Terms of Reference – Independent Evaluation of the "The Shimanami Collective: Sea and Human Security for a Free and Open Indo-Pacific" project

(C2024.TARHO070.JPNPM)

Background

1. The **United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** is a principal training arm of the United Nations (UN), with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the UN in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR's programming covers several thematic areas and activities aimed at supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; multilateral diplomacy; public finance and trade; environment, including climate change, environmental law and governance, and chemicals and waste management; peacekeeping, peacebuilding and conflict prevention; decentralized cooperation; and resilience and disaster risk reduction.

2. UNITAR's mission is to develop the individual, institutional and organizational capacity of countries and other UN stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges. Approximately three-quarters of beneficiaries from learning-related programming are from developing countries.

3. The 2022-2025 Strategic Framework includes five strategic objectives for effective and efficient achievement of results. The Division for Prosperity is one of the seven divisions for programme implementation at UNITAR. The related strategic objective aims to help countries to achieve inclusive and sustainable economic growth.

4. Funded by Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan and managed by the UNITAR Hiroshima Office (HO), the "The Shimanami Collective: Sea and Human Security for a Free and Open Indo-Pacific" project (hereafter the "project") aims to provide government officials and activists in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries with the skills, knowledge and capacity to enhance climate, social, economic, food and maritime security[1] and develop a coordination mechanism across the Pacific.

5. The project plans to equip government officials and representatives from the private sector and civil society organization (CSOs) in 14 SIDS in the Pacific region[2] and 10 ASEAN countries[3] and Timor Leste and Sri Lanka with basic knowledge and skills in sea and human security[4]. The project will also promote network-building among the participants that will support greater coordination across the region to enhance collective security. The project's primary objectives are to:

    - Enhance basic knowledge of sea and human security;
    - Promote economic security through trade and access to markets, fisheries and tourism and enhance public and private partnerships;
    - Enhance food and climate security by supporting stable and climate-resilient marine and land food production, effective trading and transportation across the region;

---

[1] The expanded concept of security that includes human security, economic security, humanitarian assistance, environmental security, cyber security and transnational crime, and regional cooperation to build resilience to disasters and climate change (Pacific Islands, Forum Secretariat, 2022).

[2] Cook Islands. Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu

[3] Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam

[4] Additional countries may be considered, such as Comoros, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritius, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste

- Nurture environmental security and maritime cooperation, including regional monitoring and surveillance, disaster response and emergency rescue operations.

6. As such, the project's desired outcome are two strengthened regional networks on sea and human security areas to address the challenges, needs and future plans in the Indo-Pacific region through building local capacity and developing clear project plans to increase local resilience.

7. The project proposal built upon Japan's overall policy to support human security and, particularly, the Government of Japan's crucial regional framework, Free and Open Indo-Pacific (FOIP), which aims to enhance the connectivity of the Indo-Pacific region and foster a prosperous region that values freedom and the rule of law, free from force or coercion.

8. The project aims to integrate Japan's experiences, technology and state-of-the-art knowledge to maintain sea and human security and Hiroshima's expertise in supporting maritime security and trade, economic growth, and disaster prevention. It builds on the UNITAR Division for Prosperity / Hiroshima Office's "Sea and Human Security" training Programme, which ran for more than 10 years, as well as the Office's experience with its "Tsunami-based Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Women's Leadership Training Programme", targeting Pacific SIDS, and other training programmes targeting ASEAN countries.

Purpose of the evaluation

9. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the project; to identify any good practices or challenges that the project has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on design, implementation and management. The evaluation's purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project's improvement, strategic direction and broader organizational learning. The evaluation should not only assess how well the project has performed, but also seek to answer the 'why' question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful delivery of the results. The evaluation is also forward-looking to inform decisions on the design and planning of possible future related projects and focus areas.

10. While the evaluation will include an assessment of all six OECD/DAC criteria, gender, disability and human rights, and environmental considerations will be taken into account. The evaluation's purpose is to serve learning and accountability purposes, and to be as forward-looking as possible to inform decisions on the design and planning of possible future phases and focus areas of this or similar projects.

Scope of the evaluation

11. The evaluation will cover the entire project period for 12 months between March 2024 to March 2025. The evaluation should maintain sufficient focus to deliver findings and conclusions with forward-looking and actionable recommendations to inform future projects.

Evaluation criteria

12. The evaluation will assess project performance using the following criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact, and likelihood of sustainability. The evaluation questions related to gender equality and the empowerment of women dimensions are marked with "GEEW". Questions related to environmental sustainability are marked with "ENVSUSE". Disability and human rights considerations should also be considered throughout the evaluation.

- *Relevance: Is the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are its related project objectives and activities relevant to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, and designed with quality?*
- *Coherence: To what extent is the project complementing, harmonizing and co-ordinating with other similar programmes and projects implemented by UNITAR and other actors in the intervention context?*
- *Effectiveness: How effective has the project been in delivering results and in strengthening regional network(s) to address the challenges, needs and future plans in the Indo-Pacific Way?*
- *Efficiency: To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships, if any?*
- *Likelihood of Impact: What are the potential cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact and intermediate outcome, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes?*
- *Likelihood of Sustainability: To what extent are results of the project likely to be sustained in the long term? How is environmental sustainability addressed in the project?*

Principal evaluation questions

13. The following questions are *suggested* to guide the design of the evaluation, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with project management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible with regard to the project's future orientation or other similar undertakings.

<u>Relevance</u>

a. *To what extent is the project aligned with the Institute's efforts to helping Member States implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the UNITAR strategic framework 2022-2025, particularly the strategic objectives 1,2,3 and 4, the Sustainable Development Goals 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, the Government of Japan's regional framework, <u>Free and Open Indo-Pacific (FOIP)</u>, the Japan ASEAN MIDORI Cooperation Plan, the <u>2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent</u>, the <u>UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework for the Pacific 2023 – 2027</u>, amongst other?*

b. *How relevant are the objectives and the design of the project to the identified needs and priorities of beneficiaries (training participants and their institutions) and based on the conducted needs assessment?*

c. *Did the project reach its intended beneficiaries, namely government officials and representatives from the public sector, civil society organizations (CSOs) and private sector in 14 Pacific SIDS and 10 ASEAN countries (and Sri Lanka and Timor-Leste)? If not, what are the hindering factors and what could have been done differently?*

d. *How relevant is the project to supporting gender equality and women's empowerment, to the extent possible (e.g. when selecting participants and resource persons)?* **(GEEW)**

e. *How relevant is the project to the security[5] challenges in the Indo-Pacific region?*

<u>Coherence</u>

f. *How well is the project aligned with other UNITAR programming focusing on sea and human security in Pacific SIDS and ASEAN countries? To what extent did the project build on lessons learned from the implementation of related programing in the region by the HO (see background)?*

---

[5] human security, social and economic security, food security and climate change, environmental security and maritime security and cooperation

g. *How well is the project aligned with and complements programmes implemented by other institutions focusing on strengthening regional networks to address the challenges, needs and future plans related to sea and human security (including economic security, food, climate and environmental security) in the Indo-Pacific region?*

h. *How well is the project aligned with relevant international frameworks and UN resolutions and priorities in maritime and security affairs, including the* <u>UN Convention on the Law of Sea</u>, <u>MARPOL Convention</u>, <u>SOLAS Convention</u>, <u>Guidelines on Maritime Cyber Security Management of IMO</u>, *Resolution* <u>MSC-FAL.1-Circ.3-Rev.2</u>:<u>Guidelines on Maritime Cyber Security Management of IMO</u>, <u>Resolution MSC. 428 (98) on the Maritime Cyber Risk Management in Safety Management Systems of IMO</u>, <u>the IACS Recommendation on Cyber Resilience (No. 166)</u>, <u>2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent</u>, <u>Report of the UN Secretary General on Human Security (A/78/665)</u>, *amongst others?*

i. *How well does the project component fit the political and operational context in Asia-Pacific region?*

Effectiveness

a. *To what extent have the planned outcomes and outputs of the project been achieved? What are the factors (positively or negatively) affecting the project components and the beneficiary institutions and trained participants? To what extent were the learning objectives achieved? How have participants applied knowledge and skills, including during their project design and implementation?*

b. *How effective is the design and training methodology, including the needs assessment, the creation of project plans, mentoring and coaching, project pitches, and study tours on achieving the intended outcomes? Have partnerships been effective in delivering and attaining results, including the performance of the implementing partner, if applicable?*

c. *To what extent and how is the project contributing to creating and strengthening two regional networks on sea and human security areas to address the challenges, needs and future plans to enhance collective security in the Indo-Pacific region?*

d. *To what extent are a human rights-based approach, disability considerations, and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project? **(GEEW)***

Efficiency

e. *To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including through grant arrangements with the implementing partner (if the case) and other partners, if applicable, in comparison with alternative approaches? Were the project's resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?*

f. *To what extent was the project including both activities and planned expenditures delivered as planned? What caused deviations from the original plan? Did the project apply adaptive management to adjust to implementation challenges?*

g. *To what extent has the project created benefits (intended or unintended) of integrating gender equality (or not) and what were the success or hindering factors? **(GEEW)***

h. *To what extent did the project consider environment-friendly practices in the delivery of its activities? **(ENVSUSE)***

Likelihood and early indication of impact

i. *To what extent have beneficiaries from training events reported changed behaviour or practices following the completion of the series of events? What emerging results were achieved through the participants' projects? To what extent were these funded and/or implemented or are likely to be?*

j. *To what extent does the project contribute to overcome sea and human security related challenges to enhance collective security in the Indo-Pacific region?*

k. What other observable end-results or organizational changes (*positive or negative, intended or unintended*) have occurred as a result of the implementation of the project?

Likelihood and early indication of sustainability

l. To what extent are the project components' results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term? What conditions will be necessary for sustainability of the activities?
m. What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project components? How can risks be mitigated and opportunities seized by project stakeholders?
n. What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming in other contexts? To what extent can the project be replicated elsewhere? What factors contribute to a sustainable impact?
o. How was environmental sustainability integrated into the project implementation? *(ENVSUSE)*

Evaluation Approach and Methods

14. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNITAR Evaluation Policy, the operational guidelines for independent evaluations and the United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation, and the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines. The evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant (the "evaluator") or a team of consultants under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME). PPME shall support the evaluation team in gathering background documentation and other data collection processes.

15. Since the project focuses on capacity development, it is recommended to look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:
    - **Individual dimension:** This relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skill levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training and competency development.
    - **Organizational/Community dimension:** This relates to organizations and networks of organizations. The change in learning that occurs at individual level affects, from a results chain perspective, the changes at organizational level.
    - **Enabling environment dimension:** This refers to the broader context in which individuals and organizations work, including the political commitment and vision; policy, legal and economic frameworks and institutional set-up in the country; national public sector budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms; power structures and dynamics.

Table 1 - Capacity areas within the three dimensions

Individual	Skills levels (technical and managerial skills) Competencies Awareness and motivation	Essential knowledge, Cognitive skills, Interpersonal skills, Self-control, Attitude towards behaviour, Self-confidence, Professional identity, Norms, Values, Intentions, Emotions, Environmental barriers and enablers with specific focus on gender and disability inclusion (among others)
Organizations	Mandates Horizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms	Organizational priorities Gender and disability inclusion

	Motivation and incentive systems	Processes, systems and procedures
	Strategic leadership	Human and financial resources
	Inter/intra institutional linkages	Knowledge and information sharing
	Programme management	Infrastructure
	Multi-stakeholder processes	Environmental sustainability
		Institutional support
Enabling environment	Policy and legal framework	Economic framework and national public budget allocations and power
	Political commitment and accountability framework	
	Governance	Legal, policy and political environment

16. To maximize utilization of the evaluation, the evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process, including the project implementation team, partners, the beneficiaries, the donor, and other relevant stakeholders. It should follow a mixed-methods approach, and data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings. Data collection could draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder mapping and analysis; surveys; review of the log frame and the theory of change (reconstruct if needed); key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if possible, field visits.

17. The evaluator should follow mixed-methods approach in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate. Suggested methods and data collection tools include:

Comprehensive desk review
The evaluator will compile, review and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the project, including a results framework indicator tracking review. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex D. A template for document review suggested by PPME, can be found here.

Stakeholder analysis
The evaluator will identify and relate the different stakeholders involved in the project. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited, to:

- UNITAR project team;
- Beneficiaries/participants at all levels: UNITAR trainers and participants (from the public sector, CSOs and private sector in the ASEAN and Pacific);
- Trainers and coaches / mentors
- The donor (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs);
- Potential donors of participants' projects;
- Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (Pacific Islands Forum);
- Pacific Climate Change Centre (PCCC), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
- Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigrations, Fiji;
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);
- UN Women;
- Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA);
- UN OHCHR

- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
- Pasona Inc.
- Hiroshima University;
- Hiroshima Prefectural Government;
- Hyogo Prefectural Government;
- WMI
- Fiji Navy
- Indonesian Youth Diplomacy
- University of Tokyo;
- Japan/Hiroshima Coast Guard Office;
- Local small and medium-sized enterprises from Hiroshima and the Shimanami area;
- Etc.

Survey(s)
With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultant will develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.

Key informant interviews
Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global, at the national or local level. Generic interview guidelines can be found here.

Focus groups
Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders at the local levels to complement/triangulate findings from other data collection tools.

Field visit
A field visit shall be conducted to Japan to attend the in-person workshop taking place from 10-21 February 2025.

Case studies could be developed to highlight specific country-related areas of application of knowledge and skills.

Gender, disability and human rights, and environmental sustainability

18. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender, disability, and environmental sustainability perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, UN country classification, and age grouping and be included in the evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on gender equality and environment.

19. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow ethical and professional standards.

Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review

20. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from January 2025 (recruitment of the evaluator) to May 2025 (publication of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.

21. The consultant shall submit an evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial interviews with the project team. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise, as well as a list of documents reviewed highlighting insights from every reviewed document.

22. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.

23. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex E. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation, and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 30 pages, excluding annexes.

24. Following the submission of the zero draft, a presentation of emerging findings with discussion of evaluation recommendations and a draft report will then be submitted to Project Management to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex F by 16 May 2025. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 30 May 2025. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report. The report will be shared with all concerned stakeholders.

Indicative timeframe:

Activity	January 2025	February 2025	March 2025	April 2025	May 2025
Evaluator selected and recruited	▓				
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis	▓				
Evaluation design/question matrix	▓	▓			
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit		▓	▓	▓	
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR				▓	
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Project Management				▓	
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned				▓	
Project Management reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments				▓	

and recommendations				 	
Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management				 	
Dissemination and publication					

Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline*
Evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	20 January 2025
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	24 January 2025
Mission plan for field data collection	Evaluator	Evaluation Manager	TBD
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	21 April 2025
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	25 April 2025
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	2 May 2025
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Programme Management	TBD
Comments on draft report	Programme Management	Evaluation manager	16 May 2025
Final draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	30 May 2025

*To be adjusted depending on the contract signature and to be agreed upon with the Evaluation Manager.

Communication/dissemination of results

25. The evaluation report shall be written in English. The final report will be shared with all partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public in UNITAR website as well as the UNEG website.

Evaluation management arrangements

26. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) ('evaluation manager').

27. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR's Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR's evaluation function's independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.

28. The evaluator should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g., accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

Evaluator Ethics

29. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project's design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with UNEG Ethical Guidelines and the Guiding Ethical Principles for using AI in Evaluation, if it is the case.

Professional requirements

30. The lead evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:

- MA degree or equivalent in international relations, including international security studies; maritime studies, economic or development studies, environmental sciences, or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in needs assessments, training design and delivery, and in areas related to sea and human security.
- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of sea and human security and/or capacity building. Knowledge of UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of sea and human security, as well as contemporary developments in multilateral efforts.
- Field work experience in Asia/the Pacific.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick method is an advantage.
- Excellent writing skills (report to be drafted in English).
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel to Japan.
- Fluency in oral and written English.

Annexes:

A. **List of planned training events**
B. **List of contact points**
C. **Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System**
D. **List of documents and data to be reviewed**
E. **Structure of evaluation report**
F. **Audit trail**
G. **Evaluator code of conduct**

Annex A: List of planned training activities

- Online training
- Regional workshop in ASEAN (in-person)
- Regional workshop in the Pacific (in-person)
- In-person workshop II in Japan (field visit)
- Virtual conference "Shimanami Masterminds 2024"

Annex B: List of contact points

Contacts (email) to be complemented by Project Management

- UNITAR project team;
    - Junko Shimazu, Team Lead, junko.shimazu@unitar.org
    - Hikari Nakajima, Project Lead, hikari.nakajima@unitar.org
    - Vicha Liewchirakorn, Project Lead, vicha.liewchirakorn@unitar.org
- Beneficiaries/participants at all levels: UNITAR trainers and participants (from ASEAN and Pacific from the public sector, CSOs and private sector);
    - (See attached)
- Trainers and resource persons
    - Johanna Paula Diwa Acallar, joandiwa@hotmail.com
    - Maria Corazon Mercader Ebarvia, ebarviamcm@gmail.com
    - Michael Fors, m@theinnovators.com
    - Dhiraj Kumar Mohan Nainani, dhirajn@nus.edu.sg
    - Asia
        - Crisanto Cayon, cris.cayon@asiafoundation.org
        - Warathida Chaiyapa, warathida.c@cmu.ac.th
        - David King Pangan, david@inbestcap.com
        - Laeli Sukmahayani, laeli.sukmahayani@gmail.com
        - Alvin Adityo, alvinadityo19@gmail.com
        - Rajendra Aryal, Rajendra.Aryal@fao.org
        - Kazuyuki Kakuda, Kakuda.Kazuyuki@jica.go.jp
        - Marina Hosoda, hosoda.marina@jica.go.jp
    - Pacific
        - Rodrigo Ricardo Garcia Bernal, rgarciabernal9@gmail.com
        - Joeli Veitayaki, joeli.veitayaki05@gmail.com
        - Viliamu Iese, viliamu.iese@unimelb.edu.au
        - Fred Siho Patison, fredp@sprep.org
        - Ofa He Paea KAISAMY, ofak@sprep.org
        - Loukinikini Vili, loukinikini@fhradc.org.fj
        - Preeya Ieli, preeya.ieli@unwomen.org
        - Lemeki Lenoa, l.lenoa@fijinavy.org
    - Japan
        Keita Furukawa, keita@meic.jp
        - Miguel Esteban, esteban.fagan@gmail.com
        - Masahiro Yamao, yamao@hiroshima-u.ac.jp
- The donor (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs);
- Potential donors of participants' projects;
- Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (Pacific Islands Forum)
- Pacific Climate Change Centre (PCCC), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (SPREP) (Ofa He Paea KAISAMY, ofak@sprep.org)
- Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigrations, Fiji (Joeli Rokodaveta, joeli.rokodaveta@homeaffairs.gov.fj)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (Christopher Yee, christopher.yee@undp.org)
- UN Women (Preeya Ieli, preeya.ieli@unwomen.org)
- Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) (Marina Hosoda, hosoda.marina@jica.go.jp)
- UN OHCHR (Momoko Nomura, momoko.nomura@un.org)

- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (Rajendra Aryal, Rajendra.Aryal@fao.org)
- Pasona Inc. (Yuko Honma, yuukhonma@pasonagroup.co.jp)
- Hiroshima Prefectural Government
- Hyogo Prefectural Government
- WMI
- Fiji Navy (Lemeki Lenoa, l.lenoa@fijinavy.org)
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) (Gustavo Caruso, g.caruso@iaea.org) - TBC
- Indonesian Youth Diplomacy (Alvin Adityo, alvinadityo19@gmail.com)
- University of Tokyo
- Japan/Hiroshima Coast Guard Office
- Local small and medium-sized enterprises from Hiroshima and the Shimanami area

<u>Target countries</u>

Pacific SIDS: 1. Cook Islands 2. Federated States of Micronesia 3. Fiji 4. Kiribati 5. Marshall Islands 6. Nauru 7. Niue 8. Palau 9. Papua New Guinea 10. Samoa 11. Solomon Islands 12. Tonga 13. Tuvalu 14. Vanuatu

ASEAN countries: 1. Brunei 2. Cambodia 3. Indonesia 4. Laos 5. Malaysia 6. Myanmar 7. Philippines 8. Singapore 9. Thailand 10. Vietnam

Additional countries may be considered, such as Comoros, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritius, Seychelles, Sri Lanka and Timor-Leste.

Annex C: Event data available on the Event Management System

Annex D: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Narrative and finance reports (in the absence of interim reporting requirements, internal reporting and monitoring data shall be provided, including self-evaluations, logframe updates etc.)
- Legal Agreement
- Logical Framework and outcome areas
- Monitoring and self-evaluation data
- Implementing partner documentation if applicable
- Needs assessment
- Stakeholder contacts
- Project Description
- UNITAR website content
- Event Management System Data
- Relevant international frameworks
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

Annex E: Structure of evaluation report[6]

- i.   Title page
- ii.   Foreword
- iii.   Table of contents
- iv.   List of Figures and list of tables
- v.   Executive summary
- vi.   Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction
2. Project description, objectives and development context
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons Learned
9. Annexes
   a. Terms of reference
   b. Survey/questionnaires deployed
   c. List of persons interviewed
   d. List of documents reviewed
   e. Evaluation question matrix
   f. Evaluation consultant agreement form

---

[6] A report template will be provided to the evaluation team by PPME.

Annex F: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)

To the comments received on (*date*) from the evaluation of the "The Shimanami Collective: Sea and Human Security for a Free and Open Indo-Pacific" project

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken

Annex G: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form*

The evaluator:
1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. He/she should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. He/she must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. He/she are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncovers evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. He/she should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he/she must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/she should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom he/she comes in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, he/she should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/she is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[7]

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)**:** _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

---

*This form is required to be signed by each evaluator involved in the evaluation.

[7]www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct