

# Mid-Term Review of the 'Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific' (SWAP) Project

A Submission to the Secretariat of the Pacific  
Regional Environment Programme

1 February 2023



## Mid-Term Review of the ‘Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific’ (SWAP) Project

A Submission to the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme

RFT 2022/026


### Prepared by

MRA Consulting Group (MRA)  
 Registered as Mike Ritchie & Associates Pty Ltd  
 ABN 13 143 273 812

Suite 408 Henry Lawson Building  
 19 Roseby Street  
 Drummoyne NSW 2047

+61 2 8541 6169  
[info@mraconsulting.com.au](mailto:info@mraconsulting.com.au)  
[mraconsulting.com.au](http://mraconsulting.com.au)

### Version History

Ver	Date	Status	Author	Approver	Signature
0.1	16/12/2022	Draft	Richard Paschke, Samuel Lawson	Sergio Nusimovich	Required on final only
0.2	24/02/2023	Final	Richard Paschke	Sergio Nusimovich	

## Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by MRA Consulting Group for the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme. MRA (ABN 13 143 273 812) does not accept responsibility for any use of, or reliance on, the contents of this document by any third party.

*This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the Agence française de développement (AFD). The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the AFD*

## Acknowledgements

MRA would like to acknowledge the assistance with preparation of this report provided by Julie Pillet, Mafile'o Masi, Didier Labrousse, Pauline Faye, Anthony Talouli, Bradley Nolan, Mimura Satoru, Ma Bella Guinto, Wendy Beti, Debra Kereseke, and Andrea Volentras.

# Contents

Glossary.....	7
Executive Summary.....	9
1 Introduction.....	11
1.1 Project Background.....	11
1.2 Purpose of this report.....	12
2 Methodology.....	13
2.1 Evaluation approach.....	13
3 Document review.....	14
3.1 Overview.....	14
3.2 Methodology.....	16
3.3 Outcomes.....	16
4 Stakeholder interviews.....	18
4.1 Overview.....	18
4.2 Methodology.....	18
4.3 Outcomes.....	20
4.3.1 Resources and focal point capacity.....	20
4.3.2 Efficiency, Administrative processes, governance.....	20
4.3.3 Relevance.....	20
4.3.4 Effectiveness.....	21
4.3.5 Cooperation with partner projects.....	21
4.4 Summary.....	22
4.4.1 Outlook.....	23
5 Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific (SWAP).....	24
5.1 Summary of the SWAP Program progress.....	24
5.1.1 SWAP background and project objectives.....	28
(*) An extension is being considered at the time of this report.....	29
5.1.2 SWAP project components.....	29
5.1.3 SWAP program outcomes to date.....	30
5.1.4 Effectiveness.....	31
5.1.5 Efficiency.....	31
5.1.6 Relevance.....	32
5.1.7 Sustainability and impact.....	33
5.1.8 Networks and linkages.....	33

5.1.9	Lessons learned and conclusions.....	33
6	Training component.....	35
6.1	Summary of training component .....	35
6.1.1	Training component objectives.....	35
6.1.2	GEDSI targets for trainings programme .....	37
6.1.3	Training component outcomes to date .....	37
6.1.4	Effectiveness.....	37
6.1.5	Efficiency.....	38
6.1.6	Relevance .....	38
6.1.7	Sustainability and impact.....	38
6.1.8	Networks and linkages .....	38
6.1.9	Lessons learned and conclusions.....	38
7	Pilot project component .....	40
7.1	Summary of pilot project component.....	40
7.1.1	Pilot project component objectives .....	41
7.1.2	GEDSI targets for Pilot Projects .....	43
7.1.3	Pilot project component outcomes to date.....	44
7.1.4	Effectiveness.....	44
7.1.5	Efficiency.....	44
7.1.6	Relevance .....	44
7.1.7	Sustainability and impact.....	44
7.1.8	Networks and linkages .....	44
7.1.9	Lessons learned and conclusions.....	45
8	Communities of practice component.....	46
8.1	Summary of communities of practice component.....	46
8.1.1	Communities of practice component objectives.....	46
8.1.2	Communities of practice component outcomes to date .....	47
8.1.3	Effectiveness.....	48
8.1.4	Efficiency.....	48
8.1.5	Relevance .....	49
8.1.6	Sustainability and impact.....	49
8.1.7	Networks and linkages .....	49
8.1.8	Lessons learned and conclusions.....	49
9	Financial assessment .....	50
10	Conclusions and recommendations .....	51
	Appendix 1 – Stakeholder list (detailed).....	53

Appendix 2 – Stakeholder interviews .....	56
<b>11 BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>56</b>
12 Moderators:.....	56
<b>INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS PARTNERS .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>QUESTIONS PARTNERS .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>13 BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>60</b>
14 Moderators:.....	60
<b>INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS DONOR .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>QUESTIONS DONOR .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>15 BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>63</b>
16 Moderators:.....	63
<b>INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS CONSULTANT .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>QUESTIONS CONSULTANT .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>17 BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>66</b>
18 Moderators:.....	66
<b>INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS FOCAL POINT .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>QUESTIONS FOCAL POINT .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>19 BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>70</b>
20 Moderators:.....	70
<b>INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS PROJECT MANAGERS .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>QUESTIONS PROJECT MANAGERS .....</b>	<b>71</b>

## Glossary

Acronym	Explanation
AFD	Agence française de développement
CP25	Cleaner Pacific 2025 Strategy
COP	Community Of Practice
GEDSI	Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion
JPRISM II	Japanese funded environmental project in the Pacific
LNO	Letter of no Objection
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MERL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning
MOU	Memorandum Of Understanding
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PacWaste Plus	Waste and Pollution reduction project, Donor EU
PICT	Pacific Island Countries and territories
PM	Project Management
PMU	Project Management Unit
POLP	Pacific Ocean Litter Project, Donor Australia
PR	Public Relations
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RF	Results Framework
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
SWAP	Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific, Donor AFD

TOR	Terms Of Reference
WG	Working Group
WSP	Waste Service Provider
W&F	Wallis and Futuna



## Executive Summary

The 'Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific' (SWAP) project was conceived by Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) officers and financed by the Agence française de développement with 3 million Euros over the 4-year term of the project beginning in February 2020.

There have been significant delays caused by factors outside the influence of the Project Management Unit (PMU) or the Project Steering Committee (PSC).

The unexpected delays added to delays, caused by administration heavy systems employed by Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and Agence française de développement (AFD). On the donor side, administrative delays have been reduced since March 2022, as AFD processes improved while a new Project Officer is on board to supervise the SWAP Project. Other governance issues were encountered due to incompatibility of the AFD and SPREP governance systems and Procurement procedures which required an amendment. This amendement was signed on 25 November 2022. Considering the obstacles encountered and the administration heavy environment in which this project is being delivered, progress is good, and the PMU and, especially the Project Coordinator, appear to be highly efficient.

After July 2021, when the first financial and technical action plan was released, the project started to get traction and the PMU proved increasingly efficient. Significant resources have been poured into the development of the components and thematic areas and there will be one year to deliver the bulk of the project outcomes. With some pilot projects still not proposed, and the governance processes as they are, it may not be possible to deliver high quality results within the timeframe.

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that:

- SPREP prepare a Business Continuity Plan to be better prepared for the occurrence of Disasters or Pandemics across their portfolio.
- the approval times (both AFD and SPREP) be published internally and that commitments are made to adhere to the published terms to create more transparency and allow for better planning.
- consideration be given to advocate for the installation of a donor forum.
- consideration be given for 'on the ground' project management capacity in the PICTs (potentially across the programmes).
- a sustainability plan be developed.
- a system to ensure program content is kept relevant and updated. This is especially important in areas where knowledge management is central.

- GEDSI targets be included into the reviews of the project and for future training programmes<sup>1</sup>.
- create a mechanism to ensure enrolling for women and vulnerable groups is possible.
- Initially, it was recommended that AFD extend the term of the SWAP, which is now confirmed from December 2023 to December 2024.
- AFD increase the funding to enable the successful completion of all pilot projects. A discussion has been initiated between the SWAP PMU and AFD for a SWAP Phase II.

<sup>1</sup> GEDSI targets have been included (OVI 25&26 of the revised Log Frame) during the preparation of the MTR

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Project Background

The project was conceived by Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) officers and financed by the Agence française de développement. The total funding amount was 3 million Euros over the 4-year term of the project Beginning in February 2020. The project is managed by SPREP who functions as an umbrella organisation bringing the management, governance and coordination of environmental projects sponsored by SPREP members under one administration.

SPREP was established by the governments and administrations of the Pacific and charged with protecting and managing the environment and natural resources of the Pacific.

SPREP has 21 Pacific members and 5 'metropolitan' members: Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States of America, and France. The 'Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific' (SWAP) Project is managed within the 'Waste Management & Pollution Control Programme' team by Julie Pillet, (Technical Waste Project Coordinator, SWAP), who was engaged almost 11 months after the start of the SWAP project.

The SWAP project assists six beneficiary countries and territories: Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu and Wallis and Futuna in implementing sustainable waste management actions.

The 'Waste Management & Pollution Control Programme team consists of 20 officers, currently providing governance, administrative and specialist support for 5 programmes that are financed by the 5 metropolitan partners.

The programmes are:

- ISLANDS Pacific Child Project,
- PacWaste Plus,
- PACPLAN,
- Pacific Ocean Litter Project (POLP), and
- SWAP.

Another project that is housed under the SPREP roof is the Japanese JPRISM II programme.

The SWAP Project, consists of four thematic areas:

- used oil management,
- marine debris management,
- disaster waste management, and
- sustainable financing.

Each thematic area is represented by three components:

- training,

- pilot projects, and
- communities of practice.

## 1.2 Purpose of this report

The Midterm Review is intended to identify strengths and weaknesses as well as opportunities and risks of the SWAP project. The review will evaluate suitability and effectiveness of its implementation and will make recommendations for the remaining period of the project through the evaluation of project outputs and outcomes to date. The review will also assess the role of partnerships and the opportunities and obstacles resulting from those.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Evaluation approach

The evaluation was undertaken in three stages as shown in Table 1. This evaluation took place between October 2022 and December 2022.

Table 1 Evaluation

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Background research	Performance assessment	Reporting
Planning, budgets and financial review SWAP publication and consultation assessment Project design review	Current performance Stakeholder interviews Performance analysis against stated criteria for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relevance,</li> <li>• effectiveness,</li> <li>• efficiency,</li> <li>• sustainability, and</li> <li>• networking and communications</li> </ul> Strategic priorities assessment Project risk review Project management review Lessons learnt	Draft report Draft Review Report finalisation

A detailed report on the document review methodology, outcomes and summary can be found in Document review.

## 3 Document review

### 3.1 Overview

MRA was supplied with an extensive range of documents to support the MTR, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Document list

Document number	Doc name	Content
1	SWAP Technical and Financial Action Plan_2021_Final	Action plan developed in early 2021 denoting SWAP actions for 2021
2	SWAP_2020 Annual Report	2020
3	FirstSteeringCommitteeMeeting_Report_Final	PSC meeting report 1
4	SWAP_1st half-year progress report_Jan-June2021	Half yearly report 2021
5	SWAP_2021 Annual report	Annual report 2021
6	2022 Technical and Financial Action Plan	Revised action plan 2022
7	SWAP_Half-year Progress Report 2022	Half yearly report
8	SPREP SWAP ResultFramework Final	Results matrix for M&E purpose
9	SecondSteeringCommitteeMeeting_Report	PSC meeting report 2
10	SWAP Audit 2020	Financial audit 2020 KPMG

Document number	Doc name	Content
11	SWAP Audit 2021	Financial audit 2021 KPMG
12	SWAP Gender Equality and Social Inclusion - Action Plan	SWAP GESI Actions
13	SWAP Gender Equality and Social Inclusion – Strategy	SWAP GESI Strategy
14	SWAP MERL Plan_FINAL	Monitoring and evaluation tool
15	Waste-project-PacWastePlus	Slide set depicting SWAP
16	SWAP-factsheet-English	SWAP project summary brochure
17	Used-oils-Vanuatu-inception-report	First report used oil project - Vanuatu
18	UOMP_Analysis Report_Vanuatu_FINAL	Third report – used oil Vanuatu
19	A1_Honiara Used Oil Project Proposal	Pilot project proposal
20	SPREP Used Oil Project Tonga Inception Report	First report used oil project - Tonga
21	FINAL - Used oil management - summary booklet	Final report summary
22	FINAL - Used oil management options report	Final report
23	SWAP Marine Litter Workshop_Activity Report_Appendices	SWAP Marine litter project workshop report

Document number	Doc name	Content
24	A1_Fiji Coastal Litter Pilot Project	Pilot project proposal
25	A1_Honiara Marine Litter Project Proposal	Pilot project proposal
26	A1_NUKU'ALOFA WATERFRONT CLEAN-UP CAMPAIGN_Pilot Project Proposal	Pilot project proposal
27	A1_Samoa Marine Litter Pilot Project Proposal	Pilot project proposal
28	A1_Shefa Province, Vanuatu_ Marine Litter Project Proposal	Pilot project proposal
29	CBE-phases-1-2-3	French language - Metal management feasibility study, Wallis and Futuna
30	N/A	

### 3.2 Methodology

The documents were sorted according to their relevance, function, and thematic area.

Each of the documents was reviewed considering planning, procurement, implementation, and finance for each thematic area and engagement method. The documents were reviewed using the chronology of their release as a guide to establish a timeline and relation between activities.

### 3.3 Outcomes

There is extensive documentation of the SWAP project and activities, however there may be issues in keeping live documents up to date with such an extensive library. Half yearly and yearly reports have been completed in time and approved. Financial audits have been undertaken annually and found no issues with financial management, the financial reporting and with expenses. SWAP uses a GOOGLE drive cloud platform to make the documents available and to enable version control and remote updates. SPREP hosts their virtual library with useful guides and study reports on their website. The library has over 10,000 titles listed and has sophisticated search functions.

A results framework spreadsheet had been developed to assess ongoing projects using a quantitative assessment scale that was defined in AFDs Financing Agreement (schedule 6). It was not clear to MRA



whether the spreadsheet existed in other 'working documents' versions and whether those versions are being updated throughout the project. It appears that the spreadsheet was used for each of the half yearly and annual reports indicating that such a live document version existed.

Only one document, of all documents that should have been developed, was missing, which was the sustainability plan for the project. According to the project coordinator there had not been sufficient time to develop the plan.

## 4 Stakeholder interviews

### 4.1 Overview

Stakeholder interviews were conducted as a part of the SWAP midterm review. Individuals, groups, organisations, agencies or entities which have an interest or are likely to be affected by the SWAP midterm review were provided an opportunity for input. Interviews collected important feedback on the SWAP project performance, outcomes to date, opportunities and issues from the perspectives of different stakeholders in this multidisciplinary project.

### 4.2 Methodology

Interviews were held between November 1 and November 11, 2022, with five types of stakeholders who were identified by the SWAP Corrdinator. These stakeholders are identified Table 3. Interviews were arranged early in the project to counteract the focal points international commitments scheduled between 15 November 2022 and 15 January 2023. Due to a tight schedule of international visitation of several climate change and other environmental global forums the interviews needed to occur in a 2-week window.

Table 3 SWAP stakeholders

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder	Interest / relevance
PICT focal point	Samoa – Ministry of Natural Resources an Environment	Beneficiaries of the SWAP project
	Solomon Islands - Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology	
	Tonga - Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications	
	Vanuatu - Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Climate Change & Adaptation	

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder	Interest / relevance
	Wallis & Futuna -Service Territorial de l'Environnement	
SWAP Donor	Agence française de développement	Donor, supervising role
Umbrella organisation	SPREP	Supervisor and project accountability and responsibility
Partner projects	PacWaste Plus Programme	Coordination with SWAP to manage focal point workload and prevent duplication
	Pacific Ocean Litter Project	
	ISLANDS Pacific Child Project	
	JPRISM II	
SWAP Consultant	Ma Bella Guinto	Initiated SWAP and currently supports PICTs in pilot project development

Questionnaires relevant to each stakeholder group were drafted and reviewed by the SWAP Coordinator. The questionnaires were disseminated prior to the interviews occurring.

10 of 13 arranged interviews were held and 3 interviews did not occur: one was cancelled due to a bad internet connection and two interviews due to unavailability of the officers. The officers were asked to fill in a questionnaire sent to them, but none were sent back.

All except one interview were held in English. The interview with the focal points of Wallis and Futuna was held in French utilising an interpreter service.

Minutes were taken by MRA staff during three of the interviews and seven interviews were recorded (with the interviewees permission) and transcribed.

Refer to Appendix 1 – Stakeholder list (detailed) for details of the interviewees and to Appendix 2 – Stakeholder interviews for a copies of interview forms sent to stakeholders. For reasons of confidentiality, interview records have not been attached to this report.

## 4.3 Outcomes

### 4.3.1 Resources and focal point capacity

Several stakeholders mentioned that it was difficult for the focal points to supply the required capacity to respond to the demands put towards the focal points usually by several projects at the same time. It was reported that the same officers were working on their job's responsibilities and the projects presented an additional workload. The same officers are required to work on several waste and pollution projects as well as climate change projects and other. Often there were not enough resources available to give credit to the projects. The JPRISM approach was mentioned, where an officer in the PICT is allocated to supervise and manage the projects. Project management support on the ground in the countries would improve efficiency, effectiveness and could improve governance.

### 4.3.2 Efficiency, Administrative processes, governance

It was mentioned multiple times in the interviews that approval processes were lengthy and had a significant impact on the projects. For example, if a focal point developed a pilot project it went through an approval process at SPREP and, following the SPREP approval, an application for approval through a no objection letter was sent to the AFD. In particular, procurement processes can take a long time according to some stakeholders. While AFD was reviewing the pilot project proposals, it appears that the terms of the original Financial Agreement did not allow in-country Focal Points to develop and implement the pilot project. An amendment had to be signed to enable this, which led to delays in Pilot project approval and the release of funds. The required amendment resulted in a delay of 4 months.

Interviewees said that once the projects were approved there was good participation and good results were achieved. For example, the International Coastal Clean-up Days that were held in several jurisdictions had good numbers of volunteers and resulted in good publicity for SWAP and SPREP.

It was mentioned that the SWAP coordinator who was meant to focus on communication and coordination is required to be involved in management as well and that things could be improved with additional support of this role.

Focal points mentioned that communication, in particular that regarding approval processes could be improved, however there were others that said that communication had been great so far.

A cofounded (between the different projects) role in each country was suggested by the beneficiaries as an improvement to the focus and efficiency of programmes and to reduce the strain on government resources.

A strong US\$ had impacted cost efficiencies.

### 4.3.3 Relevance

Stakeholders believe that the project and its projects are relevant and are well aligned with strategies like the CP25.

Comments by focal points:

*'The thematic areas were developed via consultation with beneficiary countries before the steering committee in June 2021'.*

*'The SWAP project has good themes – they cover emerging issues'*

Comments by SPREP:

*'SPREP original framework (CP25) identifies countries, issues and vision. Work plan and budget for activities here. Donors/partners can look at the regional framework and pick out what they would like to invest in and approach SPREP. SPREP then addresses donors needs and the original framework. Donors are a part of SPREP so the goals and objectives of donors/SPREP are well aligned'*

Stakeholders report that SWAP covers the high priority issues starting with litter education, removal and data collection, capacity building through trainings programmes, climate proofing landfills and dealing with used oil management at a national level.

This relevance of SWAP objectives made internal approvals for participation and implementation simple, with external stakeholders reporting other barriers reducing activity to date, particularly Resources and focal point capacity and Efficiency, Administrative processes, governance.

#### **4.3.4 Effectiveness**

There was consensus between the stakeholders that the SPREP programmes are effective and improve the environmental and social conditions in the PICTs.

There was a suggestion that the programs should deliver training programs to the private sector Waste Service Providers WSPs and that the training should be very practical, to improve effectiveness. The training should focus on operational level to middle management not higher-level management and build capacity for planning and strategy.

Comments by Focal points:

*'We want to see pilot projects that were successful shared with other PICTs with the idea of duplication'*

*'Of course it (The SWAP project) has been quite beneficial and positive. Anything SPREP organises and puts into effect is helpful and beneficial to us'*

*'One thing that might be good is have more regular exchanges with SPREP in terms of the activities that are going on. The main blame for this is local because there is not enough time to manage all the different projects and requests for my time.'*

#### **4.3.5 Cooperation with partner projects**

Stakeholders believe that coordination between the waste and pollution management projects was good, however there are projects from several other areas like climate protection or sustainability that are not well coordinated.

There was a general sentiment that overlaps cannot be prevented between the different programmes.

It was suggested that a better utilisation of programmes' synergies could help reduce the workload on country (PICT) level.

There was mention of a newly formed and informal 'donor coordinating forum' and that such forum would be very useful to improve synergies and coordinate programs and funding on a higher level.

A suggestion was made to advocate for higher level donor integration so programmes could be more strategically managed. Delaying SWAP capacity building for example to occur together with the ISLANDS and PacWaste Plus programmes could improve outcomes and reduce strain on PICT focal points.

Another suggestion was to improve programmes on the ground by having a shared (between programmes of different donors) program manager to support PICT resources.

#### 4.4 Summary

- All stakeholders agreed that COVID 19 caused major delays.
- All stakeholders agreed that the SWAP project was relevant and considered the highest priority issues of the PICTs.
- All stakeholders mentioned that the biggest bottleneck was on PICT focal point level and that project management support on the ground in each country and territory would be most beneficial to overcome this.
- It was mentioned that Project Management PM support could be across the programmes so synergies could be utilised better.
- PICT focal points, the donor and SPREP officers agreed that the AFD processes were very lengthy and administration heavy, especially at the beginning of the project, until March 2022. The situation has improved significantly since the new AFD Project Officer is on board.
- Partner officers and the donor also mentioned lengthy SPREP procurement and AFD approval processes due to administrative requirements.
- It was mentioned that programmes could be better coordinated, and a solution was to have a higher-level donor forum.
- PICT focal points and the consultant mentioned that there was a risk of the project being rushed now due to early delays.

#### **With this in mind, there are opportunities for:**

- more funding to implement human resources in the PICTs that can coordinate and manage projects on the ground,
- efficiencies in reporting from the PICTs' different projects to SPREP,
- empower PICTs to be project implementors,
- find ways to incentivise the delivery of programmes in the countries.

#### 4.4.1 Outlook

Stakeholders want to see the project extended and funding increased so that activities can be delivered that had been delayed through COVID, administrative processes, and personnel issues.

Focal points mentioned that they fear that pilot projects may be rushed as to deliver within the agreed term.

## 5 Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific (SWAP)

### 5.1 Summary of the SWAP Program progress

Table 4 Summary of SWAP project progress

Date	Activity/Report	Comment	Achieved - Not achieved
<b>Year 1</b>			
February 2020	Funding agreement signed between ADF and SPREP	Disruption due to global COVID 19 pandemic	Agreement signed
June 2020	First advance payment received		Payment received
August 2020 – September 2020	Mobilisation: Staff recruitment x2, Office setup	Unexpected delays through complications in the recruitment of coordinator and expectations of COVID restrictions easing earlier.	Project branding, Establishment of focal point contacts, Preparation of implementation plan, Steering committee and PMU established
December 2020	Inception Meeting	Project components, Activities, Governance, and Implementation arrangements discussed.	Inception meeting held
January 2021	Project Coordinator commences based in France	Recruitment was difficult due to a range of factors, including the specific skill set required and pandemic disruption.	Project coordinator commences



Date	Activity/Report	Comment	Achieved - Not achieved
<b>Year 2</b>			
February – March 2021	Follow up meetings held with beneficiary countries, validation of involvement	Inputs from Wallis & Futuna, Samoa and Solomon Islands received	Commence pilot project discussions
June 2021	Release of the final copy of the first Technical and Financial Action Plan	The plan sets budgets and defines actions taking into consideration the delays due to the pandemic	Action Plan
June 2021	Annual Report 2020	Some of the governance milestones set out for the first year were achieved, however no project activity had been recorded for the first year due to the global pandemic.	Public Relation (PR) on SPREP website and PacWaste Plus newspaper  Sustainable finance WG established  GEDSI strategy  Project activities

Date	Activity/Report	Comment	Achieved - Not achieved
July 2021	First Half Year Progress Report 2021	<p>Project activity is starting,</p> <p>Pilot projects - some delays due to lack of engagement of some beneficiaries.</p> <p>Marine debris cleanup and data collection project progressing</p> <p>Community of practice – no planned activity for this period</p> <p>Most planned communication action achieved</p>	<p>Communication plan,</p> <p>Steering committee meeting held,</p> <p>Technical and financial action plan,</p> <p>Procurement plan 2021,</p> <p>Training elements identified for SWAP,</p> <p>M&amp;E Plan,</p> <p>GEDSI strategy,</p> <p>Financial audit report,</p> <p>Training TOR,</p> <p>Pilot project allocations,</p> <p>Pilot project MOU,</p> <p>TOR Pilot projects consultant,</p> <p>Procurement consultant,</p> <p>TOR oil management,</p> <p>Choose Financing project for Wallis &amp; Futuna</p>
<b>Year 3</b>			
March 2022	2021 Annual Report	<p>Most project management/governance actions have been achieved or are ongoing.</p> <p>Training programmes should have been delivered but are delayed, likely due lengthy administrative processes in the procurement.</p>	<p>GEDSI strategy,</p> <p>2021 Annual Report</p> <p>Sustainability Plan</p> <p>Training tender training modules</p>

Date	Activity/Report	Comment	Achieved - Not achieved
		<p>Pilot projects are being allocated and agreements are being developed and signed.</p> <p>All planned Marine debris project actions achieved</p> <p>Planned Used Oil project activities starting</p> <p>Sustainable financing project for W&amp;F has commenced</p> <p>Community of practice (COP) workshops are going ahead</p> <p>Most planned communication action achieved</p>	<p>Deliver training,</p> <p>Pilot project allocations,</p> <p>Pilot project MOU,</p> <p>Pilot project template,</p> <p>Pilot project consultant signed,</p> <p>Pilot project proposals, peer review and AFD submission</p> <p>Marine debris actions</p> <p>Used oil administrative actions-MOU,</p> <p>Used oil consultant</p> <p>Used oil Samoa actions</p> <p>COP expert data base establish and maintain</p> <p>Design or establish COP platform</p>
September 2022	Half year progress report 2022	<p>The second steering committee meeting was held and eight documents and the training consultant were approved by AFD.</p> <p>Progress on marine litter and used oil management pilot projects.</p> <p>Progress on community of practice.</p> <p>Only the midterm review and the sustainability plan are delayed in the administrative actions.</p>	<p>2021 Annual Report signed off</p> <p>2022 Procurement plan</p> <p>2020 and 2021 financial audits signed off</p> <p>M&amp;E Plan</p> <p>Project Risk Management plan</p> <p>Training tender consultant selected</p> <p>Pilot project implementation</p> <p>Database creation and</p>

Date	Activity/Report	Comment	Achieved - Not achieved
			upkeep Website development

### 5.1.1 SWAP background and project objectives

Following the Solid waste management in the Pacific Initiative that was sponsored by the AFD with 1 million Euro between 2009 and 2014, SPREP developed the Cleaner Pacific 2025 (CP25) Strategy in 2016, collaborating with 21 Pacific Island Countries and territories (PICTs). The strategy was signed off by the SPREP metropolitan country members: Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States of America, and France, and with the collaborator Japan (not a member of SPREP). The strategy sets the objectives and goals for the regional waste and pollution management strategies and provides the basis for regional interventions. The strategy is providing objectives goals and targets to take advantage of regional and technical support and improve the coordination of funding.

Table 5 SWAP project overview

Item	Details
Location	SPREP (Samoa) - 6 Pacific Island Countries & Territories (PICTs): Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu, Wallis & Futuna) plus technical support from New Caledonia. French Polynesia was initially included in the SWAP but declined the support in May 2021.
Term	27 February 2020 – 31 December 2023 <sup>(*)</sup>
Implementation through	SPREP and PICT established focal points
Vision	Improve sanitation, environmental, social and economic conditions in Pacific Island Countries and Territories through proper waste management
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To help communities and local authorities to develop national waste management policies with a global approach from collection, sorting, recovery and proper disposal of target waste streams;</li> <li>To improve the delivery of waste services through development of waste management infrastructures and implementation of pilot projects;</li> <li>To strengthen communities and local authorities' capacity in the areas of technical waste management, institutional governance, and finance with focus on used oil, disaster waste, marine debris and</li> </ul>

Item	Details
	sustainable financing; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To build on initiatives through sharing of project outcomes and community experiences</li> </ul>
Components and allocations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Component 1: Training program (€297,290)</li> <li>• Component 2: Pilot projects (€1,386,990)</li> <li>• Component 3: Community of Practice (€200,000)</li> <li>• Project Management Unit (€785,720)</li> <li>• Project Management Fee &amp; Contingency (€330,000)</li> </ul>
Thematic areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• used oil management;</li> <li>• disaster waste management;</li> <li>• marine debris management; and</li> <li>• sustainable financing.</li> </ul>

(\*) An extension is being considered at the time of this report

### 5.1.2 SWAP project components

#### **Training**

The first component of the SWAP project concerns the design of a regional training program focuses on the following thematic areas:

- used oil,
- disaster waste,
- marine debris, and
- sustainable financing mechanisms.

This training program includes theoretical and practical courses on the management of targeted waste streams with case study presentations and will involve regional experts.

#### **Pilot Projects**

The second component concerns the implementation of pilot projects including:

- Development of Advanced Recovery Systems such as Container Deposit Systems;
- Construction of used oil collection, storage, treatment and disposal facilities;
- National used oil management plans;
- Research on used oil recovery technologies:

- Coastal clean-up campaigns including data sharing;
- Rehabilitation and/or climate proofing of disaster waste storage facilities;

### **Community of Practice**

In parallel, a Community of Practice will be established to exchange information on waste management issues in the Region. A knowledge sharing platform is planned and workshops bringing together experts and practitioners will be held. This component is aimed at longevity and sustainability of the SWAP project.

### **5.1.3 SWAP program outcomes to date**

#### **Administration and Governance**

- Year 1 and Year 2 financial audits
- Monitoring and Evaluation, Research and Learning (MERL) plan
- Half yearly progress reports

#### **Social**

- GEDSI strategy and action plan

#### **Trainings component**

- Terms of reference have been developed and approved by AFD
- Tender launched and Evaluation Report approved by AFD
- Consultancy agreement has been signed
- Inception meeting held
- Inception report submitted
- The training on Marine Litter is not included into the scope of work of the Training Program. A specific training on this subject will be delivered to communities involved in the implementation of the Marine Litter Pilot Projects

#### **Pilot projects**

- Submitted for approval
  - Fiji coastal litter pilot project
  - Honiara Marine litter project
  - Honiara used oil project
  - NUKU'ALOFA WATERFRONT CLEAN-UP CAMPAIGN Pilot Project
  - Samoa Marine Litter Pilot Project
  - Shefa Province, Vanuatu\_ Marine Litter Project
- Used oil management
  - National Management plan analysis phase for Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Samoa and Tonga under way
  - Research in used oil recovery technologies completed and available in English and French

- Disaster waste management (Scoping study to identify potential sites for climate proofing in Solomon Islands and Vanuatu)
  - TOR completed
  - Tender launched and evaluated
  - Contract signed
- Sustainable financing (development of suitable financial projects with W&F)
  - Feasibility study completed and local counterpart selected for the operation of the facility.

### **Community of practice**

- Platform joined (an established platform was chosen)
- Functionality of platform tested
- Virtual workshops on Marine debris held
- Visibility (Branding, Uniforms, Media releases, internal and external media participation)

### **5.1.4 Effectiveness**

There have only been implementations of one training course and none of the pilot projects have been started yet. The community of practice component has delivered significant numbers of publications, branding and uniforms which created very good visibility of the SWAP project.

### **5.1.5 Efficiency**

This project has faced obstacles from the start that had a significant impact on the efficiency of the project delivery and were outside the PMUs sphere of influence. The obstacles were:

- The occurrence of the global pandemic;
- The resignation of the project initiator and supervisor when the SWAP coordinator arrived in Samoa ; and
- The resignation of the project support officer in March 2021.

The start of the COVID 19 pandemic was unprecedented in this generation and businesses, GOs and NGOs were not prepared. The pandemic globally disrupted society and led to office and border closures, flight cancellations, lock downs and more. It was a risk not many had scheduled in their risk registers.

At the time of the start of the project, the project's initiator and supervisor resigned. Additionally the recruitment of the project coordinator proved to be challenging and additional hurdles had to be overcome to get approval for the recruitment and for the relocation of the candidate.

The resignation of the supervisor caused a knowledge gap particularly where approval processes and timelines were involved. This caused avoidable delays early on.

When the project support officer resigned in March 2021 it took 8 months to employ a replacement. For this time the Project Coordinator was left to implement the projects on her own.

The release of the first technical and financial action plan in June 2021 marked a turning point in the project and from that moment onwards, rapid progress has been made in some areas. It appears that

lengthy approval processes by AFD, especially during the first year and a half of SWAP project implementation, before the new AFD Project Officer was on board, and the SPREP procurement process had an impact on the overall efficiency. The extended contracting time for the training contractor, which was the responsibility of both SPREP and University of Newcastle, and SPREP’s long procurement processes caused the delays.

### 5.1.6 Relevance

Relevance for all activities under the SWAP should be determined by how well the projects fit with the strategies, goals and actions of the CP25 which is the governing strategy. This strategy was developed to better coordinate donations and interventions in each of the PICTs.

The SWAP project has been developed from CP25 priorities. The relevance of the SWAP project components and thematic areas has been mapped against the CP25 strategies, goals and actions in Table 6:

**Table 6 Relevance mapping**

SWAP Thematic area	Cleaner Pacific 2025			Comment
	Guiding principle	Strategic Goal	Strategic action	
Used oil Management	1 3R’s + return 2 Product stewardship 7 Multisectoral approach 10 Precautionary approach 11 Proactive approach	Covers all strategic goals	Aligned with strategic actions: 1,2,5,6,7,8,9,10,12,14	There is excellent alignment of the SWAP project with the CP25 strategy.  Each of the thematic areas has a high relevance.
Disaster Waste	4 Proximity principle 7 Multisectoral approach 9 Sound decision making	Covers all strategic goals	Aligned with strategic actions: 2,3,5,7,9,14	
Marine Litter	1 3R’s + return	Covers goals	Aligned with strategic	



Cleaner Pacific 2025			
	6 Public consultation and participation  7 Multisectoral approach	1, 2, 4	actions:  1,2,5,6,8,10,13
Sustainable Finance	1 3R's + return  2 Product stewardship  3 Polluter Pays  7 Multisectoral approach	Covers all strategic goals	Aligned with strategic actions:  1,2,3,5,6,8,10

### 5.1.7 Sustainability and impact

There has not been reporting on sustainability within the SWAP project and a sustainability plan is still outstanding. In the design of the project attempts have been made to ensure the project is ongoing. As such the thematic area of sustainable financing was included to enable the countries to continue to finance waste and pollution related programmes. The training component includes project management elements and contributes to sustainable capacity building. The Community of Practice component is built on an existing platform that ensures sustainability beyond the term of the SWAP project. Travel restrictions and border closures have had a sustainability impact resulting in significantly less travel and more virtual meetings and trainings.

### 5.1.8 Networks and linkages

The project is administered under the umbrella which is also host to the Partner projects JPRISM II, PacWastePlus, POLP and the ISLANDS Child programme. This allowed for cooperation opportunity and greater efficiencies, however there was the suggestion that higher level (donor level) forums may be beneficial to allow for better integration of the programmes.

### 5.1.9 Lessons learned and conclusions

There have been significant obstacles caused by external factors outside the influence of the PMU or the PSC. These issues have then caused others like the delay in the starting date for the SWAP project coordinator and the relocation date. As a result of this there was little or no overlap of the previous supervisor and the SWAP coordinator which in turn caused issues in the planning of the project and subsequently delays were had. The delays added to delays caused by administration-heavy systems employed by SPREP and AFD, especially during the first year and a half of SWAP project implementation, before the new AFD Project Officer be on board. Other systemic issues were encountered due to incompatibility of the AFD and SPREP governance systems and Procurement procedures which required an amendment signed on 25 November 2022.

The PMU has after a slow start overcome issues and obstacles (that were largely out of the control of the PMU) and progressed the project elements efficiently and effectively.

## 6 Training component

### 6.1 Summary of training component

The training component like the other components (pilot projects and community of practice) started slow due to the previously mentioned reasons. Only after the approval and implementation of the technical and financial action plan did the project start to get traction. The second year of the project (2021) was largely used to collaborate with the programme partners PacWaste Plus, JPRISM II and ISLANDS, and to get approval for the tender process and TOR.

A first Technical and Financial action plan acknowledging the barriers posed by the circumstances, was initially drafted in April 2021<sup>2</sup> and continued to be updated until Update 3 on 26 June 2021.

As a first step in the training programme a Terms Of Reference (TOR) was drafted in the second half of 2021 and disseminated to the regional partners J-PRISM II, PacWastePlus and GEF ISLANDS to coordinate the approaches of the different partners and prevent duplications.

In the first half of 2022 all programmes<sup>4</sup> started to move from the planning and procurement stages into implementation.

No training had been delivered by end of June 2022, except for trainings for the communities involved in the International Coastal Clean-up Days 2021 and 2022 that was delivered in September 2021 and September 2022.

#### 6.1.1 Training component objectives

The objectives for 2020 were described as:

- Conduct of training regarding the following thematic areas:
  - Disaster waste management
  - Sustainable financing
  - Used oil management
  - Marine debris management<sup>3</sup>

In September 2022 a Monitoring and Evaluation framework was established and the outcomes and outputs better defined. In an updated results framework. 25 Objectively Verifiable Indicators were also established. Table 7 and Table 8 below show outcomes and outputs according to the MERL, in regards to the training programme, by the end of the project.

<sup>2</sup> Technical and financial action plan – SWAP project

<sup>3</sup> SWAP - 2020 Annual Report, June 2021

**Table 7 Training component Outcomes**

Short Term Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification
<p>Strengthened communities and local authorities' capacity in the areas of technical waste management, institutional governance, and finance with focus on used oil, disaster waste, marine debris and sustainable financing.</p>	<p>10. At least 2 people per SWAP country/territory effectively trained on used oil, disaster waste, marine litter management, and sustainable financing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports</li> <li>• Mid-term and post-project evaluation report</li> <li>• Activity reports</li> <li>• Training modules, training materials, training reports</li> <li>• Regional Waste Monitoring Reports (including Country/Regional Waste Profile)</li> <li>• SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting</li> <li>• Terminal Report of Pilot project</li> </ul>

**Table 8 Training component Outputs**

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification
<p>Training programmes are conducted on used oil, disaster waste, marine debris, and sustainable financing.</p>	<p>12. 100% of the training programmes produced, at least one training event conducted for each of the waste streams.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training programme report</li> <li>• Progress reports</li> <li>• Mid-term and post-project evaluation report</li> </ul>
	<p>13. At least 75% positive feedback from stakeholders who received the training.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Waste Monitoring Reports (including Country/Regional Waste Profile)</li> </ul>
	<p>10. At least 2 people per SWAP country/territory effectively trained on used oil, disaster waste, marine litter management, and sustainable financing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training programme report</li> </ul>

### 6.1.2 GEDSI targets for trainings programme

The targets for the inclusion of women and vulnerable groups are shown in Table 9.

Table 9 GEDSI targets for trainings programme

GEDSI targets	Means of Verification
25. At least 50% of those trained in waste oil, disaster, marine waste management, and sustainable finance are women and/or people from vulnerable groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Progress Report</li> <li>• SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting</li> <li>• Terminal Report of Pilot project</li> </ul>

At this point a full evaluation of GEDSI targets could not take place as only the 2021 Coastal Clean-up Day 2021 was completed and there was not evaluation of the targets..

### 6.1.3 Training component outcomes to date

To date, activities included developing TOR, coordinating the trainings component with regional partners and, in 2022, publishing a tender and selecting a consultant to *Design, Develop, and Deliver a Regional Virtual Vocational Training Program on used oil management, disaster waste management, sustainable financing mechanisms for waste management, and project management*. The selection of the consultant was approved on 9 May 2022 by the AFD and the inception meeting held 23 August 2022.<sup>4</sup>

Cooperation with PacWaste Plus could result in an expansion of funds for the training program. The modules address: project management, sustainable financing mechanisms for waste management, used oil management and disaster waste management.

A training programme was delivered to train communities for the Coastal Clean-up Day 2021. The training was delivered to participants from Samoa, Vanuatu and Wallis and Futuna.

### 6.1.4 Effectiveness

Effectiveness from a planning point of view should be assessed by looking at the risk of duplication since most programmes include a training component. There has been ample coordination with project partners which should prevent duplication and take advantage of synergies. For example where SWAP is coordinating with PacWaste Plus and JPRISM II, SWAP continues from where JPRISM II is finishing up<sup>5</sup>. An assessment of the effectiveness of the training, however, is not possible to date as they have not been held.

<sup>4</sup> SWAP\_Half-year Progress Report 2022

<sup>5</sup> Interview with Satoru Mimura

### 6.1.5 Efficiency

Each step in the development of a project requires internal (SPREP) review and approval before it can be submitted to the AFD for approval through non objection letters. This process caused significant inefficiencies for the first 20 months.

In case of the regional training component it took six months from approval of the procurement to contracting the preferred bidder, the University Newcastle, in August 2022.

The PMU has since acknowledged this and accounts for the lengthy approval processes in the project planning phase. Lengthy approval processes have been mentioned several times in the stakeholder interviews and, in particular, by the country representatives and by the partner organisations.

The Marine Litter component tender was issued on 4 July 2022. The training targets communities involved in the implementation of SWAP Marine Litter Pilot Projects in Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.

There is some doubt on the efficiency of the training programmes in relation to the capacity building for pilot project development due to the significant delays the project development is facing.

The restrictions caused by the global pandemic have however resulted in some efficiency gains, as face to face trainings were cancelled in favour of online courses.

### 6.1.6 Relevance

The training programmes are closely aligned with the rest of the SWAP project and contain elements that are designed to support the implementation of the pilot projects and build project management capacity in the PICTs. The training programmes are therefore considered highly relevant.

### 6.1.7 Sustainability and impact

The trainings component has seen the most progress to date and its sustainability has benefitted from the arrival of the pandemic. The programs were originally planned to be delivered in person which would have required a significant amount of travel and would have turned out more expensive. Training courses were or will be instead developed as videos training and can now be held at any time online or in training forums.

There has been mention in the stakeholder interviews that if trainings had a project management and a train the trainer element, this would improve sustainability.

### 6.1.8 Networks and linkages

Better donor level coordination of all programme elements and in particular the training element could have improved outcomes according to some partner project coordinators.

### 6.1.9 Lessons learned and conclusions

The training program is considered relevant and important since it builds much needed capacity and improves the project management capability in the PICTs.

There have been significant delays in contracting of the consultant (preferred consultant to develop the trainings programme) for several reasons: delays in AFD and SPREP approval, administrative

procedures on the part of the consultant leading to significant delays in the signing of the contract and the launch of the mission.

It is important to include the GEDSI targets into the reviews of the project and for future training programmes ensure that the training spots are being made available. Since the assessment is done in retrospect a mechanism may be required to ensure enrolling for women and vulnerable groups is possible.

## 7 Pilot project component

### 7.1 Summary of pilot project component

Pilot projects are the biggest component of the SWAP project with a planned expenditure of €1.4 million. Pilot projects were conceived with support from a technical assistant hired by SWAP, where required, by the PICT administration. The representative filled in a template with an abstract of the project and sent it to SWAP where it would be reviewed and after amendments sent for peer review and then to the AFD for delivery of the No-Objection Letter. Once approved, a final administrative step is required for the effective implementation of the pilot project: signing an agreement with the national focal point or awarding contracts. This lengthy and administrative complexity was reported internally and externally. According to a PICT representative, the process took a long time and the administration heavy processes were noted.

Additional lengthy delays occurred when it was discovered that the implementation of pilot projects could not occur due to a governance issue relating to the standards for the procurement process and in regards of the terms of the initial Financing Agreement. For the AFD to finance the pilot projects the procurement had to be aligned with the original SPREP/AFD-signed Financing Agreement and this requires that an amendment be signed. The AFD assumed the issue would be resolved by the end of November. It was estimated that it took 4 months to resolve the issue.

Several pilot project proposals were submitted for approval:

- Five of these were ocean litter related and proposed by:
  - Fiji;
  - Solomon Islands;
  - Tonga;
  - Samoa; and
  - Vanuatu.
- A pilot project for scrap metal recovery is under development for Wallis and Futuna
- One was a used oil management project for Solomon Islands; and

In addition, the component relating to the implementation of pilot projects in Used oil management includes two other activities:

- One activity aims to implement four national used oil management plans for:
  - Samoa;
  - Solomon Islands;
  - Tonga; and
  - Vanuatu.
- To help countries develop the pilot project proposals, SWAP hired a consultant to conduct research on existing technologies for used oil treatment and recovery as a tool for decision making.



### 7.1.1 Pilot project component objectives

Objectives are specific to each thematic area as shown in Table 10.

The objectives are vague on timing and measures. Quantitative considerations are introduced with the OVI and timing can be assumed as by the end of the SWAP project term.

**Table 10 Pilot project objectives (Excerpt from Results Framework)**

Specific Objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification
Reduced spillage of oil on the ground in collection and drop off/storage areas.	3. At least 1 used oil stockpile/site cleaned up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress report</li> <li>• Steering Committee minutes</li> <li>• Mid-term and post-project evaluation report</li> <li>• Regional Waste Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Terminal Report of Pilot project</li> <li>• SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting - C3 section</li> </ul>
Reduced littering of coastlines and marine protected areas.	4. At least 1 data collection practice established for marine debris management per year.	
Improved operation of a landfill especially during disaster events.	5. At least two landfills or sites have disaster waste segregation facilities.	
Increased recovery of resources from wastes.	6. At least 10 tonnes of waste recycle and reuse.	

The results framework adds short term outcomes and muddies the targets by mixing the different components like pilot projects and training as shown in Table 11.

**Table 11 short term outcomes (Excerpt from Results Framework)**

Short Term Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification
Developed and established national waste management policies with a global approach from collection, sorting, recovery	7. At least one National Used Oil Management Plan developed for Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress report</li> <li>• Steering Committee minutes</li> <li>• Mid-term and post-project</li> </ul>

Short Term Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification
and proper disposal of target waste streams.		evaluation report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Waste Monitoring Reports</li> </ul>
Improved delivery of waste services through development of waste management infrastructures and implementation of pilot projects.	8. At least one activity proposal (concept notes) selected and approved for implementation per thematic area, according to country and territory engagements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terminal Report of Pilot project</li> <li>SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting - C3 section</li> </ul>
Strengthened communities and local authorities' capacity in the areas of technical waste management, institutional governance, and finance with focus on used oil, disaster waste, marine debris and sustainable financing.	9. At least 75% of approved pilot projects successfully implemented at national/country level.	
	10. At least 2 people per SWAP country/territory effectively trained on used oil, disaster waste, marine litter management, and sustainable financing.	

The Results Framework then adds a six OVIs per component (output) objective as shown in Table 12.

**Table 12 Outputs (Excerpt from Results framework)**

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification
Pilot project activities on the targeted waste streams are implemented.	14. At least one activity proposal (concept notes) approved for implementation per thematic area, according to country and territory engagements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Progress Report</li> <li>SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting</li> <li>Terminal Report of Pilot project</li> </ul>
	15. At least 75% of relevant activities/pilots successfully implemented.	

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification
	16. At least one used oil management activity OR installation set up (collection, storage, processing) within selected PICTs (Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu).	
	17. At least 10 actions for marine litter management conducted among the SWAP countries and territories per year.	
	18. At least 75% of identified potential disposal sites in the scoping study are rehabilitated or climate proofed.	
	19. At least one action completed in Wallis and Futuna for waste recovery.	

### 7.1.2 GEDSI targets for Pilot Projects

The targets for the Gender Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion are listed in Table 13. Pilot projects have not yet been implemented.

Table 13 GEDSI targets for Pilot Projects

GEDSI targets	Means of Verification
26. At least 40% of people involved in Pilot Projects implementation are women.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Progress Report</li> <li>• SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting</li> <li>• Terminal Report of Pilot project</li> </ul>

### 7.1.3 Pilot project component outcomes to date

To date there have been 7 pilot project proposals developed which are currently being assessed by the AFD. Significant work has gone into the development of the pilot projects. The efforts so far were interrupted by:

- The pandemic;
- SPREP personnel issues;
- Border closures; and
- Governance complications.

All pilot projects are still in the approval stage and there has been no further development.

As MRA is considering the national used oil management plans part of the pilot projects progress can be noted. The plans for Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu have progressed to stage 2 of a 5-step process with only the feasibility study and the draft and final report missing. Tonga's plan is currently waiting for the assessment report which is step two.

### 7.1.4 Effectiveness

An assessment on the effectiveness of the pilot projects cannot be made at this stage.

### 7.1.5 Efficiency

There have been significant delays in the process of implementing the SWAP and particularly in the development of the pilot projects. The delays in the development of the pilot projects specifically have resulted from incompatible governance frameworks of SPREP and AFD. The procurement process applied to the projects was governed by SPREP guidelines which weren't supported by the Project Financing Agreement. It appears therefore that the difficulties were procedural and not human error or inexperience possibly contributed to the occurrence of this issue.

### 7.1.6 Relevance

The pilot projects that have been developed are addressing Marine litter (5 projects), sustainable financing (1 project) and Used Oil Management (1 project and 4 plans in development). The areas of Marine Litter and Used Oil Management have been found to be high priority issues in the PICTs and are target areas in the CT25 strategy. The pilot projects are considered to have high relevance.

### 7.1.7 Sustainability and impact

As the projects haven't yet occurred, it is not possible to qualify sustainability and impact of the projects.

### 7.1.8 Networks and linkages

SWAP is actively working with their partner organisations and under the umbrella of SPREP to continuously improve coordination of projects on country level, where a bottleneck exists in the countries' capacity to implement projects. While this is working relatively well at the coordinators' (officer) level, some criticism was heard, mentioning the need to better coordinate activities on donor level. There appears to be potential for improvement of the networks of metropolitan members and associated.

### 7.1.9 Lessons learned and conclusions

A significant and unexpected delay added to the already delayed delivery of the project. The delay was likely attributed to by the fact that the coordinator was not as deeply familiar with the governance requirements of the AFD. The likely reason for this is that the coordinator could not be inducted by the former SWAP supervisor due to issues with a delayed relocation from France of the staff because of border closures. Contributing to this was that the AFD staff dedicated to the project was also replaced and the replacement officer has only been in their position since January 2022.

It is likely that the impact could have been reduced, with enough overlap to allow the outgoing staff to introduce the incoming staff to the admin heavy structures of SPREP and AFD.

The projects have been developing relatively well aside from the governance issues and other obstacles., largely outside the PMUs sphere of influence.

## 8 Communities of practice component

### 8.1 Summary of communities of practice component

The Community of Practice component aims to provide a platform for individuals (practitioners and experts) involved, to increase sustainability and and knowledgebase of the SWAP project. The Community of Practice has three elements:

- Organisation of the Community of Practice:
  - Create a database of experts and practitioners; and
  - Maintain and update the database.
- Establish a platform to host information to be shared to the Community of Practice:
  - Explore a suitable platform to host the Community of Practice; and
  - Design the platform and test functionality.
- Conduct workshops and meetings to disseminate project and other relevant information.

#### 8.1.1 Communities of practice component objectives

The component of the community shares their objectives with the other components. The outcomes and outputs of the component are listed in Table 14 and Table 15.

The component is designed as a knowledge and ideas platform and as such is planned to provide workshops and a contacts database to be used by practitioners. It is also used to increase visibility of the project and to develop collaterals like videos and brochures and to provide a conduit for communication with media.

**Table 14 Community of Practice Outcomes**

Short Term Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification
Increased capacity building initiatives through sharing of project outcomes and community experiences.	11. At least one knowledge sharing activity (workshop, meeting, etc) conducted per waste stream by the end of the project within the community of Practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Progress reports</li> <li>○ Mid-term and post-project evaluation report</li> <li>○ Activity reports</li> <li>○ Training modules, training materials, training reports</li> <li>○ Regional Waste Monitoring Reports (including Country/Regional Waste</li> </ul>

Short Term Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification
		Profile) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting</li> <li>○ Terminal Report of Pilot project</li> </ul>

**Table 15 Community of Practice Outputs**

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	
Collaborative platforms are set up to facilitate data and knowledge sharing as well as communication activities.	20. At least 50 people involved in the knowledge sharing platform by the end of the project.  21. At least one knowledge sharing activity (workshop, meeting, video, etc.) conducted per waste stream by the end of the project.  22. Established online website dedicated to SWAP updated at least quarterly.  23. At least 8 articles on SWAP published per year.  24. At least 2 awareness materials produced per year (videos, posters, etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Annual Progress Report</li> <li>○ SWAP M&amp;E Country/Territory Reporting</li> </ul>

### 8.1.2 Communities of practice component outcomes to date

The original plan to create a standalone platform had been cancelled since there were doubts that the SWAP PMU would be able to maintain the platform at current or beyond the end of the SWAP project. The PMU, with approval from AFD, has therefore decided to tag onto the existing Green Forum platform. The platform involves waste management experts from around the world. SWAP participates on four groups:

- Plastics – ISLANDS (100 Members),

- Used oil – ISLANDS (35 Members),
- Disaster Waste Management in the Pacific (6 Members),
- Sustainable Financing for Waste Management in the Pacific (41 Members).

SWAP has so far published six posts on the platform:

- Video produced by the Samoa Recycling Waste Management Association (SRWMA) during the International Coastal Clean-up day 2021;
- Video produced by the association No Pelesitiki Campaign in Tonga during the International Coastal Clean-up day 2021;
- Flyer to inform of the SWAP Marine Litter workshop;
- News story on the development of Samoa National Used Oil Management Plan; and
- Research on Used Oil Recovery Technologies available for Pacific Islands Context – Options Report (English Version).

Further outcomes were:

- A SWAP Marine Litter Workshop was held on 6 April 2022. It had 45 participants and 77 online recorded views.
- A SWAP teaser video was produced and was submitted for approval to the AFD.
- An awareness-raising video on marine litter is in production.
- The SWAP webpage was considered 'not attractive' and it has been approved to hire a qualified consultant to design and develop a new SWAP Project Website.
- SWAP uniforms have been developed for SWAP PMU and SWAP focal points.
- T-shirts have been produced involvement in the Recycling day.
- Four news stories have been published.
- Continued publications in the monthly SPREP bulletin and on the PacWaste Plus Newsletter.

### 8.1.3 Effectiveness

It is assumed that the Community of Practice component is effective. There are some indicators that this is the case. The Marine litter workshop for example had a participation of 45 practitioners and the recorded online version had been streamed another 77 times by the 21/22 EFY.

A visually strong branding, uniforms, T-shirts, and several publications in the regional media as well as the SPREP and partner newsletters have created visibility and awareness.

The move onto an existing platform for the professional network Green Forum by UNEP is warranting greater sustainability and frees up funding and resources.

### 8.1.4 Efficiency

The Community of Practice component has potentially been the most prolific and has, whether by design or circumstance gained efficiency by going onto the already existing Green Forum platform. This resulted in the involvement of a large number of global experts and operators and in significant immediate and future savings.



### **8.1.5 Relevance**

The Community of Practice component is a knowledge sharing and capacity building platform supporting and enhancing the other components. SWAP project objectives are closely aligned with the governing strategies and therefore the component is considered highly relevant.

### **8.1.6 Sustainability and impact**

Sustainability gains have been made by going onto the existing platform as the Green Forum will be in existence beyond the SWAP project term.

There is not much reporting regarding the Sustainability credentials of each component, SWAP or SPREP in the annual or half yearly reports. There is currently no Sustainability Plan either that would give the project guidance and set sustainability parameters.

### **8.1.7 Networks and linkages**

The Community of Practice component has made great use of existing linkages and networks as it connected with the Green Forum platform of UNEP. It is likely that this increases the number of available practitioners and potentially leads to increased continuation and sustainability of the capacity building component.

### **8.1.8 Lessons learned and conclusions**

Work on this component was prolific and has resulted in great visibility of the SWAP project.

## 9 Financial assessment

The SWAP project requires an annual financial audit to be undertaken and MRA is satisfied with the results.

The audits were completed by KPMG – one of the large well-reputed global financial auditors. Both audits Year 1 and Year 2 found that the financial statements had been prepared in all material respects, in accordance with the modified cash basis of accounting described in Note 2 (of the audit report) to meet the requirements of the Financing Agreement (No Convention AFD CZZ 2514 01Z)

## 10 Conclusions and recommendations

There have been significant obstacles caused by external factors outside the influence of the PMU or the PSC. These issues have then caused others like the delay in the starting date for the SWAP project coordinator and the relocation date. As a result of this there was little or no overlap of former supervisor and the incoming SWAP coordinator which in turn caused issues in the planning of the project and subsequently delays were had. The delays added to delays caused by administration heavy systems employed by SPREP and AFD. Other governance issues were encountered due to incompatibility of the AFD and SPREP governance systems and Procurement procedures which required an amendment signed on 25 November 2022.

Some of the initiatives and activities, although with delays, appear to be well received by participants and seem to deliver positive results. Examples are the marine litter clean ups, the marine litter workshop, the media work and in particular the videos that were produced.

Considering the obstacles encountered and the administration heavy environment in which this project is being delivered, progress is good and the PMU and especially the Project Coordinator appear to be highly efficient.

After July 2021, when the first financial and technical action plan was released, the project started to get traction and the PMU proved increasingly efficient. Significant resources have been poured into the development of the components and thematic areas and there will be one year to deliver the bulk of the project outcomes. With some pilot projects still not proposed, and the governance processes as they are, it may not be possible to deliver high quality results within the timeframe.

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that:

- SPREP prepare a Business Continuity Plan to be better prepared for the occurrence of Disasters or Pandemics across their portfolio.
- the approval times (both AFD and SPREP) be published internally and that commitments are made to adhere to the published terms to create more transparency and allow for better planning.
- consideration be given to advocate for the installation of a donor forum.
- consideration be given for 'on the ground' project management capacity in the PICTs (potentially across the programmes).
- a sustainability plan be developed.
- a system to ensure program content is kept relevant and updated. This is especially important in areas where knowledge management is central.
- create a mechanism to ensure enrolling for women and vulnerable groups is possible.
- There was a recommendation for AFD to extend the term of the SWAP. This has already been done, from December 2023 to December 2024.

- AFD increase the funding to enable the successful completion of all pilot projects. A discussion has been initiated between the SWAP PMU and AFD for a SWAP Phase II.

## Appendix 1 – Stakeholder list (detailed)

list of stakeholders and details (name, position, contact details, role with SWAP)

Stakeholders	Name / Position	Email address	Interview outcome
<b><u>SWAP Focal Point</u></b>			
Samoa – Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Seumaloisalafai Afele Faiilagi Assistant Chief Executive Officer	<a href="mailto:afele.faiilagi@mnre.gov.ws">afele.faiilagi@mnre.gov.ws</a>	Delegated to Fiasoso and Setoa (below)
	Fiasosoitamalii Siaosi Principal Chemical & Hazardous Waste Management Officer	<a href="mailto:fiasoso.siaosi@mnre.gov.ws">fiasoso.siaosi@mnre.gov.ws</a>	Cancelled due to bad internet in Samoa, requested completion of questionnaire
	Setoa Apo Principal Solid Waste Management Officer	<a href="mailto:setoa.apo@mnre.gov.ws">setoa.apo@mnre.gov.ws</a>	Cancelled due to bad internet in Samoa, requested completion of questionnaire
Solomon Islands - Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology	Debra Kereseke Senior Environment Officer	<a href="mailto:DKereseke@mecdm.gov.sb">DKereseke@mecdm.gov.sb</a>	Interview completed
	Wendy Beti	<a href="mailto:WBeti@mecdm.gov.sb">WBeti@mecdm.gov.sb</a>	Interview completed

Stakeholders	Name / Position	Email address	Interview outcome
Tonga - Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications	Mafile'o Masi Chief Environmentalist	<a href="mailto:mafileo.masi@gmail.com">mafileo.masi@gmail.com</a>	Interview completed
Vanuatu - Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Climate Change & Adaptation	Roselyn Bue Senior Officer (Chemical and Ozone)	<a href="mailto:rbue@vanuatu.gov.vu">rbue@vanuatu.gov.vu</a>	Roselyn did not attend Interview was sent to complete
Wallis & Futuna - Service Territorial de l'Environnement	Didier Labrousse	<a href="mailto:didier.labrousse@environnement.wf">didier.labrousse@environnement.wf</a>	Interview completed
<b><u>SWAP Donor</u></b>			
Agence française de développement	FAYE Pauline	<a href="mailto:fayep@afd.fr">fayep@afd.fr</a>	Interview completed
<b><u>SPREP</u></b>			
Anthony Talouli	WMPC Programme Director	<a href="mailto:anthonyt@sprep.org">anthonyt@sprep.org</a>	Interview completed
<b><u>Partner Projects</u></b>			
PacWaste Plus	Bradley Nolan	<a href="mailto:bradley@sprep.org">bradley@sprep.org</a>	Interview

Stakeholders	Name / Position	Email address	Interview outcome
	PWP Programme Manager		completed
Pacific Ocean Litter Project	Andrea Volentras POLP Project Manager	<a href="mailto:andreav@sprep.org">andreav@sprep.org</a>	Interview completed
ISLANDS Pacific Child Project	Edward Nicholas Project Manager	<a href="mailto:edwardn@sprep.org">edwardn@sprep.org</a>	Interview cancelled by Edward
JPRISM II	Mimura Satoru Chief Advisor	<a href="mailto:mimuras.ext@sprep.org">mimuras.ext@sprep.org</a>	Interview completed
<b><u>Consultant</u></b>			
Freelance Consultant, Previously SPREP Solid Waste Manager Advisor	Ma Bella Guinto  Ma initiated SWAP  Ma helped countries develop the pilot project proposals	<a href="mailto:mbaguinto@yahoo.com">mbaguinto@yahoo.com</a>	Interview completed

## Appendix 2 – Stakeholder interviews

### Interview forms sent to different stakeholders

#### Partner organisations:

### 11 BACKGROUND

12 Moderators:

Attendee:

Minutes:

Start:

End:

Major work area:

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR MODERATOR

#### MODERATOR INTRODUCTION TO INTERVIEW

The purpose of this midterm review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.

A standard evaluation criteria is used. MRA will be asking you questions to gain insight from the perspective of a [Partner](#), exploring the relevance of SWAP projects to program objectives, the effectiveness of projects, efficiency and sustainability and impact.

#### INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS PARTNERS

Theme	Prompts / questions	X response	X response
Background	<p>How are you involved with SWAP?</p> <p>When did your involvement start (month/year)?</p>		



Role	How does your role relate or align with SWAP?		
<b>Participation objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if partner wishes to utilise midterm review to implement change – preidentified issues etc.</i>	From your perspective, are there any outcomes you want from the midterm review?		

## QUESTIONS PARTNERS

	Prompts / questions	X response	X response
<b>SWAP program objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore the relevance (3.1.1 of SEC) of the SWAP program and projects from partner perspective.</i>	What is your understanding of the SWAP program objectives?  Do you believe the projects implemented in the SWAP program are appropriate to achieve objectives?  Are there any gaps or emerging issues you see that are not captured by the SWAP program projects?  Which of your projects does SWAP overlap or align with? How?		
<b>Participation</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if partner organisation has any drivers to resource / implement project, or has faced any barriers to resourcing / implementation, for the project similar to SWAP.</i>	Does your program or organisation contribute to SWAP in any way now?  Do you see any options for your		

	<p>program or organisation to participate or partner more in SWAP in the future?</p> <p>Have you seen benefits to participants from SWAP?</p> <p>Have you seen benefits to participants from your project?</p> <p>Has there been successful methods that increased participation in SWAP?</p> <p>Has there been successful methods that increased participation in your project?</p> <p>Have there been barriers to increasing participation in SWAP?</p> <p>Has there been successful methods that increased participation in your project?</p>		
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if partner insights from similar organisation or project may assist.</i></p>	<p>Can you identify ways to improve or refine the objectives of SWAP projects?</p> <p>What does success of your project look like for you and your team?</p>		
<p><b>Constraints</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if partner insights can mitigate risk at midterm review.</i></p>	<p>What would be a reason why you would not reach your idea of success? Any barriers you could</p>		

	foresee internally or externally?		
<p><b>Politics and organisational objectives</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if partner experiences political or organisational objective barriers.</i></p>	<p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might interfere with the SWAP objectives?</p> <p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might benefit the SWAP objectives?</p> <p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might interfere with the your project?</p> <p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might benefit your project?</p>		
<p><b>Additional information and stakeholders</b></p>	<p>A reminder - The purpose of this mid term review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date.</p> <p>The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.</p> <p>Is there any additional points</p>		

	<p>you would like to raise or discuss with us?</p> <p>Is there any other stakeholder you believe we should be including in the midterm review?</p>		
--	--	--	--

**SWAP Donor:**

**13 BACKGROUND**

14 Moderators:

Attendee:

Minutes:

Start:

End:

Major work area:

**MODERATOR INTRODUCTION TO INTERVIEW**

The purpose of this midterm review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.

A standard evaluation criteria is used. MRA will be asking you questions to gain insight from the perspective of a Donor, exploring the relevance of SWAP projects to program objectives, the effectiveness of projects, efficiency and sustainability and impact.

**INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS DONOR**

Theme	Prompts / questions	Response
Background	Why has Agence française de développement funded SWAP?	

<b>Role</b>	What is your role in SWAP?  When did you start your involvement (month/year)?	
<b>Participation objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if donor wishes to utilise midterm review to implement change – preidentified issues etc.</i>	Are there any outcomes you want from the midterm review?	

## QUESTIONS DONOR

	Prompts / questions	Response
<b>SWAP program objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore the relevance (3.1.1 of SEC) of the SWAP program and projects from donor perspective.</i>	What is your understanding of the SWAP program objectives?  Do you believe the projects implemented in the SWAP program are appropriate to achieve objectives?  Are there any gaps or emerging issues you see that are not captured by the SWAP program projects?	
<b>Objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore effectiveness (3.1.2 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine if donor understanding of objectives aligns with funded project objectives and if objectives can be improved.</i>	Have the objectives of SWAP been clear?  Have the objectives of each project been clear?	
<b>Outcomes</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore relevance (3.1.1 of SEC), effectiveness</i>	Is there a clear understanding of the expected outcomes of the SWAP program?  Is there a clear understanding of the expected outcomes of each project?	

<p>(3.1.2 of SEC), efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine if donors are measuring and reporting outcomes throughout project timeframe. Also confirm if midterm review includes all available data.</p>	<p>Have outcomes to date been consistent with the intended impacts of the activity and objective?</p> <p>Is the SWAP on track to achieve objectives?</p> <p>Are projects on track to achieve objectives?</p> <p>Is SWAP on track to achieve objectives within budget?</p> <p>Are projects on track to achieve objectives within budget?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Participation</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if donor organisation has any drivers to resource / implement project, or has faced any barriers to resourcing / implementation.</i></p>	<p>Have project management arrangements for SWAP projects been useful? Efficient? What is working and what is not?</p>	
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if donor ground level insights to improve project impact.</i></p>	<p>Can you identify any ways to improve SWAP?</p> <p>Can you identify ways to improve the cost efficiency of SWAP?</p> <p>What does success look like for you and your team when this SWAP is complete?</p>	
<p><b>Constraints</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if donor ground level insights to mitigate risk at midterm review.</i></p>	<p>What would be a reason why you would not reach your idea of success? Any barriers you could foresee internally or externally?</p>	
<p><b>Politics and organisational objectives</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC).</i></p>	<p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might interfere with the SWAP objectives?</p> <p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might benefit the SWAP objectives?</p> <p>For SWAP,</p>	

<p><i>Determine if donor experiences political or organisational objective barriers.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any indication if the program/project will continue beyond the project timeline?</li> <li>• Can you identify any influential internal factors?</li> <li>• Can you identify any influential external factors?</li> </ul>	
<p>Additional information and stakeholders</p>	<p>A reminder - The purpose of this mid term review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.</p> <p>Is there any additional points you would like to raise or discuss with us?</p> <p>Is there any other stakeholder you believe we should be including in the midterm review?</p>	

**SWAP consultant:**

**15 BACKGROUND**

16 Moderators:

Attendee:

Minutes:

Start:

End:

Major work area:

**MODERATOR INTRODUCTION TO INTERVIEW**

The purpose of this midterm review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.

A standard evaluation criteria is used. MRA will be asking you questions to gain insight from the perspective of a **Consultant**, exploring the relevance of SWAP projects to program objectives, the effectiveness of projects, efficiency and sustainability and impact.

## INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS CONSULTANT

Theme	Prompts / questions	Response
Background	How have you been involved with SWAP?	
Role	Have you played a role in the implementation of SWAP projects?	
Participation objectives  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if consultant wishes to utilise midterm review to implement change – preidentified issues etc.</i>	Why are you participating in the midterm review?  Are there any outcomes you want from the midterm review?	

## QUESTIONS CONSULTANT

	Prompts / questions	Response
SWAP program objectives  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore the relevance (3.1.1 of SEC) of the SWAP program and projects from consultant perspective.</i>	What is your understanding of the SWAP program objectives?  Do you believe the projects implemented in the SWAP program are appropriate to achieve objectives?  Are there any gaps or emerging issues you see that are not captured by the SWAP program projects?	
Project objectives  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore effectiveness (3.1.2 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine</i>	For each project you have worked on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is your understanding of the project objectives?</li> <li>• Were the project objectives been clear?</li> </ul>	



<p><i>if consultant understanding of objectives aligns with funded project objectives and if objectives can be improved.</i></p>		
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore relevance (3.1.1 of SEC), effectiveness (3.1.2 of SEC), efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine if consultants are measuring and reporting outcomes throughout project timeframe. Also confirm if midterm review includes all available data.</i></p>	<p>For each project you have worked on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was there a clear understanding of the expected outcomes of the completed project?</li> <li>• Was there clear reporting and measurement of outcomes?</li> <li>• Have you seen benefits to beneficiaries?</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Participation</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if consultant organisation has any drivers to resource / implement project, or has faced any barriers to resourcing / implementation.</i></p>	<p>For each project you have worked on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were project management arrangements for SWAP projects been useful? Efficient? What is working and what is not?</li> <li>• Were there better ways to engage participation in the project?</li> <li>• Were there barriers to participation in the project?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if consultant ground level insights to improve project impact.</i></p>	<p>For each project you have worked on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can you identify any ways to improve or refine the objectives of the project?</li> <li>• Can you identify any ways to improve this project?</li> <li>• Can you identify ways to improve the cost efficiency of the project?</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Politics and organisational objectives</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions</i></p>	<p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might interfere with the SWAP objectives?</p> <p>Are there any political objectives or other</p>	

<p><i>intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if consultant experiences political or organisational objective barriers.</i></p>	<p>organisations which might benefit the SWAP objectives?</p> <p>Can you identify any influential internal factors in SPREP?</p> <p>Can you identify any influential external factors?</p>	
<p>Additional information and stakeholders</p>	<p>A reminder - The purpose of this mid term review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.</p> <p>Is there any additional points you would like to raise or discuss with us?</p> <p>Is there any other stakeholder you believe we should be including in the midterm review?</p>	

**SWAP Focal Point:**

**17 BACKGROUND**

18 Moderators:

Attendee:

Minutes:

Start:

End:

Major work area:

**MODERATOR INTRODUCTION TO INTERVIEW**

The purpose of this midterm review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.

A standard evaluation criteria is used. MRA will be asking you questions to gain insight from the perspective of a [Focal Point](#), exploring the relevance of SWAP projects to program objectives, the effectiveness of projects, efficiency and sustainability and impact.

## INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS FOCAL POINT

Theme	Prompts / questions	Response
Background	<p>How are you involved with SWAP?</p> <p>When did you start your involvement (month/year)?</p>	
Role	What is your role in the implementation of SWAP projects?	
Participation objectives  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if focal point wishes to utilise midterm review to implement change – preidentified issues etc.</i>	<p>Why are you participating in the midterm review?</p> <p>Are there any outcomes you want from the midterm review?</p>	

## QUESTIONS FOCAL POINT

	Prompts / questions	Response
SWAP program objectives  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore the relevance (3.1.1 of SEC) of the SWAP program and projects from focal point perspective.</i>	<p>What is your understanding of the SWAP program objectives?</p> <p>Do you believe the projects implemented in the SWAP program are appropriate to achieve objectives?</p> <p>Are there any gaps or emerging issues you see that are not captured by the SWAP program projects?</p>	
Project objectives  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore effectiveness (3.1.2 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine if focal point</i>	<p>For each project you work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is your understanding of the project objectives?</li> <li>• Have the project objectives been clear?</li> <li>• Have the project objectives aligned</li> </ul>	

<p><i>understanding of objectives aligns with funded project objectives and if objectives can be improved.</i></p>	<p>with your role objectives? i.e. were they simple to approve/implement internally</p>	
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore relevance (3.1.1 of SEC), effectiveness (3.1.2 of SEC), efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine if focal points are measuring and reporting outcomes throughout project timeframe. Also confirm if midterm review includes all available data.</i></p>	<p>For each project you work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a clear understanding of the expected outcomes of the completed project? What are they?</li> <li>• Which project objectives have been contributed to date?</li> <li>• What have these outcomes been to date?</li> <li>• Have these outcomes been consistent with the intended impacts of the activity and objective?</li> <li>• Have outcomes been formally measured?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Have these measurements been reported to SPREP?</li> <li>○ Do you have data on the number of project beneficiaries?</li> <li>○ What have the benefits been to beneficiaries?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is the project on track to achieve the final objective?</li> <li>• Is the project on track to achieve final objectives within budget?</li> <li>• Have the project objectives been met? Were they met on time? On budget? Why not?</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Participation</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if focal point organisation has any drivers to resource / implement project, or has faced any barriers to resourcing / implementation.</i></p>	<p>For each project you work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have project management arrangements for SWAP projects been useful? Efficient? What is working and what is not?</li> <li>• Has participation in the project benefited your organisation or its broader objectives?</li> <li>• Have there been easy or successful ways to participate the project?</li> <li>• Have there been barriers to</li> </ul>	

	participation in the project?	
<b>Opportunities</b> <i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if focal point ground level insights to improve project impact.</i>	For each project you work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can you identify any ways to improve or refine the objectives of the project?</li> <li>• Can you identify any ways to improve this project?</li> <li>• Can you identify ways to improve the cost efficiency of the project?</li> <li>• What does success look like for you and your team when this project is complete?</li> </ul>	
<b>Constraints</b> <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if focal point ground level insights to mitigate risk at midterm review.</i>	What would be a reason why you would not reach your idea of success? Any barriers you could foresee internally or externally?	
<b>Politics and organisational objectives</b> <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if focal point experiences political or organisational objective barriers.</i>	Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might interfere with the SWAP objectives?  Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might benefit the SWAP objectives?  For SWAP, or each project you work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any indication if the program/project will continue beyond the project timeline?</li> <li>• Can you identify any influential internal factors?</li> <li>• Can you identify any influential external factors?</li> </ul>	
<b>Additional information and stakeholders</b>	A reminder - The purpose of this mid term review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.  Is there any additional points you would like to raise or discuss with us?	

	Is there any other stakeholder you believe we should be including in the midterm review?	
--	--	--

## **SPREP Management:**

### **19 BACKGROUND**

20 Moderators:

Attendee:

Minutes:

Start:

End:

Major work area:

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR MODERATOR**

#### **MODERATOR INTRODUCTION TO INTERVIEW**

The purpose of this midterm review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.

A standard evaluation criteria is used. MRA will be asking you questions to gain insight from the perspective of a [Project Manager](#), exploring the relevance of SWAP projects to program objectives, the effectiveness of projects, efficiency and sustainability and impact.

#### **INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS PROJECT MANAGERS**

Theme	Prompts / questions	Response
Background	How are you involved with SWAP?  When did your involvement start (month/year)?	

<b>Role</b>	What is your role in the implementation of SWAP projects?	
<b>Participation objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if project manager wishes to utilise midterm review to implement change – preidentified issues etc.</i>	From your perspective, are there any outcomes you want from the midterm review?	

## QUESTIONS PROJECT MANAGERS

Prompts / questions	Response
<b>SWAP program objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore the relevance (3.1.1 of SEC) of the SWAP program and projects from project manager perspective.</i>	What is your understanding of the SWAP program objectives?  Do you believe the projects implemented in the SWAP program are appropriate to achieve objectives?  Are there any gaps or emerging issues you see that are not captured by the SWAP program projects?
<b>Project objectives</b>  <i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore effectiveness (3.1.2 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine if project manager understanding</i>	For SWAP, or each project you work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is your understanding of the project objectives?</li> <li>• Have the project objectives been clear?</li> <li>• Have the project objectives aligned with your role objectives? i.e. were they simple to approve/implement internally</li> </ul>

<p><i>of objectives aligns with funded project objectives and if objectives can be improved.</i></p>		
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore relevance (3.1.1 of SEC), effectiveness (3.1.2 of SEC), efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC) of projects from program manager perspective. Determine if project managers are measuring and reporting outcomes throughout project timeframe. Also confirm if midterm review includes all available data.</i></p>	<p>For SWAP, or each project you work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a clear understanding of the expected outcomes? What are they?</li> <li>• Which objectives have been contributed to date?</li> <li>• What have these outcomes been to date?</li> <li>• Have these outcomes been consistent with the intended impacts of the activity and objective?</li> <li>• Have outcomes been formally measured?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are measurements reliably reported to SPREP?</li> <li>○ Do you have data on the number of project beneficiaries?</li> <li>○ What have the benefits been to beneficiaries?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is the program/project on track to achieve final objectives?</li> <li>• Is the program/project on track to achieve final objectives within budget?</li> <li>• Have the project objectives been met? Were they met on time? On budget? Why not?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Participation</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore</i></p>	<p>For SWAP, or each project you work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have project management arrangements the project</li> </ul>	



<p><i>efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if project manager organisation has any drivers to resource / implement project, or has faced any barriers to resourcing / implementation.</i></p>	<p>been useful? Efficient? What is working and what is not?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have you seen benefits to participants?</li> <li>• Has there been successful methods that increased participation?</li> <li>• Have there been barriers to increasing participation?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to determine if project manager ground level insights to improve project impact.</i></p>	<p>For SWAP, or each project you work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can you identify ways to improve or refine the objectives?</li> <li>• Can you identify any ways to improve the program/project?</li> <li>• Can you identify ways to improve cost efficiencies?</li> <li>• What does success look like for you and your team?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Constraints</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if project manager ground level insights to mitigate risk at midterm review.</i></p>	<p>What would be a reason why you would not reach your idea of success? Any barriers you could foresee internally or externally?</p>	
<p><b>Politics and organisational objectives</b></p> <p><i>Purpose: Questions intend to</i></p>	<p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might interfere with the SWAP objectives?</p> <p>Are there any political objectives or other organisations which might</p>	

<p><i>explore efficiency (3.1.3 of SEC) and sustainability and impact (3.1.4 of SEC). Determine if project manager experiences political or organisational objective barriers.</i></p>	<p>benefit the SWAP objectives?          For SWAP, or each project you work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any indication if the program/project will continue beyond the project timeline?</li> <li>• Can you identify any influential internal factors?</li> <li>• Can you identify any influential external factors?</li> </ul>	
<p>Additional information and stakeholders</p>	<p>A reminder - The purpose of this mid term review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management.</p> <p>Is there any additional points you would like to raise or discuss with us?</p> <p>Is there any other stakeholder you believe we should be including in the midterm review?</p>	

## MRA Consulting Group

Suite 408 Henry Lawson Building  
19 Roseby Street  
Drummoyne NSW 2047

+61 2 8541 6169  
info@mraconsulting.com.au  
mraconsulting.com.au

