpei State.

Kosrae's SWM budget was utilized to fund the attendance of Kosrae's nominee to the FSM National Solid Waste Management Plan development workshop in Pohnpei and to fund the attendance of the former SLM Project Manager at the 2010 Kosrae SWM workshop in 2010. This was assisted by SPREP and JICA. Further it was used to help establish a monitoring protocol for the municipal dump which was reconstructed using simple technology provided under JICA assistance and is now the best practice standard in waste management in FSM and likely to be replicated in Yap and Pohnpei. The SLM project procured water testing kits for application at designated testing sites around the vicinity of the landfill.

***Output 2.4: Individual level capacity enhancement to plan implement, monitor and evaluate SLM***

Under this output there are 12 activities which are equally divided amongst the four States. Activity 2.4.1 provides scholarships and is a major GEF funding component, with a total of \$80,000. The MTE recorded that most states had not made good achievements and are late to implement this activity. This situation has changed markedly at the time of the TE with most States having used the extension period well to spend or commit most of their funding. Yap, which had the major funding, supported a

total of nine undergraduate students over three semesters and four internships over the same period utilising over 90% of the available funding.<sup>17</sup>

Pohnpei has identified a student studying Agro forestry at the UOG for a scholarship award as have Chuuk (1 student at Eastern Oregon University studying Agricultural Science) and Kosrae (7 students from 12 applications all studying agriculture, forestry or related sciences). Funding for some of these scholarships has been requested and in some cases is still in the pipeline with UNDP. These young individuals represent the future for SLM capacity in the country should they return to the FSM. As graduates they would most likely have the opportunity to take up positions in State or National government SLM related agencies, particularly Agriculture and Forestry (but also EPA's) and will bring their education and training to bear on sustainable land management issues now and in the future. This list of scholarships is an impressive turnaround from the situation a year ago and a testament to the wisdom of extending the project. In the stakeholder meeting in Pohnpei the suggestion was made that instead of focussing the scholarship awards on undergraduates where there are significant opportunities for support, consideration be given in future projects to supporting post graduate awards as this is a more difficult level for students to find funding.

Activity 2.4.2 to 2.4.3 is covering Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Most of the state allocated funds had to be reallocated by the SLM Coordinator for the EIA workshop in Kosrae in October 2010. This workshop achieved its purpose and can be rated as successful. There was substantial co-financing by SPREP and SPC. A further reallocation of funding was made to support the four in State EIA review workshops run by the PMU with significant technical support and co-financing from SPREP. As commented on elsewhere, these activities are the cornerstones of action by the FSM SLM project to mainstream SLM principles into FSM's environmental and development planning and regulatory framework.

Activity 2.4.4 was aimed at planning and conducting school-based activities. Pohnpei and Yap had completed activities by the time of the MTE (June 2011) which focused on supporting Youth to Youth programmes. Since then Kosrae has plans underway to do the same in July 2012 and Chuuk has reported delivering support to its annual Youth to Youth activity.<sup>18</sup> Activity 2.4.6 is for planning and training in GIS. The Project has worked collaboratively with FSM's Department of Resources and Development to leverage funding through the US Forest Service to fund trainings on GIS mapping and to generally upgrade personnel skills. Good achievement was made in this activity in all States. Most of the allocated funds have been spent. The activity has good co-financing and sustainability by having GIS specialists in each State in place. Further training is tentatively scheduled in August 2012.

Activities 2.4.7 to 2.4.12 are in the area of soil erosion and land degradation and include Activity 2.4.9. Design of coastline protection plans; 2.4.10 conducting vegetation surveys and mapping; 2.4.11 selecting plants and building materials for mitigation and 2.4.12 selection of construction types to be used. Despite relatively significant funding available, at the time of the MTE most of the States had not started these activities and the MTE team expressed concern that Yap and Pohnpei in particular, would not be able to complete these activities. Both Yap and Kosrae were to have developed a guide to monitor erosion and identification of mitigation options under 2.4.7 but these did not eventuate. Yap and Chuuk both requested reprogramming of funds under 2.4.9 to support reforestation activities and as did Pohnpei under 2.4.12. It is noted that under 2.4.10 vegetation surveys and mapping were completed in all States under the State Wide Assessment and resource Strategy 2010-2015. These

---

<sup>17</sup> These students studied in the fields of Agriculture (4), Biology (2), Marine Science (2) and Environmental Science (1) 4 different campus COM FSM; Palau CC; UH Hilo and UOG.

<sup>18</sup> Pohnpei and Yap have utilized the funds for their summer Youth-to-Youth programs; Chuuk and Kosrae used or intend to use the funds in summer 2011 for similar programmes, along with other stakeholders.



and other natural resource and geophysical data sets provide a good baseline for coastal protection planning should this be the focus of any future SLM project.

***Output 2.5: Capacity for planning and establishing watershed management plans enhanced***

Under this output there are five activities, one for Pohnpei and four for Kosrae. Activity 2.5.1 is to develop guidelines and approach to demarcating and monitoring watersheds. For Pohnpei this activity and its funding were linked with 2.4.10 for the Sokehs watershed demarcation led by CSP. This received good co-financing from CSP and Forestry and was highly successful. Demarcation had been completed and documented by the time of the TE and strong levels of community consultation had taken place to allow this to happen. This and the resulting protection of the watershed is a major success for the SLM project which is further enhanced by requests from two further municipalities of demarcation of their watersheds.

Activities 2.5.2 to 2.5.5, Kosrae had four activities and in the area of Integrated Watershed Management (IWSM). A request to US NRCS for technical help to undertake IWMP in Olum and Yela watershed was submitted but the FP reported no response at the time of the TE visit. However, it was reported that protected area management planning for these areas which have been identified as Areas of Biological Significance (ABS) was underway with KCSO using non SLM funds. Under Activity 2.5.5 potential protected areas have been identified under the ABS assessment and a request to re programme these funds to the actual support of PA's under the Protected Area act 2010 had not been actioned at the time of the TE visit.

Overall, there has been some progress for Outputs 2.1 – 2.5 using non SLM funds and these can be considered partially achieved.

***Output 3.1: FSM NAP developed. Promoted and implementation supported***

At the time of the MTE it was considered that the four activities under this output -3.1.1 – 3.1.4 *Develop guide for the development of the NAP, Conduct gender-equal training for the development of the NAP, Engage consultant to develop the NAP, and Conduct consultations for the development of the NAP, ensuring a good representation of youth and women are included* – had been successfully completed. However, the TE has discovered that while this foundation work has been completed, progress with the completion of the NAP has hit the wall. The Coordinator had developed an initial NAP outline with guidance from SPREP with a view towards developing the NAP progressively. However, time was a constraint and a consultant was recruited to develop the document. Unfortunately this process was later voided when the individual violated his contract and consequently FSM does not have a NAP in place.

The Programme Coordinator also explained that since this initial work, SPREP (which is responsible for UNCCD regional programme execution), has advised that it is working with countries to produce a template which would help them align their NAP's with the UNCCD 5 year strategy. Accordingly, a decision was made in the interests of regional consistency to postpone further NAP development until the template is available. SPREP has since advised it is to work with countries to provide training on alignment protocols. Due to the advice by the UNCCD and SPREP on the need for countries to align their NAPS to the 5 Year UNCCD Strategy, FSM has decided that due to limited financial resources and the lack of in country technical expertise, it will now develop and align the NAP at the same time. As such, FSM has signed a proposal for submission to GEF for the capacity building component of the alignment process which will be spearheaded by SPREP.

The implications of this decision have affected completion of Outputs 3.2 and 4.1 below.

**Output 3.2: Draft NAP developed and endorsed by State and National Government**

Activities 3.2.1 to 3.2.3 - *NAP finalized and presented to State Governments and National Governments for consideration, NAP endorsed by State and National Governments and presented to the UNCCD Secretariat, and, Plan and conduct awareness-raising on the NAP, focusing on all relevant stakeholders, including women's groups* – these activities have not been completed. There is an indefinite delay depending on SPREP and a successful GEF funding proposal.

**Output 4.1: Enhanced capacity to develop a resource mobilization plan**

Activities 4.1.1 to 4.1.3 – Expert identified to facilitate development of *NAP resource mobilisation strategy; Training workshops on plan development and project cycle management implemented.*

These activities have not been implemented because there is no NAP for which resource mobilisation can be planned.

**Output 4.2 Medium Term Investment Plan and associated Resource Mobilisation Plan**

Activities 4.2.1 – 4.2.4 Undertaking consultations, drafting a medium term Investment Plan and guidelines for its use and promoting the plan amongst stakeholders. These activities have not been implemented and are on hold until the completion of the NAP.

**Output 5.1: Mid-Term Evaluation.**

5.1.1 - This evaluation was been successfully completed in May/June 2011.

5.1.2 - This report represents the successful completion of the Terminal Evaluation of the project.

5.1.3 - Annual Audits have been conducted by FSM Finance and audits for the entire project period to date are currently being conducted (June 2012).

**4.3.2 Sustainability**

Assessing the sustainability of the achievements of the FSM SLM project is a complex and subjective exercise which requires a good understanding of the factors which are important to ensure sustainability in countries like FSM. These include the degree to which activities are institutionalized 'mainstreamed'; the degree they will be supported financially, preferably through self funding mechanisms but also State and National Government budgets; the alignment of activities with the long term strategies and functions of the implementing stakeholder organizations; the degree of personal buy-in by key decision makers and the degree of public and community support for the activities and their benefits. Measured against these criteria, some of the outputs and outcomes of the FSM SLM would appear to be very sustainable over time. As noted by the MTE, the best example would have to be the recycling and waste minimization actions that are occurring, with state-wide policies being passed and reduction in waste streams into landfills actively occurring. It cannot be overstated how effective the recycling projects have been – and they are built for the long-term, with sustainable financing mechanisms (an additional five or six-cent tax added to glass, plastic and tin beverage containers which places a value on waste and is hugely popular in the community ) in place to ensure continuous impacts. Other examples also exist.

As with the MTE, the TE found through interviews that most, if not all, of the activities related to SWM will continue on a sustainable basis, with several of the actions being picked up by government budgets in future fiscal years: solid waste management, establishment of organic production and nurseries, water quality testing, recycling, just to name a few. In terms of the agricultural actions, these are sustainable on the basis that these activities enhance many of the traditional farming methods and management of crops in the first place and are bringing new (composting, planting vegetables) skills to local farmers who are able to use small plots of land in a highly productive manner that have a host of socio-economic and health benefits. The TE agrees with the MTE

conclusion that the SLM Project is one that will have lasting effects over time and should there be another opportunity to collaborate with UNDP on extending the SLM program, it should certainly be done in order to really achieve the goal of upgrading capacity in the sector, to pick up initiatives which have been delayed but remain important such as the UNCCD NAP and financing strategy and to perhaps renew focus and strengthen capacity in the areas of climate proofing.

#### 4.3.3 Contribution to Upgrading of Skills of Staff

At each of the State stakeholder meetings the question was posed: do you think that your involvement with the SLM project over the past 3 years has improved your understanding of SLM principles and your appreciation of value of working in partnership with other stakeholders to implement activities and achieve outcomes? While in a few cases there was initial scepticism most immediately indicated a positive response, especially when the focus of the discussion was on working in partnerships and appreciating the capabilities and potential of partners. This is particularly so for the Focal Points and Project Coordinator who have been required to develop project management and facilitation skills as a result of the project operational modalities. This lends further weight to the finding of the MTE that a program such as the SLM Project cannot but have a positive effect on capacity on a number of levels. Simply going through the process of implementation, building trust, negotiating outcomes and guiding resources – both technical and financial – toward the expected outputs has without doubt helped to increase capacity. Some particular examples (defined in more detail in subsection 4.3.1 above) of increased capacity are:

- the successful completion of the field worker's trained on Pesticide Applicator's Training held in Pohnpei, Kosrae and Chuuk in 2010 (individual capacity);
- the upgrading of skills to conduct water quality testing at the Kosrae Landfill site (individual capacity);
- enhanced knowledge on the benefits and best methods of recycling (individual, systemic and institutional capacity);
- The completion of the EIA Training in Kosrae and the associated EIA review workshops in each State (with assistance from SPREP), which upgraded the skills in conducting and evaluating these kinds of assessments (individual and systemic capacity);
- The training of two persons on brown tree snake surveillance, and training for 2 RISC members;
- The attendance of one staff member from an NGO in Kosrae at watershed management planning training;
- the strengthening of GIS skills and capability in each State (individual);
- internships for students and scholarship recipients who graduated recently.

Overall, the SLM project in FSM has successfully resulted in the upgrading of skills of staff involved both in the field implementation of activities and in project management. This is a highly satisfactory outcome. The value of this up skilling will benefit the FSM for some time to come as many of the people involved are relatively young and likely to progress to more senior decision making roles within both the government system and their communities. However it is clear to the evaluator that the FSM SLM has achieved a degree of momentum and interest in SLM and its related disciplines, has matured a project management structure which has strengthened stakeholder coordination and cooperation, at least at the State level and has laid the foundation for much more efficient programme delivery than was perhaps the case in the early days of the SLM. Having been through this learning curve will significantly benefit any future similar project be it for SLM or other UN/global priorities in FSM provided the issues relating to financial management and lessons learned are heeded and acted on.

## 5 Recommendations

### 5.1 Actions to Follow Up or Reinforce Initial Benefits of the Project

**Recommendation 1.** That consideration be given by UNDP and FSM government to identifying future project options to build on the momentum and interest which has been generated by the SLM project in FSM in order to further the mainstreaming of SLM principles into the development and resource management processes, bring to fruition activities and outcomes which remain valid but require additional time and resources and to take advantage of the familiarity of stakeholders with the project operating modalities, including the stakeholder implementing partnerships which have been formed and have proved to be effective vehicles for activity implementation.

**Recommendation 2.** That priority be given to the completion of joint activities with SPREP to improve and incorporate SLM principles into each State's draft EIA guidelines thus ensuring that the momentum and work to date results in approved EIA guidelines in all States and a possible model for mainstreaming SLM into the EIA process for use by other Pacific Island Countries .

**Recommendation 3.** That SPREP be appraised of the suspension of the UNCCD NAP and investment strategy process in FSM pending the development of Pacific country template for alignment of NAPs with the UNCCD 5 year Action Strategy and requested to elevate the FSM in priority for technical assistance for completion of these tasks within 12 months.

**Recommendation 4.** That in view of the capacity issues leading to the failure to implement climate proofing components effectively, any new project which may be instigated under recommendation 1. above gives strong consideration to building capacity in climate change adaptation planning and mitigation within the FSM through demonstration projects and targeted training and mentoring activities.

**Recommendation 5.** That the FSM government consider hosting further internal learning exchanges similar to that undertaken in partnership with JICA between Kosrae and the mayors/Governors of the other three States which demonstrated the benefits of the Kosrae Municipal Waste management programme, with the purpose of supporting the replication of successful SLM activities such as the Sokehs Municipality watershed demarcation process in Pohnpei in other States.

**Recommendation 6.** That despite the completion of this Terminal Evaluation, each State Focal point should prepare a close out report based on template to be developed by UNDP and the PMU and aimed at identifying the stakeholders views on what worked, what didn't work and why and pointing to priorities for any future project which may be developed. These should then be used to support a final close out meeting of Focal Points, PMU and principal NGO's to help inform future priorities.

**Recommendation 7.** That development of a web based mechanism be considered to support the establishment of a FSM Sustainable Land Management learning network with the objectives of providing a means of keeping the stakeholders of the SLM project networked and engaged in dialogue on SLM principles, providing a forum for sharing experiences and lessons learned, identifying new project and funding opportunities and sources of technical support, and providing a vehicle for non FSM based professionals to network with the national stakeholders.

**Recommendation 8.** That a full report and joint presentation by the UN Joint Presence Office and the Office of Environment and Emergency Management on the goals, outcomes and benefits of the SLM Project be given to (i) members of the FSM Congress and (ii) the heads of SLM related government agencies. The presentation would help increase understanding of SLM principles, provide responses to technical questions and promote strengthened governance and stewardship for land resources amongst the countries leaders and should be undertaken within three months of the conclusion of the operational phase of the project i.e.by end September 2012.

## 5.2 Proposals for Future Directions Underlining Main Objectives.

**Recommendation 9.** That strong consideration be given to maintaining the momentum achieved under the FSM SLM project and building on the successful site based demonstration activities by further strengthening national capability in sustainable resource management through the design of a project which focuses on:

- developing the National and State policy, legal and planning framework for integrated watershed and coastal management planning including climate proofing;
- developing management capacity including technical capability, for integrated watershed and coastal management planning and implementation;
- identifying and supporting at least one integrated watershed and coastal management project per State;
- promoting project implementation through a coalition of State agencies, NGO's, and CBO's, especially women, youth, school and church groups.

Further, that funding for the development and implementation of the project be sought under GEF 5 with co-financing from other relevant regional programmes and organisations such as the proposed USAID Community Climate Adaptation regional programme, SPREP and SPC.

## 6. Future Project Strategy

### 6.1 Corrective Actions for the Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Project

**Recommendation 10.** That with the agreement of the FSM government and in order to overcome the reported delays with payments, avoid multiple approval processes and issues with financial reporting, a dedicated project grants officer/finance manager position be established within the FSM National Finance Management system whose sole job is to expedite project payments and reports. Where more than one UNDP project is being executed in FSM consideration could be given to expanding the scope of this position to cover both or multiple projects with costs shared accordingly. Alternatively, consideration could be given to an institutional and operational model which allows a more direct pipeline of funding to the implementing stakeholders be they State agencies or NGO's. This could include contracting a reputable grants management organisation such as the Micronesian Conservation Trust to handle finances or utilising the SPC sub regional office for this purpose or the financial management could be delegated from Suva MCO to the UN Joint Presence Office with strengthened capacity in that agency to undertake this task if necessary.

**Recommendation 11.** That in future projects budgetary transparency is achieved so all implementing stakeholders are aware of funding allocations and keep apprised on revisions and reallocations of funding with approval being sought or at least consultation taking place before budget lines are reduced or reprogrammed.

**Recommendation 12.** That in future projects the costs of ensuring the efficient functioning of the Project Management Unit and the effective discharge of its full range of responsibilities, particularly its on-going project monitoring and evaluation functions, be clearly identified with sufficient funding allocated to a separate budget line in a transparent way. These costs would include at least 2 monitoring and evaluation visits to all States per year by the Project Coordinator, support costs to a TAG and Steering Committee, Project Coordinator travel to approved national meetings, supplies, consultation costs etc.

**Recommendation 13.** That the institutional arrangements of the Expedited Project Document be carefully assessed, particularly the provisions for Steering Committee, Technical Advisory Group and Tripartite Review teams against funding availability and logistical practicalities and be budgeted for accordingly within the PMU budget line recommended in 11 above.

**Recommendation 14.** That the provisions of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan in the Expedited Project Document which follow standard UNDP/GEF protocols, be implemented expeditiously with progress being jointly reviewed at least annually by the PMU and UNDP MCO, with programme staff from the MCO undertaking at least one FSM specific mission to coincide with and engage in, the M & E visits to States recommended in 11 above..

**Recommendation 15.** That future project designs build in a strong learning and knowledge management component to take advantage of the power of shared experiences and learning exchanges to rapidly advance the understanding, capacity and capabilities of stakeholders with funding being allocated to a separate budget provision to support travel, field inspections and regular meetings of key stakeholders around core implementation themes.<sup>19</sup>

**Recommendation 16.** That the design process of any new projects in FSM or for that matter, anywhere in the region, embrace the inclusion of key NGO representatives, especially where their organisations are expected to be actively involved in project implementation

**Recommendation 17.** That strong attention should be paid to alignment with respective state development plans, existing activities as well as NGO strategies and work-plans, so that, to the extent possible and reasonable, project activities are in line with and compliment, existing development activities and priorities, rather than adding new or additional projects for state organizations.

## **7. Lessons Learned**

### **7.1 Best and Worst Practices in Addressing Issues Relating to Relevance, Performance and Success.**

- 1) That the decentralized implementation of a complex project across the four States of the FSM poses significant institutional and operational challenges. In this regard the project delivery model developed for the FSM SLM project has proved to be largely effective and with some tweaking of the financial disbursement and M&E components and improved funding for the PMU, is a good model for the delivery of UN and other GAA Development Assistance to the Federated States of Micronesia.
- 2) That the effective implementation of a complex project involving all four FSM States requires the application of adaptive and flexible management practices, especially in relation to budgets where the underperformance of one or more States affects quarterly expenditure across all four States thus inhibiting FSM's efforts to request replenishment funding under UNDP rules. However, it is important that where adaptive management is undertaken, the effect on State allocations be clearly communicated to all affected States in a timely fashion.
- 3) That the process of inclusion of key stakeholders in the project formulation, design and inception stages significantly improved the alignment of the project to existing activities and State priorities but that it could be further improved by ensuring the engagement of representatives of key implementing NGO's.

---

<sup>19</sup> Where FP's and other key stakeholders are present at the same meetings these can also be utilised by the Programme Coordinator to monitor and review progress against work plans and budgets.

- 4) That linkages with existing State development priorities and to other initiatives with strong local backing significantly enhances the potential sustainability of project elements.
- 5) That the development of strong programmatic linkages with regional agencies such as SPC, SPREP and regional tertiary institutions greatly strengthens the capacity of the project to achieve its objectives especially those relating to capacity building.
- 6) That the power of learning exchanges, field visits and networking amongst peers in building capacity should never be underestimated and should be a prominent feature of any project with capacity building as a primary objective.
- 7) That in a multi level, complex project such as this the regular proactive monitoring and evaluation schedules are an essential management tool for ensuring transparency, supporting adaptive management and for strengthening the sense of collective ownership of the project and its outcomes. Conversely, neglect of monitoring protocols creates uncertainty, confusion and frustration as State stakeholders are in the dark over budgets, funding and other decisions.
- 8) Continuity of personnel in key positions such as the Project Coordinator and Focal Points and good communication channels strengthens project management and coordination but the converse also applies.
- 9) That forging strong partnerships with NGO's can significantly improve prospects of effective implementation especially where community based activities are involved.
- 10) That consulting with and securing the support and active participation of traditional leadership for SLM field activities such as the demarcation of watershed boundaries and the, reforestation of savannah is vital to achieving successful outcomes. Similarly, the active engagement of women's groups, youth and parent organizations has been shown to significantly enhance the delivery of project outcomes in a number of areas including organic food production, mangrove rehabilitation and awareness raising in schools and across the broader community.
- 11) That too many activities involving small sums of money create the potential for frustrating delays and hold ups in the implementation of activities. Wherever possible activities should be lumped rather than split as should the funding to ease the financial and administrative burden on FP's and PMU staff.
- 12) In the same vein opportunities should be developed to bring States with common activities such as the development of themed guidelines together so they can develop one template for subsequent adaptation to specific State needs.

## **ANNEX 1 Terms of Reference FSM SLM Terminal Evaluation Team Leader**

### **Consultancy (International Consultant) Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation of Sustainable Land Management Project, Federated States of Micronesia**

**Title:** Team Leader for UNDP/GEF Project Terminal Evaluation

**Project:** Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Federated States of Micronesia

**Duration:** 25 days to be completed by June 14th, 2012 (starting no later than May 14th)

**Supervisor(s):** UNDP Multi Country Office in coordination with national executing agency, Office of Environment and Emergency Management

**Duty Station:** Federated States of Micronesia

#### **Project Background**

The Medium Sized Project (MSP) on Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable land management in Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) is a Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded project through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The project is implemented by the Office of Environment and Emergency Management. The project duration commenced on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008 and completed on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Following a mid-term evaluation in 2011, the project was granted an extension until June 2012.

Despite the growing official recognition of the problem of land degradation in Federated States of Micronesia, SLM objectives have not been adequately mainstreamed into policies, regulations, strategies, plans and educational systems. There is a lack of understanding on the part of decision makers that land degradation is significant barrier to sustainable development. Although integrated farming systems are a way of life for local communities, the planning of local resource utilization is mostly guided by more specific sectoral objectives and policies. This suggests a strong need to create awareness and build capacity for integrative dialogue and land use planning among all stakeholders. The capacity gaps in land degradation include: i) individual level –lack of technical capacity (district level and community level for implementation); ii) institutional level – financial and human resources, monitoring capacity for enforcement of its rules and regulations); iii) lack of baseline data state and national level); iv) systematic level – there is a lack of common understanding and mechanisms to coordinate and address common land management issues.

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

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

#### **Objectives of the Evaluation**

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



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

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

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

### **Scope of the Evaluation**

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

The terminal evaluation will address the following specific issues:

#### **Project design**

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

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

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

#### **Project implementation**

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

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

### **Results**

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

- assess, quantitatively and qualitatively, the achievements and impact in terms of outputs and its contribution to outcomes as defined in the project document;
- assess to what extent the project has made impacts on promoting local participatory decision-making and local governance;
- assess to what extent the project has or will contribute to the strengthened enabling environment for conservation;
- assess the sustainability of project results.

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

### **Governance and capacity-building**

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

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

### **Lessons learned**

- The terminal evaluation will also highlight lessons learned and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:
  - Country ownership/drivenness;
  - Stakeholder participation;
  - Adaptive management processes;
  - Efforts to secure sustainability; and
  - The role of M&E in project implementation.

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

### **Methodology**

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

- documents reviewed
- interviews conducted
- consultations held with all stakeholders
- project sites visited

- techniques and approaches used for data gathering, verification and analysis

### **Conduct of the Evaluation**

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

The consultant will visit the project site to ensure adequate consultation with all key stakeholders.

Towards the end of the field evaluation, presentation will be made to all key stakeholders in country.

After the presentation the consultant will take note of verbal and/or written responses to its presentation and consider these in preparing an interim draft evaluation report that will be provided to Executing Agency/UNDP before the consultant leaves for distribution to stakeholders. The executing agency and UNDP will circulate the draft report to all stakeholders requesting written feedback and finalized by the evaluator within the dates reflected in the evaluation schedule.

While the consultant is free to determine the actual layout of the evaluation report, this must include the minimum content requirements mentioned earlier. The consultant will forward the final report by e-mail to UNDP MCO for onward distribution to all stakeholders. In addition the consultant will forward a hard copy and electronic copy saved on disk to UNDP MCO. The consultant will be responsible for the contents, quality and veracity of the report.

### **Deliverables**

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

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

The final report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format as well as a hard copy.

### **Products expected from terminal evaluation**

The main products expected from the terminal evaluation are:

- presentation(s) to key stakeholders;
- an interim draft terminal evaluation report;
- a final comprehensive terminal evaluation report

### **Qualifications of Team Leader**

- Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations agencies, development agencies and major donors;
- International/regional consultant with academic and/or professional background in natural resource management or related fields with experience in land management, with in-depth understanding of land issues as well as community-based natural resource management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required;
- Experience in leading multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations;
- Familiar with SLM approaches in Pacific and /or developing countries either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial;
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills

### **Proposed Methodology and Timelines**

The consultant shall undertake the evaluation working concurrently according to a planned schedule to be completed by June 14th, 2012. The consultant will have the overall responsibility of organizing

---

**TIERRAMAR CONSULTING**

and completing the terminal evaluation, submitting the final terminal evaluation report. The consultant is expected to propose a work layout, plan, budget and timelines to achieve the expected outputs with the appropriate methodology.

**Proposal Requirements:**

Proposals should contain the following information:

**i) Technical proposal** including a P11 form (available on the UNDP website <www.undp.org.fj>), an updated current CV, contact details of at least three referees and a cover letter setting out:

- How the applicant meets the selection criteria
- Evaluation approach and methodology

**ii) Financial Proposal**

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

Daily consultancy rates	A daily consultancy rate proposed by the consultant
Air Ticket	To and from home country
Air Ticket	(including at least one travel to Fiji for preliminary briefings)
Travel expenses to four community/demonstration sites (1 demonstration site per state)	Site visits are compulsory
Living allowances	Based on the number of days spent at the respective duty station <sup>1</sup>
Other miscellaneous expenses	(please state)

<sup>1</sup> If consultant is based in Federated States of Micronesia, living expenses for Federated States of Micronesia are not applicable

**Payment Schedule**

a) Twenty per cent (20%) of the maximum payable Consultancy Fee [Professional Service] will be paid immediately following the signing of this Agreement by May 14<sup>th</sup> (includes travel to FSM);

b) Ten per cent (10%) of the maximum payable Consultancy Fee [Professional Service] will be paid immediately following the acceptance of a work plan and report lay out by UNDP by May 16<sup>th</sup> ;

c) Twenty per cent (20%) will be paid within eight (8) working days of receipt and acceptance by the United Nation Development Program of a draft report by May 28<sup>th</sup> ;

d) The remaining fifty (50%) will be paid within eight (8) working days of the acceptance by the United Nations Development Program of the final Evaluation Report by June 14<sup>th</sup>;

**Evaluation Method**

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

	<b>Technical</b>	<b>(70%)</b>
i)	Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations agencies, development agencies and major donors;	10%
ii)	International/regional consultant with academic and/or professional background in natural resource management or related fields with experience in land management, with in-depth understanding of land issues as well as community-based natural resource management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required;	10%

iii)	Familiar with SLM approaches in Pacific and /or developing countries either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial;	15%
iv)	Knowledgeable and experienced in facilitating participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;	15%
v)	Experience in leading multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress an short deadline situations;	10%
vi)	Knowledge and experience with local/regional stakeholders and customary protocols. Ability to converse, communicate in local language/dialects advantageous.	10%
<b>B</b>	<b>Financial</b>	<b>(30%)</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>(100%)</b>

**Reporting Requirements:**

The consultant will be monitored, overseen and supervised by UNDP Multi Country Office; in coordination with national executing agency.

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

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

**Application Submission**

All applications must include a Curriculum Vitae with full contact details of three referees and P-11 form to be submitted by **April 29th,2012 5:30PM Fiji Time** either electronically to david.lumutivou@undp.org or addressed under confidential cover to:

**Terminal Evaluation Federated States of Micronesia SLM Project - Consultancy (Team Leader)**

*C/- UNDP Resident Representative*

*UNDP*

*Private Mail Bag*

*Suva.*

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

**Further Information**

For further information concerning this Terms of Reference, Mr. Floyd Robinson, Environment Program Associate, UNDP-MCO, Suva, on email floyd.robinson@undp.org / telephone (679) 3312500 or Ms. Beverley Sadole, Project Coordinator, Office of Environment and Emergency Management on email: bsadolesusumu@ymail.com/ telephone (691) 320-2863.

**Women candidates are encouraged to apply.**

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

## **Annex 1. Evaluation Report Outline**

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

### **Executive summary**

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

### **Introduction**

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

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

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

### **Findings and Conclusions**

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

### **Recommendations**

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

### **Future Project Strategy**

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

### **Lessons learned**

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

### **Annexes**

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

**Annex 2 Log Frame**

<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME</b>	<b>TERM TARGET</b>	<b>STATUS OF DELIVERY*</b>	<b>RATING**</b>
<b>OUTCOMES</b>	<b>MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME</b>	<b>TERM TARGET</b>	<b>STATUS OF DELIVERY</b>	<b>RATING</b>
* STATUS OF DELIVERY:			** RATINGS:	Highly Satisfactory = HS
<b>GREEN / COMPLETED</b>	= Indicators show successful achievement			Satisfactory = S
<b>YELLOW</b>	= Indicators show expected completion by end of Project			Marginally Satisfactory = MS
<b>RED</b>	= Indicators show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project			Unsatisfactory = U

## **ANNEX 2 Itinerary and Work plan for Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP /GEF Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in the Federated States of Micronesia**

Submitted by: Peter Thomas, Terminal Evaluation Consultant

### **Introduction**

This Terminal Evaluation commenced on 30 May on the signing of the contract between Peter Thomas (Evaluation Consultant) and UNDP Multi-country office in Suva, Fiji. The schedule for completion of the Evaluation is extremely tight as the FSM in-country phase leading to the completion and presentation of a draft report and findings is required to be completed before the termination of the project, which is currently in a final one year extension phase, on or before 30 June 2012. The following work plan details the key events and action required to meet this deadline and to deliver a final Terminal Evaluation report to the FSM Government and UNDP MCO by 16 July.

The ability of the FSM SLM Project Staff and the consultant to organise Stakeholder meetings and interviews in the States (see Phase 2) in the limited time available for the FSM country visit will be critical to the success of the Evaluation. In this regard and given the tight timeline initial focus should be on ensuring the meeting and appointment schedule for the first State visits to Yap and Chuuk are well organised prior to the consultant's departure for Guam on 14 June.

### **Work plan Phases.**

The terminal evaluation will be undertaken in three main phases;

1. Document Preparation, analysis and logistical arrangements
2. Federated States of Micronesia in country field inspections, interviews and stakeholder meetings
3. Preparation and presentation of draft and final reports.

### **Revised Terminal Evaluation methodology and work plan**

The following three phase methodology is proposed to achieve the requirements of the terminal evaluation.

#### ***Phase 1: Work plan development Information Gathering, Document preparation and logistical arrangements***

On notification of selection as the successful tender, the consultant evaluator will immediately update the submitted work plan and work with UNDP Regional Office staff to acquire and assess all relevant and available project documentation. This will include project inception reports, UNDP and GEF project documentation, annual and midyear reports, midterm evaluation, budgets, work plans and other associated management documentation. This material will be assessed and analysed to ensure the evaluator has a strong understanding of the key aspects of the project, including its scope, its intended purpose, its intended and unintended operational and implementation modalities and the resulting project outputs and outcomes. In addition a Skype meeting will be arranged with UNDP MCO Project management staff to gain further insight into the project and its management since inception.



A list of key in country project staff and stakeholders and their contacts will be acquired from UNDP MCO. During this phase direct contact will be made with FSM Government project management staff to arrange a schedule of interviews and meetings with project management staff and key individuals from implementing partners and community stakeholder groups in each of the four States of FSM.

This analysis will also inform the production of a draft Evaluation Matrix which will match the key issues to be addressed, as identified in the ToR under the broad headings of Project Design, Project Implementation, Results Governance and Capacity Building and Lessons Learned, with the information gathering methods to be used and questions to be posed, to obtain objective, quantitative and qualitative responses to those issues. In this evaluation information gathering will involve:

- analysis of project monitoring and evaluation data and related performance indicators (where available);
- development of a standard questionnaire to act as a guide for all interviews and ensure key evaluation criteria are addressed; and
- Collection of primary information through interviews, on site observation and stakeholder and group discussion and feedback.

Anticipated Time Allotment – 3 days

Phase 1 Activities

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Key Personnel</b>	<b>Date completed</b>
Acquire project documentation in electronic form	Consultant, David L and Floyd R ( UNDP MCO)	3 June
Complete revised work plan	Consultant	3 June
Inception Conference Call	Consultant UNDP MCO project staff	4 or 5 June
Analysis of Documentation and preparation of draft report format	Consultant	8 June
Organisation of FSM in-country meetings	Consultant, David L, SLM Project Team in FSM - SLM project Coordinator, Ms Beverly Sadole, & Ms Cindy Ehmes a senior officer at the Office of Environment and Emergency Management (OEEM) – the executing agency for SLM project.	14 June

*Phase 2 In-country Assessments and Interviews*

Planning for the in-country assessment phase will be undertaken in close consultation with the FSM Project Manager and staff. A schedule for the State visits to Yap, Kosrae and Chuuk and Pohnpei has been determined and co-ordinated with air travel to/from Guam. The extremely tight travel

schedule (see attached) will be linked to a schedule of field site visits, interviews and group meetings in each State that will be developed by the evaluator and the FSM Project Manager. In each State the basic evaluation methodology will be:

6. Meet with principal SLM Focal point to confirm meetings and field visits
7. Convene a SLM project stakeholder meeting to review progress and achievements related to project outputs
8. Make Field Visits to projects being implemented.
9. Conduct separate interviews with relevant implementing stakeholders
10. If time permits convene Stakeholder Meeting to provide overview of findings and opportunity for initial feedback.

A priority list of key project management staff, principals of implementing partner agencies and organisations and other relevant community stakeholder groups in each State including Pohnpei will be drawn up and appointments made by the FSM SLM Project Manager to ensure availability and co-ordination with travel plans. Should key personnel be missed due to being off island or conflicting schedules then arrangements will be made to interview by telephone/Skype as appropriate

The results of the in-country consultations, field inspections and resource materials analysis will be compiled into a preliminary draft evaluation report which will form the basis of the evaluator's presentation of preliminary findings to key stakeholders at a key stakeholders meeting to be organised in consultation with the Project Manager, in Kolonia, Pohnpei. The feedback from this meeting will inform the evaluation report which will be provided for distribution and written feedback to stakeholders before the departure of the evaluator, as required under the TOR.

### FSM In-country travel and Activity Itinerary

Date	Travel days	Location	Activities
Friday 15 June Saturday 16 June	1 - 2	Guam	Work on State visit itinerary and questionnaire/Draft report
Sunday 17 June	3	YAP	Work on State visit itinerary and questionnaire/Draft report
Monday 18 June Tuesday 19 June	4 -5	YAP	Meet with DAF and EPA staff. Meet with YINS and USFS Rep. Conduct Field visits to demo sites/nurseries. Meet with community groups  Work on Draft report
Wednesday 20 June	6	CHUUK	Travel to Chuuk  Meet with Chuuk SLM Focal Point to discuss project outcomes and issues
Thursday 21 June	7 -8	CHUUK	Stakeholder meeting and Field visits to demo sites and discussions with

<b>Date</b>	<b>Travel days</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Activities</b>
Friday 22 June			stakeholders Wrap up discussions in Chuuk Travel to Kosrae
Saturday 23 June Sunday 24 June	9 - 10	KOSRAE	Work on draft report
Monday 25 June Tuesday 26 June	11 -12		Meet with Kosrae SLM Focal Points Arrange and undertake demo site visits
Tuesday 26 June Wednesday 27 June Thursday 28 June	13 -15	POHNPEI	Travel to Guam / Cairns
Friday 29 June			Cairns to Brisbane

*Phase 3 Report Finalisation*

Additional feedback arising from the in-country presentations and written comments will be incorporated into the final terminal evaluation report and this will be submitted to the UNDP Multi Country Office by COB July 16, allowing for up to 2 weeks for stakeholder review and additional comments to be assessed and incorporated where applicable.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Key Personnel</b>	<b>Date completed</b>
Seek FSM Government and State SLM stakeholder input on draft report	Consultant/ Anissa Lawrence	1 – 7 July
Incorporate stakeholder input and finalise report	Consultant/ Anissa Lawrence	7 – 15 July
Deliver Final Terminal Evaluation Report to UNDP MCO	Consultant	16 July

Anticipated time allotment – 5 working days

### ANNEX 3 List of Persons Interviewed/Field Sites Visited

Name	Organisation	Title	Date	Comment
<b>YAP</b>			<b>2012</b>	
Tamdad Suslog	Yap DAF	Chief of Ag	<b>18 June</b>	Mtg on DAF role in SLM am
Ryan Talken	Yap DAF	Environmental Specialist	<b>18/19 June</b>	Mtg on DAF Role in SLM & field trips am
Pius Leygo	Yap DAF	Forester	<b>18 June</b>	Mtg on DAF role in SLM am
Valentino	Yap DAF	Forester	<b>18 June</b>	Mtg on DAF role in SLM am
Margie Falanruw	USFS/YINS	Scientist	<b>18 June</b>	Discussion on USFS /YINS contribution SLM project activities pm
Peter Fattamag	Yap EPA	Pollution Specialist	<b>19 June</b>	Discuss EPA role in SLM am
Francis Liyeg	YAP DFA	Invasives Species Coordinator	<b>19 June</b>	Yap invasives species work pm
Name Unknown	Yap Recycling	Foreman	<b>19 June</b>	Tour of recycling facility am
<b>Field Sites</b>				
Yap Recycling Plant			<b>19 June</b>	
Nimpal Community Marine Conservation Area			<b>19 June</b>	
Savannah Reforestation (southern site) Fara			<b>19 June</b>	
Savannah Reforestation (mid site) Dachngar			<b>19 June</b>	
Gilman Elementary School nursery			<b>19 June</b>	
Yap Municipal Dump			<b>19 June</b>	
<b>CHUUK</b>				
Julita Albert	Chuuk EPA	SLM Focal Point	<b>20 June</b>	Discuss SLM project activities in Chuuk and itinerary pm
Julita Albert	Chuuk EPA	SLM Focal Point	<b>21 June</b>	Chuuk implementing partners mtg

				am.
Ishmael H. Mikel	Chuuk EPA	Director	<b>21 June</b>	“ “
WisneyNakayama	CCS	Director	<b>21 June</b>	“ “
Esmie Eis	Chuuk DOA	Extension Officer	<b>21 June</b>	“ “
Roberto Iaio	Chuuk DOA	Forester	<b>21 June</b>	“ “
Sleeper Sared	Chuuk DOA	Invs. Plants Coordinator	<b>21 June</b>	“ “
Jason Poll	Chuuk EPA	WM Officer	<b>21 June</b>	“ “
Yosko N. Kim	COM Land Grant	Admin Asst.	<b>21 June</b>	Discussion on COM LG extension work pm
<b>Field Site Visits</b>				
No field sites were visited in Chuuk due to logistical issues ( no transport) and windy weather				
<b>KOSRAE</b>				
Blair P. Charley	KIRMA	SLM Coordinator	<b>25 June</b>	Kosrae SLM Stakeholders meeting
Andy George	KCSO	Executive Dir.		“ “
Murtanel Tolenna	DREA	Administrator		“ “
Alik William	KIRMA	Marine Specialist		“ “
Simpson Abraham	PACC/KIRMA	FSM PACC Coordinator		“ “
Mayson Nithan	KIRMA	Forestry&Wildlife		“ “
Erick Wagule	KIRMA	EIA		“ “
Presley Abraham	KIRMA	EIA Permitting		“ “
Simpson Abraham	PACC/KIRMA	FSM PACC Coordinator	<b>25 June</b>	Discussion on the linkage of PACC with SLM
<b>Field Site Visits</b>			<b>25 June</b>	
Kosrae Municipal Dump			Inspection of JICA project and monitoring protocol	
Mangrove Re-planting sites Meloh, Finolof & Okat			Inspection of sites and monitoring of planting	
PACC Road Climate Proofing			Inspection of road building and culverts	
<b>POHNPEI</b>				

Henry Susaia	Pohnpei EPA	Pohnpei SLM FP	<b>26 June pm</b>	Discussion on progress with SLM activities and stakeholder meeting logistics
Beverly Sadole-Susumu	FSM SLM PMU	SLM Coordinator	<b>26 June pm</b>	Discussion on National Government activities on project Log frame and general conclusions of the TE
Henry Susaia	Pohnpei EPA	Pohnpei SLM FP	<b>27 June am</b>	Pohnpei SLM Stakeholders Meeting
Semes Silbanuz	Pohnpei Div. Agriculture			“ “
‘	Pohnpei Div Forestry			“ “
Francesca s. Chispo	Conservation Society of Pohnpei			“ “
Mark Kostka	CoM			“ “
Alpenster Henry	CoM			“ “
<b>Field Site Visits</b>	No Field sites were visited in Pohnpei due to Logistical reasons ( transport) and inclement weather			
Cindy Ehmes	FSM Gvt.OEEM	Asst. Director and FSM SLN Project Manager	<b>28 June am</b>	FSM National Government Stakeholder Presentation of Draft report
Andrew Yatilman	OEEM	Director		“ “
Beverly Sadole-Susumu	FSM OEEM	SLM Coordinator		“ “
Patti Pedrus	FSM OEEM	SDP		“ “
Tilson T. Kephass	FSM OEEM	Program Mngr.		“ “
John P. Wichap	Department of Resources and Development.	Plant & Animal Quarantine Spec.		“ “
Okean Ehmes	UN Joint Presence/UNDP	Country Development Mngr.		“ “

<b>YAP State</b>				
Christina Fillmed	Yap EPA	Exec. Director & Yap SLM FP	<b>3 July 2102</b>	Interview on SLM implementation Yap ( by Skype)
<b>ADDITIONAL CONTACTS</b>				
Mr. Bruce Jefferies	SPREP	Terrestrial Ecosystems Management Officer and UNCCD rep	<b>14 &amp; 23 June</b>	Discuss UNCCD programme in Pacific in relation to FSM
Mr. Tapa Suaesi	SPREP	Environmental Planning Officer	<b>25 June</b>	Discussed the SPREP/FSM EIA & MEA training and SLM mainstreaming

## **ANNEX 4 Summary of Site Visits and Meetings**

### **Yap State**

#### **Meeting with DAF Staff (am 18 June)**

Good progress has been made in expending the Scholarship funding in the final year. Good inter-agency cooperation between EPA/DAF and Yap Scholarship Board saw a total of 12 students receive scholarship assistance over 3 Semesters in the fields of Agriculture, Biology, Environment/marine science. Four students returning on island were taken on as interns.

Capacity- wise they have strengthened GIS capacity.

Permission was sought to re-program 12 k of Coastal Plan Money to support reforestation of savannah sand nursery development which occurred. Good adaptive management. Problem with the Coastal Plan was identifying suitable expertise to guide and advise the work.

Savannah demo sites highly successful. This has implications for CCA – in that improved savannah soils will be better able to support agro –forestry and possible relocation of gardens and people (e.g. outer islanders). Visionary project which needs to be taken to scale if successful --rudimentary monitoring (photo points/ soil profiles examination in place. As were Elementary School nursery programs although these may have fallen away with change of teaching staff and vacation – great outreach and awareness model.

Institutional difficulties with the Program remained the same as identified by MTE- early communication – and in particular the flow of funding to the State. 'Financing is still a bottleneck'. Still awaiting payment for tree planters after 4 months(subsequently informed by SLM Coordinator that this had been actioned) But other aspects worked well such as direct contracting of tree planting groups by PMU which circumvented lengthy State process.

Good/improved interagency communication within the State and better linkages with NGO's. Could have done with more guidance and monitoring from PMU over the 4 years including more two way evaluation and visits.

Overall felt the SLM program had been a positive addition to the DAF work and had achieved goals (with the exception of CCP) in State.

Would be keen to see another SLM iteration which would focus on building on successes, replication to scale and CMP.

Would want to see a solution to the financial bottlenecks in any new iteration. (Dedicated grants manager in FSM or direct funding to State or funding through MCT)

#### **Meeting with Margie Falanruw USFDS/YINS. (pm 18 June)**

Good linkages with DAF have led to co-operative programs – information sharing, mangrove replanting, coastal vegetation mapping and science input into the Savannah Reforestation project). Some good Yap wide data sets (vegetation, mangrove changes, sea level rise) available as baselines for CMP.



But future SLM and CMP and monitoring would be greatly enhanced by the acquisition of up to date aerial photography of Yap (preferable) or high resolution satellite imagery (Ikonos) linked to further interpretation training for GIS expert. Yap has relatively outstanding capacity in this area and the data sets to achieve temporal change in vegetation – land cover etc. Any new iteration of SLM here would need to provide this.

**Meeting with EPA - Peter Fattamag (am 19 June).**

State visit has suffered from inability to meet with Focal Point (off island at meeting in Palau) as Fattamag not fully informed on progress with the project and the EPA program. With regard to the EIA activities Tapa Suaesi from SPREP ran workshop to assess Yap State EIA needs --- also some Yap attendance at EIA Kosrae workshop in 2010. Also unsure of State of WMP progress.

**Site visits (pm 19 June).**

Savannah Reforestation sites. Impressed with mixed species approach and survival rate. DAF Nursery clearly well managed and highly productive produced 6,000 trees for replanting at three sites. Need signs to explain project and goals to public. In terms of sustainability and mainstreaming, this activity and replanting of degraded areas generally is now part of the ongoing work plan of DAF Nimpal Channel Marine Conservation Area. Heard very positive story of establishment and ongoing impact of the MPA from Peter Fattamag (from establishing community) clearly strong pride in results and anecdotal evidence of positive impacts on biodiversity and fish abundance.

School vegetable/tree nursery – Gilman. Bit run down due to vacation and transfer of teacher who was driving force. Clearly showed the value of model in teaching good agricultural practices and sustainability of land management to next generation of land owners. In need of renewed leadership and worth DAF discussing options with head master including contracting a local traditional gardener to work part time with the kids.

Recycling plant. Toured with the foreman who provided a great description of an amazingly successful/sustainable Island wide recycling program/model which should be replicated on every small Pacific Island and certainly across FSM.

Visited municipal rubbish dump. Management is basic and SLM has helped linkage with Japan project to introduce improved system. Much needed as current dump structure has or may already be leaching toxics into nearby waterway.

## **Chuuk State**

**Julita Albert, Chuuk EPA and SLM Focal Point.**

Some progress has been made in the past year with the rehabilitation of landslides activities, namely field training in rehab measures ( Agriculture) and consultations with communities (UFO) on Fefan island and riparian planting ( still outstanding payments owed to communities who provided saplings). Once again, no evidence of formal guidelines being produced and activity has limited community focus.

Awareness of organic food production activities have been carried out by COM which has also undertaken community and school consultations.

Similarly, awareness raising of SWM issues – EPA undertook these (Brad) but nothing as ambitious as adopting the Yap recycling model.

Scholarships – have identified a student in Uni California to receive the funds – daughter of CCS principal undertaking environmental science degree.

EIA training and development – Tapa’s recent visit plus one in February and the Kosrae EIA workshop have utilised the funds. Promotion of SLM related career opportunities – questionable but EPA officer has been doing the rounds of schools. GIS capacity building – software purchased but no specific training for already trained personnel Brad (by TNC some years back).

Capacity for planning and establishing CPP has not had the desired effect – no expert engaged or guidelines developed. This work is linked to 2.1.5

Overall the focus has again been on implementing those small scale interventions with demonstration impact at the expense of tackling the broader State wide enabling/governance issues in land stabilisation/rehabilitation and watershed management. These require technical inputs and political support to ensure they have authority so it is hard to see how these principles are mainstreamed.

Of the suite of institutional and project execution issues, those related to the flow of funding were prominent. This has been a really difficult issue which has undermined the institutional model and created antipathy to the project as a whole. Chuuk still waiting for communities to be paid for plant materials. Uncertainty around budget and funds still available abounds.

SLM needed much closer attention to regular monitoring and evaluation of progress and constant follow up and advice to focal points on processes and reporting. Not enough time was spent in face to face contact between PMU and Focal Points especially in the early period of implementation while the new model was bedding down.

The PMU was underfunded and under-resourced for this role – must be a stronger budget to support travel etc.

Also lacking was the opportunity for sharing and learning with the exception of the EIA workshop, focal points and stakeholders were not brought together to reflect on the program and make recommendations for improvement.

Similarly, national workshops for the training and development of a model WMP/CMP/SLAM guidelines would have helped to achieve these Outcomes as it is clear the States have shied away from the technical areas needed to strengthen and mainstream SLM principles.

Consider using UNDP sub regional office in FSM as the UNDP rep office>

Not really any improvement in the efficiency of the program since the MTE but there has been more progress with some activities.

### **Implementing Agencies and partners meeting 9.30 – 12 noon 21 June (EPA office)**

TE consultant provided background on purpose, approach and methods for the TE via power point presentation.

Group discussed Chuuk activities and responded to questionnaire.

As was indicated to the MTE team, work on Activities 2.1.5 – 2.1.7 Guidelines developed for rehabilitation of landslides and community engagement and training in rehabilitation measures has been linked with Conservation Action Plan development led by CCS with support from the multi-agency implementation team and the UFO communities on Fefan Island. The Cap planning lays the ground work for CP plan development under Activities 2.4.9 2.4.10 Although draft guidelines were produced by the MTE evaluation team following its visit in May 2011, these have not been further refined and no formal guidelines were produced. All work on these inter-related activities has been focused on the one group of three communities (UFO) on Fefan Island which has also engaged in practical rehabilitation measures through riparian plantings.

The integration of these activities (recommended by MTE team) and the focused implementation in these receptive Fefan Island communities can be deemed sensible adaptive management, but the work done to date needs to be followed through and result in clear guidelines and eventually a formal CM plan. The implementing partnership CCS, EPA and DOA have worked together well on this and profess intention to continue these efforts beyond the project life.

Activities 2.2.4 Organic food production and 2.2.6 related to Sustainable Agricultural Practices on Sloping Land SALT (based around agro-forestry) have been undertaken by COM Land Grant as part of its ongoing program of extension work in these areas. From all accounts these activities have been successfully implemented and strong interest and changing attitudes have been observed in communities such as Nepukes.

2.3.5 Awareness raising to minimise illegal dumping of waste has resulted in support to the Chuuk Women's Council's litter consciousness project and support for the location of trash containers in public places.

2.4.1 Scholarships – a student at Eastern Oregon College in US studying Agricultural Science has been identified and has applied for scholarship funding.

2.4.2 In country EIA training has been linked and reprogrammed to support the National level workshop in Kosrae (2010) and EIA regulations assessments in each state led by SPREP in 2012.

2.4.4 Promoting careers in SLM related fields in school was to be focused on supporting a 2011 “youth to youth” conference but some uncertainty as to whether that occurred exists.

2.4.6 GIS support – this funding has been expended on upgrading software and additional training of EPA staff member (Brad Mori) with some existing GIS skills

2.4.8 Raise awareness of alternative livelihood option in rural communities – the plan was to spend this funding on awareness activities in outer islands but uncertainty exists as to whether this has taken place.

2.4.9 Building capacity for planning and establishing Coastal Protection Plan – see earlier comments under 2.1.5.

General discussion of topics raised in the questionnaire elicited responses in relation to three main areas:

- The formulation and design process of the project was considered to have been well handled and responsive to Chuuk State needs and the suite of activities relevant to the State's land management issues and linked to existing agency work plans and strategies
- Issues with the flow of funding from FSM national government to project implementers was seen as having been a major hindrance to the effective implementation of the project and strong recommendations were made to utilise alternatives such as MCT, the SPC Sub regional office in Pohnpei or the UNDP sub regional office in future projects.
- Communications between the State and PMU required improvement including more regular joint monitoring and evaluation of the project (State/PMU) especially in the early stages of implementation.

### Meeting with Yosko Kim, College of Micronesia Land Grant

A brief meeting with Ms Kim reinforced the value of the partnership with COM Land Grant and the SLM project in terms of progress with the promotion of organic agricultural produce and demonstration of techniques for SALT. In both cases COM has taken the lead and established successful demonstration and outreach activities which are resulting in increased interest and development of gardens in 4 communities on Tenoas, Weno, Tunuk and Fachuk, Romanim Islands. The program is reaching out and teaching prisoners organic farming methods and will be sustainable due to community interest and COM on-going support.

## Kosrae State

### Stakeholder Meeting Monday 25 June

Blair P. Charley	KIRMA	SLM Co-ordinator
Andy George	KCSO	Executive Director
Murtanel Tolenna	DREA	Adminstrator
Alik William	KIRMA	Marine Specialist
Simpson Abraham	PACC/KIRMA	PACC Coordinator
Mayson Nithan	KIRMA	Forestry and Wildlife
Erick Wagule	KIRMA	EIA
Presley Abraham	KIRMA	EIA Permitting

The TE team leader outlined the purpose, approach and expected results of the TE via a power point presentation. He then used the TE Questionnaire to prompt responses from the group on the key areas of focus of the Evaluation and later worked through each of the Kosrae State SLM activities to assess progress towards completion.

The Key observation from this meeting is that the stakeholder perspective on the issues raised in the questionnaire had not changed since the same issues were aired to the MTE team in April 2011. Of real surprise was the revelation that the MTE report had not been sent to the State FP either for review or in final form.

As in previous State meetings the central issues of concern were those of communication and coordination between State FP and National PMU; Budget transparency, the complicated financial disbursement system and serious delays. Related to this is the suggestion that the project covers the cost of an assistant or dedicated FP in the States rather than load this additional responsibility onto an already overworked staffer. The Financial planning aspect of the project came in for some criticism – not enough transparency –process far too complicated and needing to be more direct.

Of concern were the comments that in the end the frustration level reached the point where it just got too hard to access funding - too little money – too much effort- and it never materialised e.g. re-programmed funds from Activity 2.5.5. (2 1/2 months since invoiced). The comment was made that vendors would no longer provide credit if it was to be charged to SLM

There was general agreement that the Formulation and design process went well and contributed to a sense of country ownership but that NGO representation and participation in the formulation and inception workshops would have improved the process and helped to ensure it built on existing and related SLM commitments. Acknowledged that the Logical Framework and budget was essential for

understanding the complex program and tracking activities. But there are too many activities and greater effort should have been made to consolidate these and the individual item budgets into more manageable parcels of activity thus reducing the administration needs.

The Implementation Approach should be modified to improve the communication, coordination and partnerships nexus between the PMU and the States FP. It should also recognise the need to provide specific State level support to the FP or compensate for the additional responsibilities that person shoulders over and above their normal full time duties

Stakeholder Participation in Kosrae has been good and improved over the past year with regular weekly monthly meetings and good understanding of the project and implementation. However, this took time to mature and could have been improved if the NGO stakeholders had been involved from the outset and if their activities they were responsible for had been clearly defined and directly funded.

The value of linkages with other programmes was strongly emphasised and the Japan work on SWP was a quoted example as was the use of Venezuela Fund for rehabilitation planting of mangroves. Another example is the State PA plan based on the identification of ABS and the work going on to include these areas under the PA law. Management planning is in various stages of completion under the leadership of KCSO for several of the ABS.

On the subject of Venezuela Fund – there was uncertainty as to the status of the remaining funding both for Kosrae and other States, this despite the completion of the SPC midterm evaluation. The information has not been forthcoming from the PMU.

Opportunities for replication were briefly discussed and the SWM project was cited as a case in point. In general discussion it was agreed that more funding should have been made available to take advantage of learning and exchange opportunities across the project and farmer visits to assess the damage of upland sakau cultivation in Pohnpei was offered as an example where exchanges can influence and change behaviour.

In terms of sustainable results the ongoing support for SWM activities including monitoring by Kosrae State will happen as will the continuation of the NGO led PA and community specific watershed management plans. The EIA work on mainstreaming SLM principles will also continue and there is interest in finding a way to undertake an integrated Watershed Management Plan and overcoming the difficulties experienced in trying to identify and contract an expert to help through the USFS. Awareness work on organic production and recycling with schools and youth which includes garnering interest in environment and SLM related fields as a career will also be continued through the up-coming Youth to Youth program. Essentially those activities which are core business for the implementing agencies will continue to be sustained.

### **Meeting with Simpson Abraham, FSM PACC Coordinator 25 June**

PACC in FSM is being delivered direct by SPREP to Kosrae State thus circumventing some of the financial management difficulties which have hindered the SLM. If possible this is a model which should be explored as an option for future projects of this nature i.e. delivery through SPREP direct to the States. The PACC is complementary to SLM in that it is focused on mainstreaming and demonstrating coastal CC proofing, building capacity and developing an efficient programme delivery approach through the PMU.

It is using an earlier ADB report on climate proofing and focussing demos on climate proofing a stretch of shoreline road which runs adjacent to areas of mangroves re-planted under SLM. Is a good example of synergy with SLM.

### **Field Visits – afternoon of 25 June**

Visits were made to the following sites with Blair Charley and Alick William KIRMA:

**Kosrae Municipal Dump – SWM project.**

Process of improving decay and breakdown of rubbish and draining and capture of leachate was explained as was the monitoring protocol. Very impressive SWM example and clearly one to be replicated in other small islands. Notable was the lack of stench even on a blistering hot day.

**Mangrove replanting sites:**

Visits were made to Meloh, Finolof and Okat mangrove replanting sites with the strike rate and scale at Finolof being particularly impressive.

**PACC Climate Proofing – Okat Bay road**

Inspected the climate proofing of road near Okat Bay involving raising of road base and re-culverting low flood prone areas.

## **Pohnpei State**

### **Afternoon 26 June 2012**

**Meeting with Henry Susaia, Pohnpei State EPA and SLM Focal Point.**

Met with Henry to review the TE programme for Pohnpei State and progress with the work plan and activities before and since the MTE. As was the case with the FP's in Kosrae and Chuuk, the Pohnpei FP had not seen the final MTE report or its recommendations which made assessment of progress with the implementation of the recommendations unrealistic.

The Evaluator presented the overview of the TE and reviewed the work plan. The questionnaire was used to guide discussion on broader project outcomes and issues.

The activity by activity assessment of implementation indicated that Pohnpei State had been unusually successful in carrying out most of its specified activities over the project period and had made good use of the project extension to tidy up outstanding matters. Particularly impressive was the watershed demarcation work in Sokehs Municipality which had been completed in partnership with CSP and had the support of both traditional and local government leadership and the community including women and youth groups.

Also completed were activities relating to invasive species mapping, and training in eradication measures (herbicide application) and training in and strengthening nursery management for reforestation purposes. Demonstration sites for sustainable agriculture and recycling (composting) were established and were being used for outreach learning with framers. Can recycling was underway and a new regulation formally establishing or the programme came is in effect. Pohnpei had managed to spend its modest scholarship money to support a student of agriculture at UoG for two semesters.

EIA mainstreaming was linked to the Kosrae workshop and subsequent State visit by SPREP representative to help review and strengthen EIA regulations. Visits to schools to promote environmental and land management career paths were undertaken by CSP as part of its "Green Road show" and Youth to Youth programmes. Training in methodologies to monitor and mitigate erosion centred on the CSP Forest Rangers training programme.

The broader coastal vegetation survey activity was linked into the National Resources Conservation Survey of vulnerability and adaptation on 14 atolls the report of which is under preparation by the National Government. Money for Activity 2.4.12, for construction types and methods for coastal protection had been reprogrammed to support the Sokehs watershed demarcation process which

was very successful and further replication of the demarcation process has been requested by at least two other municipalities.

On the issue of broader SLM implementation issues, the FP emphasised the important role of the NGO partners – CSP and CoM had played in project implementation. He also identified the financial management and processing through national government as being the single most difficult management issue he faced throughout the project but he agreed that despite this the project had largely achieved its outcomes in Pohnpei state.

#### **Meeting with Ms. Beverley Sadole-Susumu, National SLM Coordinator**

This meeting focussed on clarifying status of national activities including the mainstreaming of SLM principles into National and State policies and development strategies and planning, incorporating the SLM principles into EIA and the UNCCD National Action Plan (NAP)

Activities 1.1.2; 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 involved engaging a consultant to draft guidelines form mainstreaming SLM into land use and master zoning plans and holding a workshop to validate these .Activities 1.1.4 and 1.1.5 were to use the guidelines to achieve SLM integration and to hold a seminar of national leaders to promote SLM mainstreaming.

The National Coordinator explained that these activities did not take place (although a consultant was originally engaged for the work) primarily because of a lack of workable land use and master zoning plans in FSM. The assumption that workable instruments were in place and functioning effectively may have been unrealistic and a project design flaw. The consequence of the apparent lack of feasible planning instruments is that the mainstreaming guidelines were never completed and the flow on activities did not take place. However the Evaluator has recognised that the completion of the project and the successful implementation of many of its activities offers an opportunity UNDP and the FSM OEEM to report on the project and to a high level meeting and to promote the mainstreaming of SLM etc.

Activities 1.2.1 - 1.2.5 related to the review and incorporation of SLM principles into EIA guidelines. With the strong technical support of SPREP these activities have nearly been implemented in full although the critical final stage of actually finalising the guidelines for each State is still is achieved. In this regard it is important that follow up with SPREP and the States is carried out to ensure the final product is a reality.

Activities 3.1.1 – 3.1.4 Relate to the development of a guide for the NAP process, gender equal training for the development of the NAP and associated consultations, which were carried out with mixed success. However, the drafting of the NAP under Activities 3.2.1 – 3.2.3 was not achieved. The National SLM Coordinator explained that although the initial development and consultation work had taken place, including the gender equal training, it had transpired at the training workshop that SPREP as UNCCD regional focal point was concerned to see a consistent approach to all Pacific NAP's and in particular, their alignment with the UNCCD 5 year Action Strategy., SPREP had advised it would be preparing a template for member country use and would be advising on how this should be used. Consequently and in the interests of regional consistency, the FSM work on the NAP had been shelved pending the development of the SPREP template and availability of SPREP technical staff to assist with further development.

Another consequence of this action was the postponement of work on developing a Medium term investment plan and associated resource mobilisation strategy for the NAP although expertise was hired – but the contract elapsed and some training was undertaken ( Activities 4.1.1 - .41.3). The drafting and promotion of the Investment Strategy did not occur, again as a consequence of the postponement of the NAP development process.

Clearly the failure of the project to meet these fundamental outputs is disappointing and hopefully will remain a work in progress. SPREP should be apprised of the situation and urged to give FSM priority in its process for completing the template and working countries to implement it.

Other matters discussed were the re-programming of funds which the PMU to activities which were ongoing and looking like being successful. In this regard the PMU has been responsive to the State requests and had made several re-programming recommendations which had been approved. These had been actioned and the adaptive approach was appreciated by the States. In this regard also the National Coordinator had appreciated the y visits of the UNDP MCO senior staff (Ms Ravuvu) in the early days of the project (Feb, June and December 2009) and the advice given on the flexibility and rules of the financial processes in terms of re-programming. Unfortunately this level of mission did not take place in 2010 or 2011 or 2012.

## **June 27 - Morning**

### **Meeting with Pohnpei State SLM implementing stakeholders, State EPA office**

Henry Susaia	Pohnpei EPA and State SLM Focal Point
Semes Silbanuz	Pohnpei Div. Agriculture
Saimon Lihpei	Pohnpei Div. Forestry
Francesca Chispo	Conservation Society of Pohnpei (CSP)
Mark Kostka	College of Micronesia FSM
Alpenster Henry	College of Micronesia FSM.

The Evaluator presented on the purpose, approach and expected results of the TE via a power point presentation. He then used the TE Questionnaire to prompt responses from the group on the key areas of focus of the Evaluation and worked through each of the Pohnpei State SLM activities to assess progress towards completion. The group responded well and in some cases provided further clarification on the responses provided by the FP the previous day.

With regard to some of the activities undertaken in Pohnpei, there was agreement that the completion of the Sokehs Watershed demarcation project was a major accomplishment but other projects of note included the composting and agro – forestry demo sites (over 50 farmers attended). Both projects will be repeated, are considered sustainable and are attracting additional funding.

In terms of the questionnaire, comments on broader project issues included the observation that although the project formulation and design process was fairly good, the stakeholder input had been rushed and early involvement of the NGO's would have been helpful. The frustration with the financial processed was again evident with the group recommending that funding go direct to the States possibly through an organisation like MCT as a reputable grant managing agency .

In terms of Stakeholder participation there was agreement that as the project had matured this had got stronger and they were more comfortable working together now than in the early days. On Scholarships the suggestion was made that in future these should be focused on post graduate students rather than undergraduates because the latter had far more funding options to choose from.

Replication opportunities in Pohnpei centred on the watershed demarcation projects, composting and agro-forestry demonstrations. The Invasive species activities were cited as being sustainable due to on – going State and regional funding. Similarly, it was felt the SLM project in Pohnpei had been cost effective and one example to illustrate this was the purchase of the chipper of composting at \$930 and the tremendous benefit which had been derived form that piece of equipment including the targeting of the invasive African Tulip for chipping material.



In terms of the project time frame – it was considered that more time (and money) would have been beneficial and another iteration of the project would focus on replicating success like watershed demarcation, composting and waste management (bio gas) and invasive species. On the issue of money, the assumption that the available funds should be equally shared across the 4 States and National office was questioned. The suggestion was made that in any future project the funding should be allocated on merit and related need, past results, capacity and a realistic assessment of potential success – reward the early implementers.

Finally the Sokehs experience was a great example of how the project has helped to strengthen governance with multi layers of leadership involved and signing on including women’s and youth groups.

**June 28 am.**

**FSM National Stakeholder meeting OEEM Office**

Andrew Yatilman	OEEM	Director
Cindy Ehmes	OEEM	SLM Project Manager
Beverly Sadole –Susumu	OEEM	SLM National Coordinator
Okean Ehmes	UN Joint Presence Country Development Manager	
Patti Pedrus	OEEM	SDP
Tilson T Kephass	OEEM	Program Manager Env. Div.
John P. Wichap	R&D (Agric. Unit)	Plant & Animal Quarantine

The Evaluator thanked the group of assembling a short notice and described the essence of his visits to four States, thanking Beverly and Cindy for their help in organising the itinerary and meetings. The purpose, focus, scope and ToR for the Evaluation were presented and the draft report summarised with the focus being on the recommendations and lessons learned. Specific comments included:

Recommendation 3 – refer to the need to align NAP with other PICs under the SPREP Template

Recommendation 5 – note that some learning exchanges on EIA have taken place

Recommendation 8 – this is important and needs to be elevated in priority

Recommendation 10 – note that initially implementation at the state level was not moving well

Recommendation 11- needs to be strengthened with the initial focus being on building internal capacity to deal with the issue before contracting out to grant managing organisations

The Steering Committee, TAG and Tripartite Reviews had been wound back as a cost saving measure.

Some of the financial problems arose from the slow implementation by some states and the initially the PMU did not have the flexibility to re programme across the States which are pretty autonomous and resisted any re-programming of allocated funds even if they were not spending them. Hence, initially the program ran into problems under the UN 80% reimbursement rule as the PMU waited for all states to spend their allocation so replenishment could be secured. This changed after one of the UNDP MCO missions explained that re- programming could be undertaken.

Gender equality is a feature of the project and was achieved through training at the inception meeting and the involvement of women’s groups in project implementation (Chuuk litter campaign).

## ANNEX 5 List of Documents Reviewed

### Yap

1. Yap Environmental Majors SLM Scholarship Awardees
2. Yap SLM Scholarship Award Letter to Students, 7 March 2011
3. Yap State letter to PMU advising scholarship awardees March 10 2011
4. Yap State letter to PMU advising Scholarship awardees 11 October 2011
5. Yap Department of Agriculture and Forestry SLM Activity and Expense Log
6. Yap SLM Work Plan
7. Yap State Natural Heritage: A Terrestrial Ecological Assessment, 2010
8. Yap State Wide Assessment and Resource Strategy 1010 – 2015
9. Yap State Solid Waste Management Plan 2012 - 2017

### Pohnpei

10. Pohnpei State SLM Work Plan
11. Pohnpei Focal Point and Stakeholder Budget Breakdown and Expenditure List
12. Sokehs Watershed Boundary survey plan

### Kosrae

13. Kosrae State Solid Waste Management Plan 2011-2015
14. SLM Project 2011 Kosrae Work plan and Budget
15. Areas of Biological Significance (ABS) in Kosrae map.
16. YELA Integrated Watershed Management Plan Draft
17. Informational Materials Provided by KCSO to Schools: *Compost Materials and Troubleshooting; Compost, and, Reuse and Reduce Examples*
18. Kosrae Focal Point Recommendations for Future Implementation List
19. Kosrae Watershed Mangrove Restoration GIS site maps for Finolof, Likinluem, Pukusrik, Kupulu and Meloh restoration areas.

### Chuuk

20. Sustainable Land Management Project--- Rehabilitation of Degraded Areas in Chuuk, FSM
21. Unnuno, Fongon and Onnongoch draft Conservation Action Plan, Fefan, Chuuk State, FSM.
22. Growing and Using Local Produce - Sustainable Agriculture Information Series Brochure no.1 ( June 2011) COM –FSM Chuuk Campus

### FSM National

23. Federated States of Micronesia Capacity Building, Policy Development, and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management Expedited Medium Size Project Proposal under the LDC – SIDS Portfolio Project for Sustainable Land Management, September 2007
24. FSM Sustainable Land Management Project Inception Report (23-25 February 2009)
25. Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in the Federated States of Micronesia – a Medium Sized Project for Capacity Building, Policy Development, and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management Mid Term Evaluation, June 2011.
26. FSM SLM Inception Report Annex D: Stakeholder Involvement Matrices: Chuuk
27. FSM SLM Inception Report Annex 6: Revised Matrix on Risks and Mitigation Measures
28. FSM SLM Inception Report Annex 1: Participant List
29. FSM SLM Inception Report Annex 5: FSM SLM Annual Work Plan
30. FSM SLM Inception Report Annex 4: Revised Projects Logical Framework
31. FSM Five Year Environment Sector Plan 2008
32. FSM Strategic Development Plan 2004 – 2023 – the next 20 years Achieving Economic Growth and Self Reliance Vol 1 Policies and Strategies
33. FSM SLM 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Narrative Report 2010
34. FSM SLM 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Narrative Report , 2010
35. FSM SLM 1<sup>st</sup> Quarterly Narrative Report , 2011

### SPREP

36. SPREP: Report National EIA Training & Mainstreaming MEAs in to EIA Workshop, Kosrae, FSM, 15-19 March, 2010: 15-Mar-2010 to 19-Mar-2010, Kosrae, Federated States of Micronesia
37. SPREP: Guiding Notes For The Development of EIA Guidelines for FSM States
38. Brief for Pacific Island Countries; UN Convention to Combat Desertification, 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties, 10 – 21 October, Korea
39. SPREP: Feasibility of Integrated Financing Strategies (IFS) for Fiji and Samoa and regional inferences

## **ANNEX 6 Questionnaire Used and Summary of Results**

It is unfortunate that the relative short time available to complete the Terminal Evaluation precluded the formal circulation of a questionnaire to all stakeholders and the tabulation of results. However, past experience has shown that a generic questionnaire is very useful to guide discussion in both one on one, small group and larger stakeholder meetings and helps to elicit responses in a consistent and organised way. Consequently the Evaluator prepared the following questionnaire for use at all meetings. One of the prime points of interest to the Evaluator was to assess the impact of any changes made to the Project management system following the recommendations of the Mid Term Evaluation hence the reference to the MTE in several questions. It became apparent that most stakeholders were unaware of the recommendations and hence the tenor of the questions became more generic to the overall performance of the project over its 4 year life.

A power point presentation was also used in the larger stakeholder meetings to introduce the purpose, objectives and scope of the Evaluation and this included most of the questions on the questionnaire.

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

(Based on Terms of Reference and Evaluation Report Format)

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

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

#### **2. Project Implementation**

- Did the institutional arrangements including joint implementation and coordination, State Focal Points etc, for the project work effectively and how could they be improved?
  
- Was the communication and coordination between FSM Govt. PMU, State implementing agencies and community partners effective?
  
- Were the project management tools – logical framework, work plans , reporting requirements helpful in keeping track of implementation requirements/progress

- Were the MTE recommendations effectively implemented and did they make a difference to the efficiency of the project management?

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

The MTE found that the SLM project was by and large, one which FSM and your State wanted to undertake and was of long term value to communities, States and country as a whole.

- Over the course of the last year has your view on this changed?
- Would you support a similar new project?

### **4. Stakeholder Participation**

The MTE found that SH participation varies from State to State and but was important and warranted more direct involvement in all project stages from planning to implementation.

- In your State do you think stakeholder participation in implementation and adaptive management decisions making has been encouraged and benefited the project?
- How could levels of stakeholder participation been improved and strengthened?

### **5. Replication Approach**

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

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

### **6. Cost Effectiveness**

The MTE found that the project was considered cost effective in that activities have delivered community benefits, there is community and political support and the projects have been straightforward and relatable.

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

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

The MTE found that developing “win win” linkages with other projects was a significant component of the design and implementation of the project (and co-financing).

- Resulting from the work of the past year, do you have examples where the SLM project has successfully linked with or supported other similar programmes and vice versa e.g. Venezuela Fund?

## 8. Management Arrangements

The MTE found there were issues with adjusting to a new management approach FP's- States - FSM Govt. –UNDP which seemed complicated and suffered from a lack of “directness” in decision making and financial transfers.

- Did the management function more smoothly in the extension year following the identification of these issues and how effectively were the MTE recommendations implemented?

## 9. Financial Planning

The MTE found there were issues with the planning and flow of funding such as the allocation then withdrawal of funds from States for national initiatives and slowing of the project due to time consuming reporting at national level.

- Given the urgency to spend funds, did the financial allocation process function more smoothly in the extension year following the identification of these issues?
- Examples?

## 10. Execution and Implementation Modalities

The MTE found there were issues with the execution of the SLM particularly with the turnover/inconsistency of staff and additional responsibilities for existing staff.

- Do these concerns and the MTE team recommendations for improvement to future programs remain valid?

## 11. Coordination and Operational Issues

These are closely linked to the above. The MTE found that the roles and responsibilities of the various key stakeholders should have been made more clear from the outset, especially for NGO's, in implementation of key activities.

- Has the situation improved as the project has matured and did the extension year activities proceed more smoothly as a result of this?
- If a future SLM- like project was to be developed do you imagine it would function more effectively and efficiently from the outset by building on the experience of this project

## 12. Results Generally

- To what extent do you think the FSM/SLM project achieved its outcomes in your State?
- Overall has the project improved the understanding of SLM issues and principles in the State and capacity to plan and manage responses?
- How has the project strengthened the enabling environment for conservation and SLM

- Has the project helped promote local participation on SLM and environmental decision making?
- What are the significant achievements in your State and will these have lasting effect?

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

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

### **14 Lessons Learned**

The MTE found in general that the project offered lessons to be learnt in the following areas:

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

Are there areas which are missed on this list which perhaps have come to the fore in the extension year of the project?

Thank You for your assistance.

## **ANNEX 7 Overview of Co-financing and Leveraged Resources.**

The Expedited MSP Proposal document for the FSM LCD –SIDS Portfolio Project for Sustainable Land Management identified US\$ 933,300 of co-Financing for the project. This figure included a \$440,639 contribution from the Kosrae, Pohnpei, Chuuk and Yap State governments, \$228,661 from the FSM Government, a very modest \$10,000 from the State NGO's (CSP, KCSO, CCS, YINS) and 254,000 from Bilateral assistance sources including , USFS, SPREP, SPC, Japanese Government and the Venezuela Fund.

Over the eventual four year period of the project this co-financing amounts to less the \$250,000 per year which is considered quite modest for a project of this complexity with the large number of stakeholders and activities involved, especially as much of the co-financing involved is in-kind contributions of project personnel salaries, office space, meeting venues, nurseries and associated running costs, vehicle use and running costs, support administration and communications. None of these costs have been detailed and accounted for in a formal way within the overall project accounting. However, it is fair to speculate that in the case of the four States for example, \$110,000 a year or a modest \$27,500 per State would have easily been expended each year on project related activities.

Similarly the FSM Government contribution of \$228,000 represents an annual average expenditure on in kind support of approximately \$57,000, which can be accounted for in salaries of the OEEM staff involved in the project, national finance staff handling accounting, office space, vehicle use, some travel and IT and communications infrastructure and support.

As the project unfolded, it became apparent that the State based NGO's and CBO's would play an important role in the implementation of many of the activities. This turned out to be the case and the work of these organisations has been vital to the overall success of the project. Indeed, FSM is very fortunate to have properly constituted and well developed conservation and social development organisations in each State as well as the presence of the College of Micronesia. One of the capacity building successes of the project has been the joint implementation activities it has promoted between NGO's and State land management agencies. So it is not unreasonable to speculate that this level of involvement has far exceeded the modest \$10,000 dollar (\$2,500 per year across four organisations) in-kind and cash contribution attributed as co-financing by the NGO's/CBO's

The other major source of co-financing is the US\$ 254,000 contributed by bilateral and regional development and technical assistance organisations. This is delivered in the form of both funding and technical assistance. Most prominent amongst these was the Venezuela Fund, the Japanese Government (JICA), USFS, FAO and SPREP.

The Venezuela Fund committed US\$ 90,000 to the project particularly in support of degraded land restoration work in all four States. The Japanese Government contributed both financially and through technical assistance to the recycling projects in each State and perhaps more importantly to the Solid Waste Management planning and implementation in Kosrae, Pohnpei and Yap. At the time of writing, Yap State FP has advised the Evaluator of Japanese Government approval of a \$60,000 grant to assist with the upgrading of the Yap dump in a replication of the work undertaken in Kosrae. The USFS has provided technical expertise and funding for several activities including advice on savannah reforestation on Yap and FAO has provided seed and gardening tools for nursery and replanting activities. SPREP has been instrumental in supporting the mainstream of SLM into EIA processes through the provision of technical expertise over a number of weeks throughout the project. Advice has also been provided on the development and alignment of the NAP under the UNCCD and SPC has assisted with agricultural production and invasive species related activities.



When looked at from these perspectives, the conclusion drawn by the Evaluator is that the co-financing goal of the project has been achieved and is a reflection of the willing contributions of the many stakeholders who have provided in kind, technical and financial resources in support of its implementation over the past 4 years.

**ANNEX 8 Summary of Evaluation Findings**

**Table Legend**

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

OUTCOME 1: National and State level sector policies and strategies have SLM principles and objectives mainstreamed into them						Rating	
Outputs	Measurable Indicators from PLF	Activities	Agency	Target	Delivery Status	MTE	TE
1.1 SLM principles integrated into National and State policies, development strategies and development planning procedures	At least four National and/or State sector policies and strategies incorporating SLM principles by end of project life	Engage consultant to draft guidelines for mainstreaming SLM into land use and master zoning plans. (1.1.1 – 1.1.2)		Consultant engaged and draft guidelines ready Yr1	All States	S	MS
		Conduct workshop to validate draft mainstreaming guidelines. (1.1.3)		Consultation workshop implemented and guidelines finalized Yr 1-22	All States	MS	U
		Use guidelines to integrate SLM into appropriate national and state policies and strategies. (1.1.4)		Integration of SLM into national and state policies and strategies Yr 3	All States	MS	S
		Conduct seminar with national leaders to promote mainstreaming of SLM and explore opportunities for introducing economic incentives		Seminar conducted and guideline promoted amongst stakeholders Yr 2	All States	MS	U

Outputs	Measurable Indicators from PLF	Activities	Agency	Target	Delivery Status	MTE	TE
1.2 SLM principles incorporated into EIA used in planning and decision-making processes for land-based investment and infrastructure development.	At least four major projects will have EIA's that incorporate SLM principles in the planning and development process by end of project	Identify and engage consultant to review EIA procedures. (1.2.1)		Consultant engaged Yr 2	All States	MS	HS
		Plan and Conduct workshop and use of EIA guidelines incorporating SLM principles. (1.2.2)		Workshop conducted on EIA/SLM practices Yr 2	All States	MS	HS
		Promote EIA guidelines to stakeholders through public awareness activities. (1.2.3 – 1.2.5)		EIA guidelines produced and promoted Yr 2	All States	MS	S
<b>OUTCOME 2: Capacity for Sustainable Land Management enhanced at the systemic, institutional and individual levels.</b>						<b>Rating</b>	
Outputs	Measurable Indicators from PLF	Activities	Agency	Target	Delivery Status	MTE	TE
2.1 Institutional and individual capacity enhanced to identify and rehabilitate degraded lands	State government agencies, NGO's and at least one community in each state able to collaborate, prioritize and use technical guidelines to identify And rehabilitate degraded land areas.	Resource person identified and practical training planned and implemented in the identification and mapping of areas degraded due to impact of invasive species. (2.1.1)	DL&NR	Resource persons identified and training planned and implemented. Yr 1	Pohnpei	S	S
		Field based practical training for government, NGO and communities undertaken on measures to eradicate invasive species on degraded lands.(2.1.2)	PIST	Field training on methods to eradicate invasive plant species carried out. Yr 1	Pohnpei	S	S
		Practical training undertaken on measures to reforest and restore natural habitats. (2.1.3)	Forestry YDAF	Field training on methods to reforest and restore natural habitats conducted. Yr 1	Pohnpei Yap	S S	S S

Outputs	Measurable Indicators from PLF	Activities	Agency	Target	Delivery Status	MTE	TE
		Practical training in establishing nurseries for replanting of indigenous species. (2.1.4)	KIRMA Forestry YDAF	Training on establishing native species nurseries conducted. Yr 1	Kosrae Pohnpei Yap	S MS S	S S HS
		Guidelines developed for rehabilitation of lands disturbed due to landslides /natural disasters/coastal erosion (2.1.5)	Ch EPA	Guidelines developed for rehabilitation of land disturbed due to landslides and climate change. Yr 1-3	Chuuk	U	U
		Community consultation carried out on use of guidelines and identifies practical rehabilitation measures. (2.1.6)	Ch EPA	Community consultations carried out on use of guidelines and practical rehabilitation measures identified. Yr 1-3	Chuuk	U	MS
		Field training in use of appropriate rehabilitation measures (2.1.7)		Field training in use of measures completed Y1-3	Chuuk	U	S
		Development of guideline on replanting of savannah areas degraded by fire (2.1.8)	YDAF	Guidelines developed Y2 - 3	Yap	U	U
		Training in reforestation of savannah areas (2.1.9)	YDAF USFS	Training completed Y3	Yap	S	HS
		Training in methods for monitoring reforested savannah areas (2.1.10)	YDAF USFS	Training in methods for monitoring reforested savannah areas completed Y3	Yap	MS	MS
		Public awareness activities and consultations with community and public partners. (2.1.11) co-finance	YDAF	Public awareness activities and consultations with community and public partners completed. Yr 2-3	Yap	S	S

2.2 Sustainable agriculture practices on sloping land and appropriate technologies promoted and demonstrated, with awareness materials and sites focused toward women and youths.	At least two demonstration sties established in each State that demonstrate sustainable agriculture practices , a guide for sustainable agriculture on sloping land developed and made available to all States and a minimum of 30 farmers -50% of which should be women – in both target States benefiting from training	Plan and establish an agro-forestry demonstration site on sloping land using SLM principles. (2.2.1)	Agri.	Demonstration sites established and implemented Y2 - 3	Pohnpei	MS	S
		Conduct Field Day and farmer training at the demonstration sites (2.2.2)	Agric	Field day and training activities conducted Y2-3	Pohnpei	MS	HS
		Establish practical demonstration site composting (2.2.3)	Agric	Demonstration sites established and implemented Y2 &3	Pohnpei	MS	HS
		Promote organic production through awareness raising activites (2.2.4)	Agric CoM LG Agri.	Awareness activities undertaken	Kosrae Chuuk Pohnpei	S S S	S S S
		Develop sustainable agriculture practices guide for agricultural production on sloping land(2.2.5)	YDAF	Guide produced and distributed to communities Y 2 & 3	Yap	MS	U
		Promote sustainable agricultural practices through community consultations (2.2.6)	COM	Sustainable agricultural practices promoted through community consultations Y1 &2	Chuuk	MS	S
		Develop SALT Guidelines (2.2.7)	KIRMA	Guidelines developed Y2-3	Kosrae	U	U
		Establish demonstration site for SALT (2.2.8)	KIRMA	SALT site established Y2 -3	Kosrae	U	U
		Conduct field demonstrations on SALT sites (2.2.9)	KIRMA	Demonstrations conducted Y3	Kosrae	U	U
		<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators from PLF</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Delivery Status</b>
2.3 Capacity enhanced to minimize negative impact of solid waste on land resources	Solid waste management plan developed for at least two States, at least one training activity implemented in the two States to promote waste minimization and public awareness raised on the negative impacts of illegal	Expertise identified and engaged to develop a SWM plan. (2.3.1)	KIRMA EPA	Expert identified and engaged. Yr 1	Kosrae Pohnpei	S S	S S
		Consultation workshop carried out to develop a SWM plan and includes Government, NGOs, communities, women’s groups	KIRMA YEPA	Workshop carried out with broad stakeholder input toward development. Yr 1 and 2	Kosrae Yap	S S	S S

	dumping of waste	and private sector.(2.3.2)					
		SWM Plan draft finalised and endorsed by State authorities (2.2.3)	KIRMA YEPA	SWM Plan developed, reviewed and endorsed Y3	Kosrae Yap	S S	S S
		Plan and implement activities to promote recycling and waste minimisation	KIRMA EPA	Training completed and recycling program implemented	Kosrae Pohnpei	S S	HS HS
		Conduct awareness raising activities to minimize illegal dumping of solid waste, and share actions and successes with other islands, donors, govts., and regional organizations. (2.3.5)	KIRM A EPA	Training completed and recycling program implemented. Yr 2	Kosrae Chuuk	MS MS	S MS
2.4 Individual level capacity enhanced to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate SLM	Capacity at the individual level is enhanced through the issuance of at least 1 scholarship for each state in a field related to SLM, with returning students being employed within relevant government organisations in the FSM by end of project	Provide scholarships for award training in environment management and sustainable agriculture focusing on gender equality. (2.4.1)	KIRM, AGR. Agr/EP A Agr. EPA	Training completed and recycling program implemented. Yr 2	Kosrae Chuuk Pohnpei Yap	U U MS MS	S S S HS
		Identify expertise to conduct in-country EIA(2.4.2)	EPA YEPA	Expert identified and engaged in Y1-2	Pohnpei Yap	S MS	S S
		Plan and conduct in country EIA training (2.4.3)	KIRMA Ch EPA P EPA YEPA	Practical training in EIA conducted Y 1- 3	Kosrae Chuuk Pohnpei Yap	S S S S	S S S S
		Plan and conduct school-based activities to promote career opportunities in environment in SLM. (2.4.4)	KIRMA CH EPA P EPA YEPA	School activities designed and presented on SLM related career opportunities. Yr 1-3	Kosrae Chuuk Pohnpei Yap	S MS S S	S MS S S
		Plan and conduct training on methodologies to monitor soil erosion and implement mitigation options. (2.4.5)	KIRMA CSP	Practical training conducted. Yr 2 and 3	Kosrae Pohnpei	U MS	U MS

		Plan and conduct training in use of GIS to support SLM. (2.4.6)	KIRMA Ch EPA YEPA	Y Practical training conducted. Yr 2 and 3	Kosrae Chuuk Yap	MS S MS	S S S
		Development of a guide to monitor erosion and identification of mitigation options related to development activities. (2.4.7)	KIRMA YEPA	Guide developed. Yr 2 and 3	Kosrae Yap	MS MS	U U
		Raise awareness on alternative livelihood options targeting rural communities and aimed at minimizing land degradation. (2.4.8)	KIRMA Ch Agric YEPA	Awareness raising activities completed. Yr 1-3	Kosrae Chuuk Yap	MS MS MS	MS MS MS
		Design a coastline protection plan to minimize erosion and land degradation. (2.4.9)	DAF/YS G Ch EPA	Coastline protection plan designed and approved. Yr 1	YAP Chuuk	U MS	U U
		Conduct vegetation survey and mapping of selected site. (2.4.10)	YSG/DA F Ch EPA P EPA	Vegetation survey and mapping completed. Yr 2	Yap Chuuk * Pohnpei	S S S	S S S
		Selection of plants and building materials to be used based on surveys and data. (2.4.11)	DAF	Plants and building materials selected. Yr 3 ( Yap reprogrammed the funding to savannah reforestation)	Yap	MS	MS
		Selection of construction types and methods to be used. (2.4.12)	PSG PSG	Construction types selected and approved. Yr 3 ( both States reprogrammed the funding to savannah rehabilitation and Sokehs w/shed demarcation)	Yap Pohnpei	U MS	U U
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators from PLF</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Delivery Status</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>TE</b>

2.5 Capacity for planning and establishing watershed management plans enhanced, with a focus on gender equality	Watershed management plans incorporating SLM principles are planned and developed in at least two States involving a wide range of stakeholders including women and youth.	Develop guideline and approach to demarcating and monitoring watershed areas. (2.5.1)	Forestry CSP	Guideline developed. Yr 2	Pohnpei	MS	HS
		Identify and engage expertise to facilitate the development of an integrated watershed management plan. (2.5.2)	KIRMA	Expert identified and engaged. Yr 2	Kosrae	U	
		Conduct consultations to develop an integrated watershed management plan. (2.5.3)	KIRMA	Consultations held to develop WMP. Yr 2	Kosrae	MS	
		Conduct practical training for stakeholders in integrated watershed management planning including the use of terrestrial conservation approaches. (2.5.4)	KIRMA	Practical training using conservation approaches conducted. Yr 2 and 3	Kosrae	U	MS
		Identify and establish potential protected areas. (2.5.5)	KIRMA	Potential protected areas identified. Yr 2 and 3	Kosrae	U	S
<b>OUTCOME 3: FSM NAP developed, promoted and implementation supported.</b>						<b>Rating</b>	
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators from PLF</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Delivery Status</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>TE</b>
3.1 Consultations undertaken for the development of the FSM NAP	National government and stakeholder representatives in all States participate in the development of the NAP.	Develop guide for the development of the NAP ,Yr1 (3.1.1)	SD Unit	Guide developed and circulated to facilitators in the national and State governments. Yr 1	SD Unit	S	U
		Conduct gender-equal training for the development of the NAP. (3.1.2)	SD Unit	Training of facilitators carried out. Yr 1	SD Unit	S	S
		Engage consultant to develop	SD	Consultant engaged. Yr 1	SD Unit	MS	U



		the NAP (3.1.3)	Unit				
		Conduct consultations for the development of the NAP. (3.1.4)	SD Unit	Consultations carried out at State level and information obtained to develop the NAP. Yr 1	SD Unit	MS	MS
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators from PLF</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Delivery Status</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>TE</b>
3.2 Draft NAP developed and endorsed by State and National Governments  NOTE: Progress on NAP and associated Investment Plan (4.1/4.2) held up pending completion by SPREP of regional template for country alignment with UNCCD 5 year action plan.	Training of trainers carried out on the development of a resource mobilization strategy and stakeholder representatives from each State trained in ways to develop resource mobilization strategies, project management and development of project proposals	NAP finalized and presented to State and National Governments for consideration.(3.2.1)	SD Unit	Draft NAP completed. Yr 1	SD Unit	MS	U
		NAP endorsed by State and National Governments and presented to the UNCCD Secretariat. (3.2.2)	SD Unit	NAP endorsed by government and presented to the UNCCD Secretariat. Yr 1	SD Unit	MS	U
		Plan and conduct awareness-raising on the NAP. ( 3.2.3)	SD Unit	Awareness raising activities carried out. Yr 1	SD Unit	MS	U
<b>OUTCOME 4: Medium Term Investment Plan developed and used to support the implementation of the NAP.</b>						<b>Rating</b>	
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators from PLF</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Delivery Status</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>TE</b>
4.1 Enhanced capacity to develop a Medium Term Investment Plan and its associated resource mobilization plan.	Training of trainers carried out on the development of a resource mobilization strategy and stakeholder representatives from each State trained in ways to develop resource mobilization strategies, project management and development of project	Expertise identified and secured to facilitate the development of the FSM NAP resource mobilization strategy. (4.1.1)	SD Unit	Expert engaged to facilitate development of strategy and training program developed. Yr 2	SD Unit	S	U
		Training workshop on developing a resource mobilization strategy planned and implemented.(4.1.2)	SD Unit	Training workshop implemented and evaluated. Yr 2	SD Unit	MS	U

	proposals	Training workshop on Project Cycle Management and development of project proposals planned and implemented. (4.1.3)	SD Unit	Training workshop implemented and evaluated. Yr 2	SD Unit	S	S
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators from PLF</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Delivery Status</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>TE</b>
4.2 Medium Term Investment Plan and associated Resource Mobilisation Plan developed	Medium Term Investment plan and resource mobilization plan completed, endorsed by Government and used as a guide in development and NGO work plans and project proposal development	Consultations undertaken by a team of national experts and draft Medium Term Investment Plan developed and Resource Mobilization plan developed. (4.2.1)	SD Unit	Training workshop implemented and evaluated. Yr	SD Unit	MS	U
		Draft Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy presented to National and State Governments for consideration and endorsement. (4.2.2)	SD Unit	Training workshop implemented and evaluated. Yr 2	SD Unit	MS	U
		Guideline developed for use of the Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy by stakeholders. (4.2.3)	SD Unit	Consultations carried out and draft plan completed. Yr 2	SD Unit	MS	U
		Medium Term Investment plan and resource mobilization strategy promoted amongst stakeholders. (4.2.4)	SD Unit	Draft plan presented to National and State governments. Yr 2	SD Unit	MS	U
<b>OUTCOME 5: Effective Management and Lessons Learnt</b>						<b>Rating</b>	
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>TE</b>

	<b>Indicators from PLF</b>				<b>Status</b>		
5.1 FSM SLM Project effectively monitored and evaluated		Mid-term Evaluation (if necessary) (5.1.1)	SD Unit	Timely completion of MTE	SD Unit	S	S
		Terminal Evaluation (5.1.2)	SD Unit	Timely Completion of TE	SD Unit		S
		Annual Audits (5.1.3)	SD Unit	Timely Completion of Audits	SD Unit		S