

Annex E: Evaluation Audit Trail

To the comments received in *June 2025* from the “*Shimanami Collective: Sea and Human Security for a Free and Open Indo-Pacific*” (Reference: TARHO070) project team

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by author (“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 |
|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Chisa MIKAMI | 1 | Page 3 | While this evaluation was paid from TARHO068, the project evaluated was TARHO070. | Adjusted accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 2 | Executive Summary | While these (referring to “climate, social, economic, food and maritime security”) were mentioned on the project proposal, we redefined five key security areas as the following during the curriculum development stage: climate, environmental, economic, food, and maritime. | Adjusted accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 3 | Executive Summary | The participant numbers are as follows: Phase I: 915 enrolled, 461 received CoC, 86 received CoP Phase II: 152 enrolled, 146 received CoC Phase III: 50 enrolled, 50 received CoC | Updated across the document. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 4 | Paragraph 1 | There were 3 projects implemented under the Shimanami Collective branding in 2024 from Government of Japan funding. Something like “Sea and Human Security Project” may be a more appropriate reference, as to not confuse it with other Shimanami Collective projects. | Well noted and adjusted. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 5 | Paragraph 5 | “Environmental” Please keep as “social” if we want to maintain what was outlined in the project proposal. | Adjusted accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 6 | Table 4 - Post- training survey | In our records, the number of responses is recorded as 42, most likely due to the last response having been submitted after you had checked the results. Not sure if you’d want to reconcile this somehow or we can leave it as is. | I have reviewed and adjusted accordingly. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|----|--|---|--|
| | | responses (below paragraph 18) | | |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 7 | Footnote #18 corresponding to Paragraph 25 | Amended footnote as “climate change” was not one of the thematic areas used for policy groups. | Changed accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 8 | Paragraph 30, third bullet | This rating is supposed to indicate that the activity achieved 60-80 per cent of the targets etc. but in the last sentence it says “However, a significant part of these was not achieved”. Can you clarify? | Adjusted for a clearer description of the point-scale. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 9 | Figure 18 (page 42) | I could not make the edits in track change on the figure so leaving my edits here: - Change “Call for nominations” to “Call for applications/nominations” - Remove Online Training Phase II. There was only one phase of online training, and the Regional Workshops were considered Phase II. - Remove “II” in the “In-person workshop II” as it may get confused with phase numbers. | Changed accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 10 | Paragraph 80 | In Phase II, out of the 152 attendees across the 2 regional workshops, there were 6 attendees who did not complete their coursework. This is because they had to withdraw either at the start or beginning of the workshop due to family, work, or health emergencies. In Phase III, all 50 attendees completed the workshop. | Changed accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 11 | Table 12 – Project results framework Comments on numbers of projects submissions in Phase I and II. | I currently have 518 project plans submitted at the end of Phase I, and 138 submitted at the end of Phase II. I will check to see where the discrepancy came from. In the meantime, can you let me know where you retrieved this number? I checked the source for my numbers. Can you confirm? End of Phase I: 518 project plans submitted See Certificate of Completion tab v3 FINAL-online progress status as of 310824.xlsx This is the number that I got by taking the total number of submissions on the Google Form (567), then deleting duplicate submissions and adding submissions sent by email. End of Phase II: Asia 72 project plans + Pacific 66 project plans = 138 project plans FOIP Phase 3 Evaluation Sheet.xlsx | Numbers updated. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 12 | Figure 20 (below paragraph 81) | Seeing some discrepancies in the numbers. Can you confirm whether these numbers came from EMS or somewhere else? I have: Phase I: 915 enrolled, 461 received CoC, 67 received CoP Phase II: Asia - 80 enrolled, 66 completed Pacific - 72 enrolled, 69 completed Phase III: 50 enrolled, 50 completed | Numbers updated. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----|-------------------------|---|--|
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 13 | Paragraph 82 | Check the phrase “while all the participants...”, considering previous comment | Updated accordingly |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 14 | Paragraph 91 | <p>I would like to dispute this, particularly for phases II and III. At the end of most workshop days in Phase II, mentoring session took place, where participants had access to at least 3-5 experts, if not more, where they can ask for guidance regarding their group work, individual projects, or general career/professional advice. This included UNITAR staff, consultants engaged by UNITAR, as well as session speakers from that day.</p> <p>In phase III, while we did not have time for dedicated mentoring sessions as we did in Phase II, 4 experts (2 consultants and 2 UNITAR staff) participated in the full itinerary of the workshop to give feedback and help improve the group policy brief and presentation.</p> | The text was adjusted to specify the sessions offered after Phase II and III. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 15 | Table 13 | Check numbers in “465 out of 911 or 51 per cent of the participants...”, considering previous comment in Paragraph 91 | Updated accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 16 | Table 14 | What is the significance of the numbers marked in red? | They are not marked in red anymore. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 17 | Table 101 | Just wanted to check if these two age groups are comparable as I understand we had significantly less number of participants who are 55 years and older vs. those who are 35-44 years. | Updated accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 18 | Paragraphs 106 - 118 | All findings 12-14 seem to indicate a largely positive outcome for the programme. Considering the rating “Moderately satisfactory” is supposed to indicate that the programme achieved 60-80 percent of its objectives, it does not align with the overwhelmingly positive findings indicated. More clarity on the reasoning for the rating would be appreciated! This especially stands out to me since the findings for Likelihood of Impact and Likelihood of Sustainability indicate a more explicit reasoning behind the rating of “Moderately satisfactory”. | Rating changed from “Moderately satisfactory” to “Satisfactory” after re-assessment. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 19 | Paragraph 112 | Check number in “with over 500 participants completing” considering comments above | Updated accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 20 | Paragraph 140 | <p>This was the initial list of themes laid out by the UNITAR team but this was later adjusted to better align with the participants’ interests and preferences. The final nine themes was as follows:</p> <p>Coastal protection Marine transport Aquaculture Fishing - Sustainable fisheries Fishing - IUU fishing Marine plastics and waste Ocean conservation - Deep-sea mining Ocean conservation - Oil spill pollution Water pollution</p> | Updated accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 21 | Paragraph 151 | If I remember correctly, the disability status was asked in the programme application form, not in the phase I course survey. | Corrected accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 22 | Table 21 (Paragraph 164) | Please see my previous comment in the Efficiency section | Corrected accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 23 | Recommendation 3 | While the programme was focused on individuals, an approach targeting institutions may further lead to lasting results and multiplier effects, “Is there more information regarding this recommendation? Apologies if this is in the main report and I have missed it. | Further explanation added in the recommendation and in the findings section under “sustainability”. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 24 | Recommendation 4 | All of the gender and human rights sessions conducted during the regional workshops were led by experts from the region, who we believe had good understanding of the historical and cultural context of each region. | Corrected accordingly. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|----|-------------------|---|----------------------------|
| | | | Rather, our main issue could have been the fact that we tried to cover the topic of gender and human rights in a 90-minute session respectively, and that was not sufficient to do these topics justice. | |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 25 | Recommendation 5 | Feasibility was included in one of the criteria for the selection process. | Corrected accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 26 | Lessons Learned 4 | Agreed on the additional consideration of reaching potential applicants. In regards to timeliness, however, I'm not sure the recommendation of "additional time" is realistic in a 1-year programme. The programme started in April 2024 and call for application was launched on 15 May. | Corrected accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 27 | Annex B | This is the final count of resource persons I have from my end. Please refer to Annex III here: Project Completion Report FOIP2024 17Jun25 | Updated accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 28 | Annex G, table 2 | Regarding "...a significant part of these were not achieved", refer to previous comment | Updated accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 29 | Annex G, annex 1 | Regarding "To confirm role in the project", Are these not more so internal notes, rather than comments that need to be included in the report? | Notes removed accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 30 | Annex G, annex 1 | Regarding Gustavo Caruso and International Atomic Energy Agency, "Withdrew from taking part in the training" | Removed accordingly. |
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 31 | Annex G, annex 1 | Regarding Crista Ake, "she was one of the participants. She did a mini-presentation during the regional workshop, but as a participant showcasing her work, not as a trainer" | Removed accordingly. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----|------------------|---|----------------------|
| Hikari NAKAJIMA | 32 | Annex G, annex 1 | Regarding Eroni D. Rokisi, withdrew from taking part in the training. | Removed accordingly. |
|--------------------|----|------------------|---|----------------------|