

Pacific Maritime Boundaries Project (2017-2020)

End of Investment Evaluation

September – October 2020

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION	5
Background to the Evaluation	5
Report Structure	6
Evaluation Methodology	6
Approach to Data Collection	6
Limitations and Reliability of the Data Obtained	6
Ethical Considerations	6
KEY FINDINGS	7
Relevance	7
Results and Lessons Learned	9
Outcome 1: Certainty over Maritime Boundaries and Limits	10
Outcome 2: Information Management	12
Outcome 3: Capacity	13
Outcome 4: Political Will	14
Budget and Institutional Arrangements	15
Budget	15
Institutional Arrangements	17
Gender Equality and Social Inclusion	18
RECOMMENDATIONS	18
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE	19
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION PLAN	27
ANNEX 3: INTERVIEW GUIDE	37

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AGD	Attorney-General’s Department, Australia
CLCS	Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf
CRGA	Committee of Regional Governments and Administrations
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia
DOALOS	Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea
ECS	Extended Continental Shelf
EPOG	Enhancing Pacific Ocean Governance
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FOC	Forum Officials Committee
GA	Geoscience Australia
GEM	Geoscience, Energy and Maritime Division, SPC
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PIC	Pacific Island Country
PIF	Pacific Islands Forum
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PDH	Pacific Data Hub
PMB	Pacific Maritime Boundaries
RBBP	Resilient Boundaries for the Blue Pacific
SPC	Secretariat to the Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention for the Law of the Sea
USYD	The University of Sydney, Australia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Evaluators would like to thank everyone who was consulted for giving their time and for providing valuable insights which informed the findings and recommendations made in this report. Special thanks are extended to Dr Liz Brierley, Robyn Frost and Matthew Teh for their support in providing advice and guidance, relevant documents, and ensuring that the Evaluators had access to a broad range of views and information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Evaluation

This is an independent evaluation of the Pacific Maritime Boundaries (PMB) Project. It was commissioned by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and conducted over September - October 2020. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the project, and to identify areas for improvement in project design and partner arrangements for future work on maritime boundaries in the Pacific.

Approach taken to the Evaluation

This is the first time that an evaluation of the PMB Project has been conducted. The evaluation was completed by three independent evaluators; the methodology featured document review, interviews with key project stakeholders, application of a modified Outcome Harvest methodology, and validation interviews/communications to test findings and clarify details with select stakeholders.

Key Findings

Relevance: There is universal agreement that the project is highly relevant to the needs of Pacific Island countries (PICs) and there is a clear rationale for continued Australian investment. Over the course of the investment, climate change, the COVID-19 pandemic, and political impediments to the completion of outstanding work, have emerged as key challenges prompting a shift in ways of working.

Certainty over Maritime Boundaries: There is evidence of increased certainty relating to maritime boundaries and limits. Progress determining boundaries has continued but slowed in the second half of the investment period. Important technical and legislative work was completed, but no new boundary treaties have been signed by any PICs participating in the project since 2016. Overall, PICs remain committed to progress technical boundaries work, conclude treaties, and review and update domestic legislation. Settling Extended Continental Shelf (ECS) limits, which is technically complex and high cost, is an emerging priority for some PICs and there is demand for assistance.

Information Management: The Secretariat to the Pacific Community (SPC) has developed the Pacific Data Hub (PDH) as the authoritative portal for reliable data on maritime boundaries and regulations in the Pacific. A beta version of the system that houses maritime boundary information is currently undergoing testing and is expected to be launched in December 2020. Once operational, Pacific maritime boundary information will be available to PICs and regional organisations through secure access, and an interactive dashboard will give public access.

Capacity: Consortium Partners bring together a wide range of specialist scientific, technical, and legal expertise and experience from the Pacific region and Australia. Strong and enduring professional relationships and collaboration has been established between Consortium Partners and with PICs. This helps facilitate complementary capacity assistance, that is responsive to the different emerging needs and opportunities of PICs and of regional organisations. Additional human and financial resources and access to technology and information through the Consortium Partners' wider networks and connections with other projects within the region and internationally gives access to additional technical and financial resources and connects the Pacific with relevant global initiatives.

Political Will: Harnessing of political will and diplomatic influence has helped where the process of setting boundaries and negotiation of treaties has stalled or appears to be blocked. Since 2016, no new maritime boundary

treaties have been signed. By building political will in different ways, certain PICs have renewed their commitment and have re-engaged in the process and made progress.

Institutional Arrangements: It is timely to transition the project management and administration role from Geoscience Australia (GA) to SPC, with GA's focus being on technical advice and quality assurance going forward. GA concluded its management function in June 2020, at which time SPC stepped into the project management role, leading on project coordination, communication, and monitoring. While SPC has had only de facto project management responsibility, in effect the transition to SPC seems already to be underway.

Gender Equality and Social Inclusion: Interviews confirmed quite strong participation in the project by women, particularly in legal roles, but also in leadership and technical roles. However, there is no evidence of any strategic approach being applied to gender equality or social inclusion.

Recommendations

This report makes a series of recommendations to DFAT and the Consortium Partners in addressing the key findings of the evaluation. These recommendations are divided into: (1) areas which should be addressed as immediate priorities, (2) areas for the design of the next phase of assistance, (3) design features. These recommendations are intended to inform any future Australian support to assist PICs determine their maritime boundaries.

Immediate priorities

- 1. Hold a roundtable discussion of this report:** DFAT should organise a roundtable meeting to consider the findings and recommendations made in this report. All Consortium Partners should be invited to attend.
- 2. Hold a facilitated workshop for Consortium Partners to develop a transition plan:** Consortium Partners should agree immediate priorities and corresponding strategies and ways of working to focus their efforts over the coming months prior to conclusion of a formal design process for the next phase of assistance.

Design of the next phase of assistance

- 3. Determine a methodology for the formal design process for the next phase of assistance:** DFAT and SPC should jointly determine the process for the new design, which should be a partner-led design by SPC in collaboration with DFAT, GA and the Attorney-General's Department (AGD). There should be strong involvement of Consortium Partners including their representation on the design team, to provide an appropriate mix of technical advice from both Pacific and Australian perspectives.

Design features

- 4. Transition the project management and administration role from GA to SPC, with GA playing a technical and quality assurance role going forward:** DFAT should provide programmatic funding to SPC to manage and administer support for PICs to determine their maritime boundaries. This recognises SPC's capability in managing the project coordination, monitoring, accountability, and communication. The approach also supports localisation and strengthening of Pacific regional organisations. The DFAT representative who manages the relationship with SPC for core funding should be consulted with in the design of the next phase.
- 5. Adjust the project's approach to capacity development and support to PICs that meets the different and specific needs and priorities of each country:** Changes to the project's capacity strengthening approach

should be determined by the Consortium Partners in collaboration with the PICs involved in the project, based on an assessment of their needs and priorities. Changes may include adjusting the regional workshop model (e.g. changing the location and duration of the workshop as well as the number of countries attending and workshop focus (staged or thematic) and approach) and increased focus on national and subregional support. Changes proposed should account for practical considerations including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on travel, travel costs, and access to any technology required to progress work.

- 6. Allocate a portion of project funds for PICs to apply for ECS assistance and investigate mechanisms for PICs to access survey vessels to undertake this work:** The design of the next phase of assistance should make provision for adequate levels of budget to provide the required technical expertise and access to survey data that PICs that are ready to progress ECS work require. Assistance for ECS work should be combined with a diplomatic strategy to support effective engagement with the CLCS.
- 7. Develop a political engagement and influencing strategy:** There is need to recognise the strategic importance and value of appropriately directed political influence on progressing negotiations and agreement of maritime boundaries. Various forms of influencing have occurred in support of progress. Partners recognise its importance and value, but it is not reflected in the current design. A strategy on political influencing should be developed as part of the new design, with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS), among other actors, playing a key role. Experience gained so far from the different types of action undertaken provides a good starting point to inform the strategy.
- 8. Ensure alignment with PIF Leaders' commitments on sea level rise and climate change:** The design should align with relevant PIF Leaders' commitments, project activities should be coordinated with the work of the newly established Forum Officials Committee (FOC) Specialist Sub-Committee on Sea Level Rise in relation to International Law (Terms of Reference for the Sub-Committee are currently being developed).
- 9. Strengthen project governance to improve strategic oversight and accountability:** Project governance should be strengthened in the new design for greater clarity on strategic management and accountabilities between Consortium Partners and with participating PICs and regional organisations. As part of determining governance arrangements, the membership, role, and responsibilities of the Consortium should be reviewed to determine the merit of it being becoming a more formal governance body for the project.
- 10. Develop a gender equality and social inclusion strategy:** There is opportunity to strengthen the approach to addressing gender equality and social inclusion. Development of a gender equality and social inclusion strategy should be incorporated into the design process, and a plan to manage implementation should be developed at the inception of the new phase.
- 11. Strengthen monitoring, evaluation and learning:** Development of a monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) framework based on a project Theory of Change, should be incorporated into the design process to support improved understanding of progress and factors affecting the extent of progress. There is a need to strengthen MEL going forward to capture progress technically, and to better understand the contribution made to strengthening individual and institutional capacity, and in progressing legislation and influencing politically. MEL should also seek to capture how the project supports and reinforces other programs in areas related to and influenced by maritime boundary certainty. Findings and lessons learned should be used as part of a continuous improvement approach and to adjust strategy as needed.

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Evaluation

Since 21 July 2017, investment by the Government of Australia to assist PICs determine their maritime boundaries has taken place primarily through the PMB Project.¹ The project has aimed to contribute to sustainable economic growth, regional security, and food security by maintaining momentum on efforts by PICs to secure maritime jurisdictional rights consistent with international law. Support has been provided to 14 countries through project partners operating as a 'Consortium' in delivering assistance: DFAT, GA, SPC, AGD, The University of Sydney (USYD) and GRID-Arendal.² Consortium Partners have provided legal and technical assistance, delivered through regional workshops held at USYD, in-country visits and workshops, and intersessional advice to countries. The project has also coordinated activities with the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and Commonwealth Secretariat.³

The expected end-of project outcomes are:

- Outcome 1: Greater certainty in relation to maritime boundaries and limits, and the rights, responsibilities and restrictions related to them (including shared boundaries, high seas and ECS)
- Outcome 2: Improved systems for the capture, storage and public use of authoritative maritime boundary and other maritime regulatory information.

Australia's investment in the project concluded by mutual agreed between DFAT and GA on 30 June 2020. It is therefore an appropriate time to undertake an evaluation of progress made over the last three years. This evaluation is timely for four key reasons: first, Australia's work relating to maritime boundaries in the Pacific has continued in various forms for a decade;⁴ original project design elements may no longer be relevant. Second, progress in determining maritime boundaries seems to have slowed and a differing approach may be required to address the changing nature of the challenges faced. Third, Australia is considering future support to determining Pacific maritime boundaries and understanding the effectiveness of the PMB Project as an Official Development Assistance (ODA) investment will shape Australia's future input to this work. Fourth, the project's delivery modality has changed since the COVID-19 pandemic such that the project now looks quite different to its original design.

The stated purpose of the evaluation is two-fold: (1) to evaluate the effectiveness of the PMB Project as an investment under DFAT's ODA, and (2) to identify areas for improvement in project design and partner arrangements for future work on maritime boundaries in the Pacific.⁵ The findings in both areas are intended to inform any future Australian support for securing Pacific maritime boundaries.

¹ The Australia-funded PMB Project involves support from GA, AGD, SPC, GRID-Arendal, the University of Sydney and DFAT. This is the focus of the evaluation and this document. Separately, SPC has a PMB Project of which the Australia-funded PMB Project is a part but which involves multiple donor investments and a larger grouping of partners.

² The partners to the Australia-funded PMB Project are DFAT, GA, AGD, SPC and USYD — these partners operate as a 'Consortium' in delivering assistance. There is also a wider group of Consortium Partners through SPC's PMB Project which includes those organisations mentioned directly above as well as the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Commonwealth Secretariat, PIFS/Office of the Pacific Ocean Commissioner, and FFA, additional to the core group of this investment. Note, the evaluation revealed that since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been a convergence of the two Consortiums; interviews did not reveal any distinction between the two.

³ Investment Design: Pacific Maritime Boundaries, 2017.

⁴ Prior to the PMB Project, support for PICs to determine their maritime boundaries was provided through the Enhancing Pacific Ocean Governance (EPOG) Project (2014-2017). Prior to the EPOG Project, support for maritime boundaries work was provided through the Australian Government's Public Sector Linkages Program.

⁵ Terms of Reference: Pacific Maritime Boundaries End of Investment Evaluation.

Report Structure

This document sets out the findings of the PMB Project End of Investment Evaluation conducted over September – October 2020. While the primary audience is DFAT, it is a short, concise report intended for wide readership by Consortium Partners. It responds to the five key evaluation questions,⁶ and features recommendations for future investment in establishing maritime boundaries in the Pacific. Evaluation findings with respect to results and lessons learned are presented through four case studies of four outcome areas.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation was conducted by three independent consultants whose Terms of Reference is set out in Annex 1. The detailed evaluation methodology is in Annex 2.

Approach to Data Collection

To answer the evaluation questions, the methodology featured a mixed-methods approach involving: review of project documentation and other relevant policy and development aid program documents from the Pacific region; 20 semi-structured interviews with project stakeholders (all Consortium Partners and some representatives of PICs involved in the project) conducted over Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic; application of Outcome Harvest methodology;⁷ and validation meetings/communications to test findings and clarify details with select stakeholders.

Limitations and Reliability of the Data Obtained

The main limitations of the data collected are: (1) the evaluators were only able to interview representatives of four PICs (Federated States of Micronesia, Samoa, Vanuatu and Tonga) of the 14 countries supported through the project, though a larger number of country representatives were invited to participate; (2) there is limited robust monitoring and evaluation evidence available on which to base an assessment of project progress.

Ethical Considerations

The Evaluators started each interview with a clear description of the purposes of the evaluation and that their participation was voluntary. The Evaluators emphasised that information provided would be treated confidentially, and that there would be no direct attribution of views to any individual. Attribution of information shared by specific countries was also minimised. Given that most stakeholders were very open about their views and were prepared to provide a critical assessment of the project, the Evaluators consider that this approach was successful.

⁶ Q1: How relevant was the work of the PMB Project to the needs of PICs? Q2: What progress was made in the delivery of outputs and achievement of outcomes described in the PMB Project framework? What factors affected the achievement of results? Q3: To what extent were the PMB Project's budget and institutional arrangements fit for purpose? Q4: What contribution, if any, did the PMB Project make to gender equality and social inclusion? Could anything be changed going forward? Q5: What are the lessons learned from PMB Project support for maritime boundaries in the Pacific? (a) What changes, if any, are recommended by stakeholders for future support, and for future project design and delivery? (b) What has worked well and what have been the challenges or limitations?

⁷ Outcome Harvest methodology was applied as a framework to guide the analysis and validation of information collected through enquiry undertaken for each of the evaluation questions. This methodology is a simple and systematic way to enable respondents to identify, formulate, verify, analyse, and interpret outcomes, particularly in programming contexts where relations of cause and effect are complex or depend on a range of factors.

KEY FINDINGS

Relevance

During the evaluation interviews, stakeholders were asked about the relevance of the project to the needs of PICs, and whether there are any new issues, challenges or priorities that have emerged over the past three years that any future project support should consider. Their responses show universal agreement that the project is highly relevant to the needs of PICs and there is a clear rationale for continued Australian investment. Over the course of the investment, climate change, the COVID-19 pandemic, and political impediments to the completion of outstanding work, have emerged as key challenges prompting a shift in ways of working.

The rationale for providing support for determining maritime boundaries and limits is set out in the Investment Design: maritime resources are the largest natural resource base for the Pacific. Maritime resources support government revenues, employment, livelihoods, and food security, so enabling PICs to access and manage such resources within each State's maritime zones is vital. Also, determining maritime boundaries and enacting maritime zones legislation provides States with a certain and precise basis for the governance of their own maritime zones, and co-operation with neighbouring States.⁸

Further, since establishing maritime boundaries sets the foundations for clear zone-based rights, this enables economic development opportunities that can benefit women and men (e.g. women may participate in coastal fisheries and onshore fish processing industries). The potential of the project to assist in private sector development can in turn promote positive outcomes for employment and livelihoods; and increased certainty of maritime jurisdictions improves the quality of the investment and business environments in the affected countries, enabling countries to take advantage of development opportunities from the use of the ocean and its resources.⁹ Each of these factors confirming the project's relevance were mentioned by respondents in interviews.

The Investment Design explains that uncertainty in Pacific maritime boundaries has various consequences for the region: difficulty in fisheries management and enforcement without certainty of a State's exclusive economic zones; environmental management responsibilities are unclear; and commercial investment in the region, including seabed mining and fishing, is impeded by uncertainty of State's jurisdictional rights to resources.¹⁰ These factors were also raised in interviews, confirming the ongoing relevance of the project to the needs of PICs.

The above paragraphs underscore the relevance of development assistance for securing maritime boundaries in the Pacific. There is a clear rationale for continued Australian investment in this area: interviews revealed demand for Australian engagement. Australian expertise through GA, AGD, and USYD is highly regarded. There is demand for their continued involvement in future Pacific maritime boundaries work and evidence that regional organisations (notably, SPC and PIFS) are supportive of Australia continuing to provide support.¹¹ Interviews also confirmed the

⁸ Adapted from Investment Design: Pacific Maritime Boundaries, 2017, pp.1-4.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ The Investment Design identifies other factors prompting Australian engagement in Pacific maritime boundaries, though these were not mentioned in interviews: (1) Pacific Step-up: certainty of maritime jurisdictional rights in the Pacific contributes to Australia's national interest in building a robust regional security system, improving regional border, fisheries, maritime security and law-enforcement cooperation: all of which must be underpinned by known

geopolitical rationale for engagement flagged in the Investment Design in terms of the diplomatic, legal and security risks of uncertainty of maritime boundaries. The logic is that promoting a consistent regional practice for declaring boundaries, underpinned by technical rigour, will contribute to long-term stability in the region.

Over the course of the investment, the importance of establishing maritime boundaries and zones consistent with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) has grown given the region's increased attention to the impacts of sea level rise and climate change on PICs.¹² Respondents reported that recent, reinvigorated commitments of Pacific Island Forum (PIF) Leaders to secure maritime boundaries in the face of sea level rise and climate change has given urgency to this issue and elevated maritime boundaries work to the political level.

Of note is the 2019 Pacific Island Forum (PIF) Leaders commitment to develop international law such that once established consistently with UNCLOS, a coastal state's maritime zones and boundaries should not be required to be amended as a result of changes to the coastline caused by sea level rise and climate change.¹³ Also, in October 2020 PIF Foreign Ministers endorsed, in-principle, the establishment of the FOC Specialist Sub-Committee on Sea Level Rise in relation to International Law: one stated focus area of the Sub-Committee is to support outstanding maritime claims. So, the project's continuing relevance and alignment with regional priorities on climate change is clear. Relatedly, there are synergies between the PMB Project and the Resilient Boundaries for the Blue Pacific (RBBP) Project; the RBBP Project's objective is to assess and address the legal and technical implications of climate change on maritime zones. Continued investment in the PMB Project complements and reinforces the RBBP Project and vice versa.

The PIF Leaders' commitments on maritime boundaries have in turn made maritime boundaries a priority issue for PIFS, particularly for the International Legal Team. Over the past 18 months, PIFS has become more active in the Consortium. There seems to be an evolving role for PIFS in building capacity and political will in support of PICs securing their maritime boundaries.¹⁴ This role could involve providing legal advice to countries on determining their maritime boundaries, in coordination with and complementing the legal advisory role played by AGD, and influencing to build political will. One view reflected is that the PIFS International Legal Team could engage countries on legal aspects of maritime boundaries on a high level, strategic plane. There is opportunity in the PIFS International Legal Team providing legal advice to countries in terms of enhancing the quality and accessibility of legal advice available to countries, as one respondent explained: *"two eyes are better than one"*. This approach also supports localisation as well as sustainability by strengthening regional organisations. It would also inform and complement PIFS' efforts to influence politically.

and identifiable borders in the maritime domain; (2) continuity of Australian support is considered helpful to maintain in-region commitment and momentum; (3) Strategy for Australia's aid investments in agriculture, fisheries and water: Certainty in individual States' fisheries rights, and development of improved systems for fisheries data management and sharing supports Strategic Objectives One (Increase contributions to national economic output) and Two (Enhance food, nutrition and water security) of the Strategy for Australia's Aid Investments in Agriculture, Fisheries and Water, and contribute to Pillar 3 (Promoting effective policy, governance and reform).

¹² Draft Final Aid Quality Check for Assisting PICs to secure their Maritime Jurisdictional Rights under international law, 2020.

¹³ Fiftieth Pacific Islands Forum Funafuti, Tuvalu, 13 – 16 August 2019, Forum Communiqué, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Kainaki II Declaration for Urgent Climate Change Action Now, para 14.

¹⁴ Note that there is a capacity issue in terms of the PIFS International Legal Team only having two lawyers who provide legal advice and support to PIFS on a range of legal issues, beyond maritime boundaries.

There is opportunity for increased focus to be given to building political will for countries to conclude their maritime boundaries work. Certainly, the provision of technical and legal support through the project has been the right thing to do. This is because there are bilateral boundaries remaining to be settled, and some PICs also have ECS claims. Technical and legal support has been and continues to be required for countries to make progress towards completion of the remaining boundaries. However, progress in the second half of the investment (over the past 18 months) has slowed as much of the outstanding work has political impediments to its completion and it is not only a matter of Consortium Partners providing legal and technical assistance.¹⁵ This issue will be explored in more detail below, in the Results and Lessons Learned section. It should be noted also that while technical and legal support has been relevant to the needs of PICs, as countries progress their maritime boundaries work, their needs and priorities are evolving such that the modality and methodology of assistance may need to be adjusted in the next phase. Further, the next phase could be further tailored as the participating countries are at quite varying stages on the maritime boundaries pathway, which require different kinds of action and support.

The COVID-19 pandemic has arguably increased the project's relevance as PICs come to rely more heavily on their maritime resources (e.g. fisheries for food security and economic development) due to the decline in revenue from tourism.¹⁶ However, the pandemic has meant that regional workshops, in-country visits and other face-to-face advice has not been possible due to international travel restrictions, such that the project has shifted to online communication. Some respondents reported that this has been a satisfactory interim measure, however it is not a model recommended over the longer-term as the project relies on strong relationships, forged through face-to-face contact, to progress outcomes. One unintended, noteworthy impact of the pandemic is that as GA concluded its support, SPC assumed the project coordination role and commenced hosting monthly Consortium Partner meetings. This has created momentum on maritime boundaries work, improved communication and established SPC in a project management role. This is returned to below in the discussion of the project's institutional arrangements.

Results and Lessons Learned

The absence of a MEL framework and paucity of output and outcome monitoring data has significantly limited the extent to which a robust assessment of project results can be completed. A modified Outcome Harvest methodology was used as a framework to guide analysis of information collected from interviews.

Case study analysis of four outcome areas is presented in this section of the report. Two of the case studies are the expected end-of-project outcomes (set out in the introduction to this report). Outcome 1 is on maritime boundary certainty, and outcome 2 is on systems for storage, access and use of authoritative information on maritime boundaries. Two further outcome areas were selected for analysis; they were frequently raised during the informant interviews: outcome 3 relates to the high-quality technical capacity on maritime boundaries that the project has made accessible to the Pacific. Outcome 4, on political engagement and influencing, has emerged as an increasingly important enabler for triggering and maintaining progress on maritime boundary agreements.

¹⁵ Draft Final Aid Quality Check for Assisting PICs to secure their Maritime Jurisdictional Rights under international law, 2020.

¹⁶ DFAT, *Partnerships for Recovery: Australia's Covid-19 Development Response*, 2020.

Outcome 1: Certainty over Maritime Boundaries and Limits

There is evidence of increased certainty relating to maritime boundaries and limits. Progress determining boundaries has continued but slowed in the second half of the investment period. Important technical and legislative work has been completed,¹⁷ but no new boundary treaties have been signed by any PICs participating in the project since 2016. Overall, PICs remain committed to progress technical boundaries work, conclude treaties, and review and update domestic legislation. Settling Extended Continental Shelf (ECS) limits, which is technically complex and high cost, is an emerging priority for some PICs and there is demand for assistance.

The main contributors to this outcome

- **PICs have contributed to the process in different ways depending on the country situation and resources:** The governments have contributed resources for personnel time, office space, equipment and technology and some have established a national coordination mechanism to take carriage of maritime boundary issues.
- **SPC, Geoscience Energy and Maritime (GEM) Division:** SPC has provided dedicated technical and administrative staff time (from SPC core budget and European Union project funds). Also, since March 2020 when GA ceased its management and administrative responsibilities, SPC has taken on project administration and coordination responsibilities.
- **PIFS International Legal Team:** Provides legal advice and inputs at national and regional levels on maritime boundary matters, and **OPOC** facilitates communication and access to the Pacific Ocean Commissioner /Secretary General (SG) of PIFS.
- **Australian Consortium Partners:** Australian Partners (GA, AGD, USYD) have provided a range of high-quality expertise and experience on maritime boundary issues.
 - **Geoscience Australia (GA): Staff have specialist technical expertise and experience** in obtaining and preparing evidence required for the settling of maritime jurisdictions; offers **access to high quality technical data and expertise in its application** for the purposes of setting certain boundaries; and **connections with leading global scientific and technical networks** that are leading on innovative and cutting-edge work in the subject matters.

¹⁷ The Draft Final Aid Quality Check for Assisting PICs to secure their Maritime Jurisdictional Rights under international law, 2020 details progress on maritime boundaries technical work between July 2017 – June 2020 as follows: Baselines data finalised: 6 PICs: Vanuatu (2018), Solomon Islands (2018), Samoa (updates in 2018), FSM (2018), Cook Islands (revised 2018-2019), Tonga (noting this is yet to be signed off by Tonga); Charts and schedules of coordinates produced: 4 treaties: Solomon Islands-Fiji (2019), Tonga-Samoa (2018), Tonga-Niue (2018), Tonga-US (American Samoa). Also Tonga, Samoa and the US have reached in-principle agreement on their tripoint (2018) and Tonga, Niue and the US agreed to a minor adjustment to their tripoint in 2018; Treaties signed by States: 0 treaties; Treaties entered into force: 2 treaties: US-Kiribati (July 2019) and US-FSM (July 2019); Treaty information deposited: FSM (US treaty in 2019). The same document also details the following progress on national maritime boundaries legislation: Baselines data finalised: Nauru (review 2020); draft legislation finalised: Nauru (2019 proclamation); Draft legislation presented to Parliament: PNG (2018), FSM (2018), Cook Islands (2018), Nauru (amendments 2019) and FSM (2019); Legislation commenced: 5 instruments: PNG (2018), FSM (2018), Cook Islands (2018), Nauru (2019 amendments) and FSM (2019); Other Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS) deposits: 3 deposits: Samoa deposited Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone limits (2018), Tuvalu deposited limits for Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf in 2019 and Vanuatu deposited limits for Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf in 2019.

- **USYD, Maritime Studies institute, School of Geosciences and GRID-Arendal: A senior staff member** who has specialist technical expertise and experience and strong international connections through research, academic and program advisory roles; and **mapping and printing technology** that is not available in the Pacific and is made available to PICs during the Sydney workshop.
- **AGD, Office of International Law: Dedicated staff time** on technical advice (by request) to PICs and SPC on national legislation, UNCLOS, treaty negotiation and implementation, and enforcement of boundaries; **support to SPC in design of learning and communication materials** on maritime boundary processes; and sharing Australia's experience on treaty negotiations and legislation.
- **DFAT: Investment of ODA and staff time** to provide strategic advice and management support; and **access to additional resources** through DFAT and from other investments (e.g. RBBP Project).

Key strategies used to achieve this outcome

- **Regular collaboration at regional workshops** hosted by USYD for two weeks every eight to nine months that brings together representatives from different PICs, regional organisations, and Australian and international technical advisors in a practical working forum.
- **Access and practical experience in the use of specialist technology available at USYD** to generate reliable data points and boundary maps that meet international standards and are required to progress lodging of boundaries and for treaty negotiations.
- **Multi-pronged and adaptive approach to capacity strengthening** that offers technical and legal inputs and is supported by wider political and diplomatic influence.

Significance and implications

- **Capacity within PICs and regional organisations has been strengthened** on maritime boundaries and limits issues and in treaty negotiations and implementation to a level that enables certain areas of work to continue without the need for or with reduced inputs from Australian Partners.
- **Ongoing support is needed to sustain regional capacity** to continue current work and respond to and manage emerging priorities for PICs, for example on defining and completing submission of ECS limits.
- **Strong and trusted relationships have been established between PICs and with regional organisations:** There is a common understanding and shared commitment to the process which assists progress on treaty negotiations, joint submissions on agreements, and in related areas of work on maritime boundaries and ocean management in the Pacific. Project support has also facilitated collaborative relationships of peer-to-peer learning, enabling lessons to be learnt from the experience of other PICs.

Key lessons learned

- **Effective management of the different stages and needs of countries** requires a more targeted and nuanced approach that is based on assessment of each country's specific status and context.
- **Reaching certainty on boundaries is an unpredictable and lengthy process** that requires long-term, sustained commitment and a flexible approach.

- **Regional workshops offer dedicated time for participants to focus on progressing their maritime boundaries work**, and access technical, legal, and collegial support and advice. Interviews confirm regional workshops have proven effective in periodically focusing effort of all participants and maintaining momentum for negotiations.
- **Different types of ongoing support at a national level and with individuals that is accessible and responsive to emerging needs** helps keep up momentum of the process and supports progress.
- **Joint work between PICs at regional workshops has helped create trust and supported a greater openness** for information sharing on boundary matters.
- **The strong relationships established over long-term engagement between participants and Consortium Partners has helped the transition to remote work in 2020** since the advent of COVID-19 restrictions.

Outcome 2: Information Management

SPC has developed the PDH as the authoritative portal for reliable and current data on maritime boundaries and regulations in the Pacific. A beta version of the system that houses maritime boundary information is currently undergoing testing and is expected to be launched in December 2020. Once operational, Pacific maritime information will be available to PICs and regional organisations through secure access, and an interactive dashboard will give public access. SPC is collaborating with FFA to integrate fisheries data into the PDH. Ultimately, all ocean related data from the Pacific is planned to be deposited and made accessible through the system. The PDH has evolved over the duration of this investment from the initial work undertaken through collaboration between SPC, GA, USYD and GRID-Arendal to establish an administrative infrastructure and capability for the region on boundary dissemination (PacGeo). The shift to PDH came about due to its fit with an established regional system that is technically managed and administered by SPC.

The main contributors to this outcome

- **SPC (GEM Division)** is leading the development and testing of PDH and the dashboard. It will be responsible for ongoing data management quality control and user access.
- **DFAT allocated specific funding** (AUD 39,893) through an agreement with SPC in June 2020 for design and technical development services of the front facing Dashboard that is part of the SPC PDH.
- **PICs and regional organisations** contribute boundary information and are support testing of the system.

Key strategies used to achieve this outcome

- **Project leadership by SPC** to ensure the design specifications and ongoing management of the system aligns with the technical capacity and resources available in the region.
- **Dedicated budget for system design and development to support** its technical quality.

Significance and implications

- **PDH provides a secure and accessible storage place for Pacific maritime boundary information and related information** that can be easily accessed and updated by the users of the system in the region.
- **Accessible information will help increase awareness and understanding** and contribute to progress by PICs on their maritime boundary work.

- **Quality information that satisfies international standards provides a strong and enduring foundation** that will benefit the work of PICs and regional organisations.
- **Public access to information may increase awareness and understanding** on maritime and ocean issues.

Key lessons learned

- **Budget allocation for the activity enabled SPC to dedicate specific personnel and technical inputs** to develop the dashboard component of the system.
- **A design specification that integrates the existing SPC system is cost efficient to set up and manage** and increases the likelihood of sustainability rather than PacGeo that would require ongoing external technical assistance.
- **Local leadership by SPC increases regional commitment and ownership** and increases the likely willingness of PICs and regional organisations to share data.

Outcome 3: Capacity

The Consortium Partners bring together a wide range of specialist scientific, technical, and legal expertise and experience from the Pacific region and Australia. Strong and enduring professional relationships and collaboration has been established between Partners and with PICs. This helps facilitate complementary capacity assistance, that is responsive to the different emerging needs and opportunities of PICs and of regional organisations. Additional human and financial resources and access to technology and information through the Consortium Partners' wider networks and connections with other projects within the region and internationally gives access to additional technical and financial resources and connects the Pacific with relevant global initiatives.

The main contributors to this outcome

- **SPC convenes Consortium** meetings and facilitates coordination and communication between Consortium Partners and with PICs.
- **Regional organisations** (SPC, PIFS, FFA) contribute personnel and funding.
- **Australian Partners** (DFAT, AGD, GA, and USYD) provide technical advice and training and additional technical, financial and information resources mobilised through their own institutional and professional networks.

The key strategies used to achieve this outcome

- **Regular communication and coordination meetings between Consortium Partners** that has been increased to monthly since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and SPC assuming a larger role in project administration.
- **Fostering the Consortium as a 'community of practice' and a resource** on maritime boundary issues for the Pacific, rather than formalising its structure and function.
- **Retaining consistency of membership** by institutions and individuals over the long-term.
- **The Pacific region has a high-quality, knowledgeable and well-connected 'community of practice'** on maritime boundaries that meets the current needs of PICs and has capacity to support PICs on emerging priorities, for example, the work on ECS and the S121 Standard.

- **The international connections of Consortium Partners** help to raise awareness and gives voice to Pacific priorities and concerns at international forums and decision-making bodies.
- **The Partners bring additional resources that leverages the scale and scope of the project's activities** and provides a strong basis for sustainability of capacity.

Key lessons learned

- **An informal 'community of practice' rather than a formally organised 'Consortium'** has promoted openness in exchange and communication and has helped manage risks related to concern over mandate creep between Partners.
- **Long-term commitment and engagement** have helped generate trust and understanding between Partners.
- **Increased frequency of Consortium meetings (monthly since March 2020)** has strengthened coordination, cooperation and understanding between Partners and helped manage the adjustments required given the change in operating context.

Outcome 4: Political Will

Harnessing of political will and diplomatic influence has helped where the process of setting boundaries and negotiation of treaties has stalled or appears to be blocked. Since 2016, no new treaties have been signed and only FSM (in 2019) and Cook Islands (in October 2020) had completed their maritime boundaries. By building political will in different ways, certain PICs have renewed their commitment and have re-engaged in the process and made progress.

The main contributors to this outcome

- **PIF leaders through their public declarations, commitments, and communiqués** that emphasise the economic, social, and environmental importance of determining maritime boundaries.
- **Senior members of PIFS (the SG and Deputy SG)** applying soft diplomacy and influence with other PIF members and with other bordering countries.
- **PIFS through OPOC** facilitates communication of technical information and advice to support engagement and influence of leaders.
- **PIFS International Legal Team** has direct links to leaders, and with national colleagues and other regional agencies through their contributions on legal issues.
- **DFAT** by raising the importance of finalising maritime boundaries in senior officials talks/meetings.
- **Commonwealth Secretariat** use of its diplomatic access to PICs leaders.
- **AGD** by contributing to briefing for the SG on the progress of countries on their maritime boundaries.

Key strategies used to achieve this outcome

- **National workshops** that bring in cross-government engagement at different levels and other stakeholders serves to increase prominence and improve understanding and commitment at different levels of government to maritime boundary issues and on related policy agendas.

- **Regional workshops** provide a neutral location for informal discussions and negotiations between PICs and with other States to take place, and if required, access to technical advice and support of the process.
- **Individual meetings and briefing at ministerial level** led by national technical teams.
- **The influence and commitment of PIFS leadership** to convey formally and informally to Pacific leaders the need to prioritise setting boundaries.
- **Seeking opportunities for different forms of diplomatic engagement** including on the side of high-level meetings between Pacific leaders, and during the Sydney workshop meetings with representatives from countries with boundary interests in the Pacific.

The significance and implications of the outcome

- **Greater focus and more strategic approach in political and diplomatic engagement** can support progress of boundary and treaty issues that stalled, often due to sensitive and complex issues between States.
- **The commitment of the Pacific leaders to maritime boundaries** gives PIFS the mandate to take a lead role to engage politically on the matter.
- **PIFS membership of the Consortium of Partners** (though OPOC and Legal Team) provides an effective point to strengthen coordination and communication between the technical, legal, and political aspects that relate to maritime boundaries.

Key lessons learned

- **Political engagement is one key part of a multifaceted approach** that also includes technical and legal inputs to progress the long-term process of achieving certainty of maritime boundaries and limits.
- **Political processes generally take longer than technical processes** and to be effective requires commitment to long-term strategic engagement based on strong context specific understanding and knowledge.
- **Political advocacy and influence** may take place at different levels and points of influence of government and engage Pacific and non-Pacific actors.
- **Access to and engagement with key decision-makers and other influential actors** helps build commitment and supports progress.
- **Robust evidence on maritime boundaries** supports effective advocacy and influence of political will.

Budget and Institutional Arrangements

Budget

The three-year project budget is AUD 1,981,213. Based on the final acquittal prepared by GA and submitted to DFAT, the overall expenditure to the end of 2020 is about 33% underspent. Some of the underspent budget (AUD 39,893) has been reallocated (in June 2020) to SPC to support the design of the PDH Dashboard.

GA, which had responsibility for administering the project budget, reported certain challenges in acquitting and reporting on expenses. Challenges were attributed to timing issues associated with the transition (in the first year) of certain inputs and costs from the EPOG Project, and delays in receiving accurate invoices from SPC, attributed to SPC staff having responsibility for management and administration of other projects.

Consortium Partners have very little visibility of the project budget and expenditure and were unable to comment with any certainty on the extent to which the amount and allocation to different activities and inputs was appropriate. Overall, Consortium Partners and the participating PICs did not identify any specific areas or activities that were insufficiently funded. Indeed, they more often noted the responsiveness and flexibility of funding available for activities, for example funding being made available for an additional PIC representative (government staff) to participate in the regional workshops, and availability of financial support for a national workshop.

Certain Australian Partners did express concern that the full cost recovery of staff salaries commensurate with the time spent on the project did not occur. This matter was mentioned by GA, but ultimately not followed up. SPC staff are currently funded through SPC's core budget and through the Pacific-European Union Marine Partnership. DFAT recognises that provision for SPC staff costs may need to be made in future phases. Previous reviews of SPC such as the Independent External Review of 2012,¹⁸ noted the importance of providing core funding versus project funding to facilitate flexibility and capacity to attract and retain high quality staff. This is an issue that should be addressed in the design of future support.

Most Consortium Partners provide supplementary resources to support various project inputs and activities. This support is drawn from organisational operational budgets and from specific donor funded investments. There is no centralised mechanism for capturing the value and type of additional contributions. Anecdotally, Consortium Partners are supporting a range of activities including travel for PIC team members for workshops and treaty negotiations, paying for academic consultants, and covering staff salaries and associated costs for participating in the project. There is insufficient monitoring data to complete a Value for Money assessment. Based on the anecdotal evidence available, additional contributions clearly benefit the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the project implementation and results.

Reliance on contributions from Partners for certain project inputs has created challenges. The Commonwealth Secretariat ceased its funding, limiting progress on ECS work. Additional funding through the project budget enabled some ECS work to continue, though some elements of the ECS work were only able to continue if countries financed this work themselves and/or sought funding through the United Nations Trust Fund established to assist developing countries prepare and defend ECS submissions before the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf (CLCS). During the evaluation interviews, stakeholders flagged the value and relevance of assistance for ECS work in the next phase, including support for ECS submissions to the CLCS and determining ownership, management, and administration of ECS zones following a CLCS recommendation. Evaluation findings confirm the recommendation in the draft Final Aid Quality Check for contingent funding for ECS work:

One area that has been difficult to accommodate within the existing project design is the ECS work where countries are required to fit in with the lengthy delays of the CLCS and increased demands from the CLCS for more expensive survey data. This area involved a high degree of expertise, which is not available in many PICs and requires expensive external consultants and access to vessels for survey work... One way to accommodate for this expensive stop-start work would be to allocate a portion of the project funds available for PICs to apply for ECS assistance and investigate mechanisms for PIC's to access to survey vessels to undertake this work.¹⁹

¹⁸ Independent External Review of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2012.

¹⁹ Draft Final Aid Quality Check for Assisting PICs to secure their Maritime Jurisdictional Rights under international law, 2020.

Partner contributions have supported flexible and responsive action and have assisted in creating cost efficiencies for the project. However, in the next phase as part of strengthening planning, monitoring and accountability processes, strengthening the financial management mechanism would further enhance cost efficiencies. It would also provide a clearer picture of the real scale of investment needed to implement the project and would help manage risks related to shortfalls and changes in funding. It is important that sufficient resources are allocated to support on-time and accurate financial management of the project.

Institutional Arrangements

Transition of project management responsibility to SPC

There is agreement that it is timely to change the project management arrangements. Most informants expressed an interest in the project management and administration role transitioning from GA to SPC, with GA focus being on technical advice and quality assurance going forward. When GA concluded its management function in June 2020, SPC stepped into the project management role, leading on project coordination, communication, and monitoring. While SPC has had only de facto project management responsibility, in effect the transition to SPC seems already to be underway. For example, SPC has been coordinating monthly Consortium Partner meetings and facilitating communication and sharing updates on progress with Partners. SPC staff acknowledge the support that DFAT provided that has assisted effective transition.

Core funding, or funding through the SPC workplan, would enable SPC to respond flexibly to the needs and priorities of PICs participating in the project. Risk management is built into a core funding approach through the existing Audit Committee and oversight provided by SPC's governing body, including the Committee of Regional Governments and Administrations (CRGA). DFAT could agree contractual arrangements with Australian Partners (AGD, GA and USYD) to account for staff time and costs associated with providing advice such as travel costs. This approach supports localisation and strengthening of a Pacific regional organisation, in support of sustainability.

The experience of transitioning program management and administration roles from the Bureau of Meteorology and GA to SPC (and SPREP) in the Climate and Oceans Support Program in the Pacific is instructive. The experience points to the importance of thorough planning for a smooth transition, and identification of any blockages or gaps to be mitigated such as staff capacity and finance systems and policies being fit-for-purpose for project requirements.

Consortium delivery model

The use of a 'Consortium' of partners has allowed for a range of expertise to be brought to the project — respondents emphasised the value and effectiveness of this approach. Also, the 'Consortium' approach has the advantage of "multiplying the impact of the core funding provided by DFAT and continuity in the program during the gaps between funding tranches".²⁰ The evaluation findings confirm the recommendation in the Final Aid Quality Check that "[g]iven the wide range of stakeholders in the Consortium, maintaining engagement and momentum

²⁰ Draft Final Aid Quality Check for Assisting PICs to secure their Maritime Jurisdictional Rights under international law, 2020.

requires a large allocation of resources. Any future iteration of the project will benefit from adequate funding for strong central coordination” — this is a role SPC appears to be stepping into.²¹

Further, through the evaluation interviews, the value of strengthening project governance became clear. Interviews revealed an opportunity for the Consortium to take on a stronger role in the project governance. This issue could be explored in the design of the next phase of assistance, including assessing the merits of formalising the current Consortium, or a subset of the Consortium, which may require reconfiguring as well clarity over roles and responsibilities of each partner.

Gender Equality and Social Inclusion

Although gender and social inclusion were addressed in the design document, there is no evidence of any strategic approach being applied. The Investment Design provides that “throughout the project, data on gender matters will be collected to facilitate effective consideration of gender equality objectives in evaluation and reporting”.²² However, this did not occur. Also, the Investment Design explains that during the detailed development of the program, partners “will be asked to consider opportunities and potential barriers for the participation of people with disabilities”.²³ It was foreshadowed that this may lead to the development of a strategy or other measures to facilitate participation of people with disabilities, however this too did not occur.

Interviews confirmed quite strong participation in the project by women, particularly in legal roles, but also in leadership and technical roles. In the invitation letters sent to participating countries for the most recent regional workshop in 2019,²⁴ SPC encouraged country partners to pursue a “fair, inclusive and gender balanced selection of participants” — anecdotally, this influenced selection increasing the number of female participants.²⁵ At this workshop, SPC tracked the percentage of women participating in the workshop at 30%. The women’s leadership lunches held at each Sydney workshop were also acknowledged by respondents as effective ways of bringing women together. It was overall agreed that opportunities to continue to address gender equality should continue. No specific inputs around disability inclusion took place.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report makes a series of recommendations to DFAT and the Consortium Partners in addressing the above findings. The recommendations are set out above at the end of the Executive Summary.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Investment Design: Pacific Maritime Boundaries, 2017, p. 10.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ 19th Pacific Islands Maritime Boundaries and Limits Development Working Session, 25th November – 6th December 2019.

²⁵ The following language around gender equality and social inclusion was included in the regional workshop invitation: “The Pacific Community is committed towards common principles and goals such as social inclusion and gender equality. We also acknowledge the various Pacific Leader’s commitments towards gender equality. In this regard, the promotion of more Pacific women accessing capacity building opportunities and participating in decision-making processes remain important priorities, nationally and regionally. Thus, we would like to support and encourage our country partners in pursuing a fair, inclusive and gender balanced selection of participants”.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

GOALS AND OUTCOMES

Goals of the PMB Evaluation will be to:

1. Evaluate the effectiveness the PMB Project as an investment under DFAT's Official Development Assistance (ODA).
2. Identify areas for improvement in program design and partner arrangements for future work on maritime boundaries in the Pacific.

Outcomes will be:

1. An Evaluation Report detailing the findings of this Review.
2. 'Lessons learnt' from the PMB Project—in the Report and/or as a virtual workshop—as recommendations for future program design for DFAT's continuing investment in establishing maritime boundaries in the Pacific, and future reporting frameworks between key Australian and regional partners.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The PMB Evaluation will assess performance of the PMB Project to its end on 30 June 2020, considering:

- The high-level objectives and expected results of the PMB Project from its inception in July 2017, and relevant PMB Project work/results prior (see further under 'Background', below).
- Key deliverables from the PMB Activity Schedule and governance architecture.
- Budget and institutional arrangements across key partners and target stakeholders including GA, the Australian Government Attorney General's Department (AGD), the Pacific Community (SPC), the University of Sydney (USYD), GRID-Arendal, the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Association (FFA), and key Pacific island countries (PICs).

Items out of scope of the Review include:

- The performance of previous PMB-related programs on securing maritime boundaries in the Pacific (including the Australian Government's Enhancing Pacific Ocean Governance Project (EPOG))—though the PMB Evaluation may consider the legacy of previous investments over the previous decade or so supporting the establishment of maritime boundaries in the Pacific.

METHODOLOGY

The PMB Evaluation will be undertaken by the supplier in close consultation with DFAT, and will also liaise closely with key partners on its methodology.

Provisionally, the supplier's evaluation team will evaluate the PMB Project through complementary qualitative techniques including desktop studies, phone surveys, and video teleconference (VTC) meetings. VTC meetings, when available, are preferred over teleconferencing. Given the travel restrictions associated with the global COVID-19 pandemic, in-country fieldwork is not planned.

DFAT will retain all intellectual property rights in relation to the outputs.

SCHEDULE AND BUDGET

Proposed timeline and milestones for the entire Review (from inception to delivery) weeks ending:

- 3 July: Draft concept note and ToR for PMB Evaluation.
- 10 July: Complete funding approval for PMB Evaluation.
- 17 July: Tender for PMB Evaluation open.
- 31 July: Tender for PMB Evaluation close.
- 7 August: PMB Evaluation commences (**providing Services 1–4, as below**).
- 25 September: Results of PMB Evaluation presented to DFAT, with end of service between DFAT and supplier for the Review.

Preferred schedule and milestones for the supplier:

<i>Weekending</i>	<i>Tasks</i>
7 August	Notification of successful bid. Service 1 (inception meeting): Briefing between DFAT and successful supplier for PMB Evaluation (VTC or in-person at DFAT RG Casey Building), with provision of background material.
14 August	Service 2 (Evaluation Plan; undertaking of Review): Propose and agree a final Evaluation Plan. Complete desktop review component by supplier by this week's end. Consultation with key Australian Government partners: DFAT, GA, AGD (VTC or in-person at relevant locations). Weekly update meeting between supplier and DFAT.
21 August	Phone/VTC consultation with key Pacific regional organisation partners (SPC, FFA), and other Australian partners (USyd). Weekly update meeting between supplier and DFAT.
4 September	Phone/VTC with relevant Pacific island countries' representatives for PMB (provisionally, Vanuatu, Samoa, and potentially the Federated States of Micronesia). Weekly update meeting between supplier and DFAT.
11 September	Distilling of findings from interviews. Weekly update meeting between supplier and DFAT, with opportunity for further liaison with DFAT.

18 September	Service 3 (draft Evaluation Report): Draft findings and present draft Evaluation Report for PMB Evaluation to DFAT.
25 September	Service 4 (final Evaluation Report and presentation of findings): Final Evaluation Report sent to DFAT for distribution to PMB Partner Consortium. Presentation from supplier to PMB Partner Consortium on outcomes and findings of PMB Evaluation. End of service between DFAT and supplier for PMB Evaluation.

PMB partner consultation will be undertaken primarily by phone surveys and VTC meetings, requiring minimal travel outside Canberra. However, increased resources may also be required due to the short timeframe of this Review. The total funding for the PMB Evaluation is therefore estimated between AUD30,000 – AUD60,000.

Respondents are invited to propose a budget for the services. This budget is to cover the full cost of the Review including any consultant fees, travel expenses and allowances, all research and fieldwork expenses, and contingency. Payment will be made upon receipt of invoices with an agreed payment schedule, based on milestones according to the indicative schedule below:

<i>Output</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Target date</i>	<i>Indicative fees (%)</i>
Contract signing	Signature of contract and inception meeting between supplier and DFAT (Service 1).	Week ending 7 August	25%
Evaluation Plan	DFAT's acceptance of the final Evaluation Plan; commencement of PMB Evaluation (Service 2).	Week ending 14 August	50%
Final Evaluation Report	Following review of draft by DFAT (Service 3), acceptance of the final Evaluation Report (Service 4)	Week ending 25 September	25%

TEAM COMPOSITION

The successful supplier will provide a team with the following knowledge, skills and experience to undertake the Review:

- Previous experience evaluating of development activities, preferably in the Pacific region.

- Knowledge, experience, and understanding of the Pacific region’s political, economic, social and cultural context.
- Understanding of the Pacific issues relating to ocean governance and maritime boundaries.

Additionally, respondents will demonstrate:

- Excellent research, analysis, and writing skills.
- Excellent written and spoken English and cross-cultural communication skills.

Respondents are invited to submit a capacity statement on the above capabilities and provide a curriculum vitae for each team member.

Key personnel involved in the Review will include:

- PMB Evaluation Lead: Supplier and team (TBC)
- PMB Evaluation coordinators (DFAT Contract Managers): Matthew Teh and Robyn Frost
- DFAT representative: Dr Liz Brierley
- GA representatives: Mark Alcock and Anna Potter
- AGD representatives: Toby Hanson and Frances Anggadi
- SPC representatives: Jens Kruger, Molly Powers and/or Andrick Lal and Malakai Vakautawale
- FFA representative: Pio Manoa
- USyd representative: Dr Elaine Baker
- Country representatives (provisionally, Vanuatu, Samoa, and potentially the Federated States of Micronesia, but with the potential to extend to others).

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The successful supplier will commit to adhering to the requirements of [DFAT’s monitoring and evaluation standards](#), in particular:

- Standard 5: Independent Evaluation Plan
- Standard 6: Independent Evaluation Report

Evaluation Plan: The successful supplier will develop an Evaluation Plan to be approved by the PMB Evaluation coordinators. The Evaluation Plan will clarify goal, outcomes and outputs, described in a results diagram (program logic, logic model).

The Evaluation Plan will detail the information requirements that will be met through documentation review, and those that will need to be filled through further consultation integrating suggested methodologies identified above. The Evaluation Plan will also consider and address potential research ethics challenges, including risk, confidentiality, and voluntary participation.

The final Evaluation Plan will incorporate feedback from the PMB Evaluation coordinators. The Evaluation Plan must be approved prior to the start of any substantive work, and will be appended to the final Evaluation Report.

Evaluation Report: The Evaluation Report should not be longer than 30 pages. The Report must include a one to two page evaluation summary written in plain and simple language, and must contain findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions and recommendations must be based on clear evidence and presented in a way that allows readers to form independent views on the validity and reliability of the findings, including assessing the vested interests of sources. Where there is conflicting evidence or interpretations, the Report should note the differences and justify the findings.

The final Evaluation Report will incorporate feedback from a review of the draft Report, provided to the PMB Evaluation coordinators by week ending 18 September.

INDICATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation questions will cover the assessment topics from DFAT’s Aid Quality Check processes as an established criteria:

<i>Relevance</i>	How relevant is the work of PMB to the priority needs of PICs?
<i>Effectiveness</i>	What progress has been made against the outputs and short- and medium-term outcomes described in the PMB program framework? What factors have affected the achievement of results to date? What (if any) unintended outcomes (positive and negative) were there? Why?
<i>Efficiency</i>	Have outputs been achieved in a timely manner? If yes or no, why? Could similar outputs have been achieved in a different way?
<i>Impact</i>	What positive and negative medium- and long-term impacts at the sub-national, national and regional levels have resulted from PMB? What would happen without PMB or a similar project?
<i>Sustainability</i>	Is PMB relevant for now and the near future? What, if anything, needs to be changed going forward? Is donor support required to maintain the long-term provision of services? Can the impacts of PMB be continue to be realised independently?
<i>Gender and social inclusion</i>	To what extent did PMB contribute to gender equality and empowerment?

	<p>To what extent is PMB contributing to social inclusion and realising economic and employment benefits among diverse social groups? Could anything be changed going forward?</p>
--	---

BACKGROUND

DFAT entered a Grant Arrangement with GA for the *Funding to assist Pacific island countries secure maritime jurisdictional rights consistent with international law* on 21 July 2017 (Activity Schedule 43 to Record of Understanding No. 51172).

In May 2020, the parties agreed to bring forward the end date of the Activity from 30 June 2021 to 30 June 2020 since:

- The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted planned and contemplated activities for completion of the project activities, including two in-country workshops from March – June 2020.
- GA is focussing on consolidating its domestic capacity, and cannot allocate any additional time to the project activity.

This evaluation is also timely since:

- Australia’s work relating to maritime boundaries in the Pacific has continued for a decade; initial program design elements may no longer be relevant.
- Progress in achieving measurable outcomes of the work relating to maritime boundaries in the Pacific appears to have slowed and a differing approach may be required to address the changing nature of the challenges faced.
- Australia is considering future support to establishing Pacific maritime boundaries, and understanding the effectiveness of PMB as an ODA investment will shape Australia’s future input to this work.
- Evaluations have been undertaken for Australia’s previous work relating to maritime boundaries in the Pacific (see, for example, the [EPOG Evaluation Report](#)) that offers a direct comparison for the trajectory of Australia’s future engagement.

DFAT will be undertaking this End of Investment Review as per Activity Clause 19.3, stating that GA:

- (a) will conduct systematic and regular evidence-based assessment and reporting on the performance and quality of Activity;
- (b) will focus on results at all stages, including working collaboratively with other agencies, where relevant, to strengthen a results focus, applying lessons learnt to improve the focus on results for Activity;
- (c) will cooperate fully with DFAT and their agents should the Activity be subject to an evaluation; and
- (d) will commit to taking action to improve, including responding to requests to prepare and submit a Performance Improvement Plan, or cancel any Activity that is found to be performing unsatisfactorily.

PMB Framework (from Investment Design, July 2017):

<p><i>Mission statement</i></p>	<p>To settle maritime boundaries and enact modern maritime zones legislation that enables better access and management of resources within PICs' maritime zones. PMB continues Australian support to maintain in-region commitment and momentum of work mandated by Strategic Priority 1 by PIF Leaders in the Framework for a Pacific Oceanscape, supporting actions under Strategic Priority 3 and, more recently, as affirmed by Leaders at the Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the UN Ocean Conference in April 2017 and at the Officials meeting of the Forum Fisheries Committee in May 2017.</p>
<p><i>High level objective</i></p>	<p>To contribute to sustainable economic growth, regional security and food security by assisting Pacific island countries to secure maritime jurisdictional rights consistent with international law.</p>
<p><i>Expected results</i></p>	<p>Expected end-of-program outcomes included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 1: Greater certainty in relation to maritime boundaries and limits, and the rights, responsibilities and restrictions related to them (including shared boundaries, high seas and extended continental shelf) • Outcome 2: Improved systems for the capture, storage and public use of authoritative maritime boundary and other marine regulatory information.
<p><i>Deliverables</i></p>	<p>Deliverables under Outcome 1 included the provision of legal and technical assistance and mentoring to Pacific countries and regional organisations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiate their maritime boundaries. • Review and update their maritime zones legislation. • Declare the outer limits of their maritime zones.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support extended continental shelf submissions to the UN Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf.• Build legal and technical capability within regional agencies and PICs adequate to resolve ongoing domestic and international boundaries beyond the life of the program. <p>Deliverables under Outcome 2 included providing technical and mentoring support to Pacific countries and regional organisations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establish an administrative infrastructure that supports efficient use of the marine space, supports decision-making processes in relation to conflicts between users and can interface with existing regional practices.• Develop and maintain regional information management and delivery approaches which drive cross-sector coordination and regional cohesion and allow regional agencies to deliver on requirements beyond the life of the program.• Develop and maintain information management systems which facilitate the core business for regional organisations that can be sustained with minimal ongoing investment.• Train and mentor spatial and technical staff in CROP agencies, increasing regional capability to support PICTs to establish maritime boundaries, including domestic administrative zones.• Promote professional communities of practice within the Pacific and involvement of Pacific technical experts in broader internal forums.
--	---

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION PLAN

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Background to the evaluation

The Pacific Maritime Boundaries (PMB) Project seeks to contribute to sustainable economic growth, regional security, and food security by maintaining momentum on efforts by Pacific Island countries to secure maritime jurisdictional rights consistent with international law. The expected end-of project outcomes are:

- Outcome 1: Greater certainty in relation to maritime boundaries and limits, and the rights, responsibilities and restrictions related to them
- Outcome 2: Improved systems for the capture, storage and public use of authoritative maritime boundary and other marine regulatory information.

DFAT entered a Grant Arrangement with Geoscience Australia (GA) for *Funding to assist Pacific island countries secure maritime jurisdictional rights consistent with international law* on 21 July 2017. In May 2020, the parties agreed to bring forward the end date of the Activity from 30 June 2012 to 30 June 2020 since:

- The Covid-19 pandemic disrupted planned and contemplated activities for completion of the project activities, including two in-country workshops from March-June 2020
- GA is focussing on consolidating its domestic capacity and cannot allocate any additional time to the project activity.

This evaluation is also timely because:

- Australia's work relating to maritime boundaries in the Pacific has continued for a decade; initial project design elements may no longer be relevant
- Progress in achieving measurable outcomes of the work relating to maritime boundaries in the Pacific appears to have slowed and a differing approach may be required to address the changing nature of the challenges faced
- Australia is considering future support to establishing Pacific maritime boundaries and understanding the effectiveness of the PMB Project as an Official Development Assistance (ODA) investment will shape Australia's future input to this work.

A collaborative approach to developing the evaluation plan

This evaluation plan has been developed collaboratively by the evaluators and with DFAT. Key partners and stakeholders have been or will be given the opportunity to comment on the evaluation plan (or a short summary version of the evaluation plan) before the evaluation commences. This includes GA, the Australian Attorney General's Department (AGD), the Pacific Community

(SPC), the University of Sydney (USyd), GRID-Arendal, the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Association (FFA), and key Pacific Island countries (PICs).

Current state of knowledge about the effectiveness of the PMB Project

No independent evaluation has been conducted of the PMB Project, giving rise to a need for a robust assessment of performance to inform any future Australian support. The evaluation has been designed to respond to this gap in knowledge.

However, there is relevant information available. First, there is some internal reporting on PMB Project progress and achievements including annual Aid Quality Checks (AQCs) completed by DFAT. AQCs report on the project's effectiveness, including progress towards project outcomes, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability as well as issues of gender equality, sustainability, risk, disability inclusion and climate change. Second, an evaluation of the Australian government's prior project Enhancing Pacific Ocean Governance Project (2014-2017) was completed in 2018. It reviews the performance of a previous PMB-related project on securing maritime boundaries in the Pacific. Third, Geoscience Australia is currently completing a completion report for the PMB Project.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In-scope

The evaluation will assess performance of the PMB Project from its inception in July 2017 through to its completion on 30 June 2020, considering:

- The high-level objectives and expected results of the PMB Project
- Key deliverables from the PMB Activity Schedule and governance architecture
- Budget and institutional arrangements across key partners and target stakeholders

Out-of-scope

The performance of previous and current PMB-related projects on securing maritime boundaries in the Pacific (including the Australian Government's Enhancing Pacific Ocean Governance Project (EPOG), and the Australian Government-funded Resilient Boundaries for the Blue Pacific Project (RBBP)). However, the evaluation may consider the legacy and impact of previous and complementary investments like EPOG and RBBP that support maritime boundary activities in the Pacific.

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The objectives of the evaluation are two-fold:

- 1) To evaluate the effectiveness of the PMB Project as an investment under DFAT's ODA

- 2) To identify areas for improvement in project design and partner arrangements for future work on maritime boundaries in the Pacific.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The guiding question prompting the evaluation is **how effective was the PMB Project as an investment under DFAT’s Official Development Assistance?** Within the framework of this guiding question, the evaluation will address the following key questions:

1. How relevant was the work of the PMB Project to the needs of PICs?
2. What progress was made in the delivery of outputs and achievement of outcomes described in the PMB Project framework? What factors affected the achievement of results?
3. To what extent were the PMB Project’s budget and institutional arrangements fit for purpose?
4. What contribution, if any, did the PMB Project make to gender equality and social inclusion?
 - a) To what extent did the PMB Project contribute to gender equality and social inclusion?
 - b) Could anything be changed going forward?
5. What are the lessons learned from PMB Project support for maritime boundaries in the Pacific?
 - a) What changes, if any, are recommended by stakeholders for future support, and for future project design and delivery?
 - b) What has worked well and what have been the challenges or limitations?

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

To answer the evaluation questions, the evaluation employs the following mixed-methods approach:

- Document review: review and analysis of relevant PMB Project documentation (see list of documents for review below).
- Qualitative, semi-structured interviews with partners and stakeholders (see list of recommended respondents below). Interviews will be approximately 45 minutes to one hour in duration. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, all interviews will be conducted remotely. Respondents will be given the choice of video or voice call, and whether the interview is recorded.
- Outcome Harvest (OH) methodology will be applied as a framework to guide the analysis and validation of information collected through enquiry undertaken for each of the evaluation questions. This methodology is a simple and systematic way that enables informants and stakeholders to identify, formulate, verify, analyse and interpret outcomes, particularly in programming contexts where relations of cause and effect are multi factorial and may not be readily clear or easily understood.

Short simple OH case studies on critical successful outcomes, and poor or negative unexpected results will be prepared. The case studies will provide the basis for validating emergent findings, conclusions, and testing of preliminary evaluation recommendations through discussions that will take place with DFAT and with PMB consortium members at key points during the evaluation. Case studies will be framed in terms of results, impact, or issues rather than as country case studies.

- Periodic, informal, short discussions between DFAT and the evaluators. Purpose is for evaluators to update DFAT on evaluation progress, emergent findings and to raise any questions, concerns, or risks early.
- Validation meeting(s): interactive, participatory approach with DFAT staff and partners to share and validate OH case study findings. Involves an interactive, group-discussion to test and validate early findings. This could be one meeting with multiple stakeholders or a few smaller meetings; this will be decided depending on findings.

The interview guide containing questions for respondents will be developed once this evaluation plan is accepted by DFAT.

Coherence between evaluation questions and methodology

Evaluation Question	Specific Considerations/Issues to Probe	Methods
<p>1. How relevant was the work of the PMB Project to the needs of PICs?</p>	<p>PIC context: situation/context of each PIC, particularly geopolitical factors (i.e. low hanging fruit initial success in negotiations, location, and political boundary issues); other actors involved and engaged with PICs (e.g. EU donor project, commitment of UN).</p> <p>Technical assistance and mentoring inputs provided by PMB Project: consider nuancing of methodology of consortium partners in relation to context and needs of each PIC.</p> <p>Consider how the PMB Project complements and supports other maritime boundary-related activities in the Pacific—for example, DFAT’s Resilient</p>	<p>Interviews OH case study: country focus</p>

	Boundaries for the Blue Pacific Project.	
<p>2. What progress was made in the delivery of outputs and achievement of outcomes described in the PMB Project framework? What factors affected the achievement of results?</p>	<p>Technical inputs: quality, accessibility, timing</p> <p>Capability: organisational, individual, technical, and administrative</p> <p>Coordination: with PICS, between different PICS, between consortium members, with other key actors/entities</p> <p>Improved systems: access and use of information by and between PICs</p> <p>To what extent are the results achieved sustainable? Will the benefits last?</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>OH case studies: effectiveness of an input/activity (e.g. workshop, negotiation); capability of PIC members (individual and institutional); regional coordination and cooperation</p>
<p>3. To what extent were the PMB Project's budget and institutional arrangements fit for purpose?</p>	<p>Do systems in place ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economy Efficiency Effectiveness Ethics <p>Individual and organisational capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFAT and GA management and governance arrangements Suitability of other organisations to manage implementation in support of sustainability 	<p>Document review, particularly budget expenditure</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Value for money analysis with reference to DFAT principles and approach</p>
<p>4. What contribution, if any, did the PMB Project make to gender equality and social inclusion?</p>	<p>To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?</p> <p>To what extent did the project contribute to social inclusion and economic benefits among diverse social groups including people with disabilities and people living in smaller islands and/or remote</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p>

	<p>locations (consider boundary areas)?</p> <p>How was engagement in gender equality and social inclusion undertaken? Did it align with and support DFAT and PIC policy commitments and any treaties?</p>	
<p>5. What are the lessons learned from PMB Project support for maritime boundaries in the Pacific?</p>	<p>What changes, if any, are recommended by stakeholders for future support?</p> <p>What is recommended, e.g. design, implementation arrangements, governance, resourcing, and funding?</p> <p>What has worked well and what have been the challenges or limitations?</p> <p>Any issues of sustainability?</p>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Validation of OH case studies</p>

Connection between evaluation questions and DFAT Aid Quality Check requirements

Relevance	Evaluation question 1
Effectiveness	Evaluation question 2 & 5
Efficiency	Evaluation question 3
Impact	Evaluation question 2
Sustainability	Evaluation questions 2, 3 & 5
Gender equality and social inclusion	Evaluation question 4

A flexible methodological approach

The methodology is designed to be sufficiently flexible to allow changes where necessary to respond to new or unexpected issues and ideas as they emerge. For example, the list of recommended interview respondents is not intended to be exhaustive. The evaluators may determine to request some additional interviews with people not listed (below), where recommended through the course of the evaluation (snowballing interview technique).

Triangulation of methods

The mixed-methods approach (combining document review and interviews with a subsequent participatory approach to validation) is intended to garner more nuanced, reliable, and valid evaluation findings through the triangulation of data. That is to say, the combination of evaluation methods goes towards enhanced confidence in the ensuing findings. Moreover, the conduct of interviews with a diverse array of respondents representing different organisations is intended to allow for triangulation of interview findings and so heightened reliability.

SAMPLING STRATEGY AND RECOMMENDED RESPONDENTS

The sampling strategy used will be ‘stratified sampling’, capturing a diversity of perspectives of people representing a mixture of organisations and having different roles in the project:

- DFAT representatives
- Geoscience Australia representatives
- Attorney-General’s Department representatives
- The Pacific Community (SPC) representatives
- Forum Fisheries Agency representatives
- The University of Sydney representatives
- Representatives of key Pacific Island countries participating in the PMB Project
- Other donors providing support on maritime boundaries in the Pacific

The sample size of respondents to be interviewed is intended to allow for a diversity of views and experiences to be canvassed. Approximately 20 interviews are proposed to be conducted. This number is expected to lead to the point of data saturation whereby similar messages are heard repeatedly and few new insights are gained by continuing interviewing.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

- Investment Design – Pacific Maritime Boundaries,
- GA-DFAT signed agreement Pacific Maritime Boundaries, 2017
- PMB Project Aid Quality Checks, 2018-2020
- Final Aid Quality Check for Assisting Pacific Island Countries to secure their Maritime Jurisdictional Rights under international law (draft, prepared by GA)
- PMB Project reporting and acquittal documents
- PMB Project workshop reports
- PMB Project progress reporting
- Enhancing Pacific Ocean Governance Evaluation Report, 2018
- Frost, et al. Redrawing the map of the Pacific, Marine Policy, 2016
- Email correspondence: Re EPOG: Maritime boundary work feedback, 2017

- Background documentation on the Resilient Boundaries for the Blue Pacific Project

DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

The evaluators will use a simple and organised system of data processing and analysis as follows: for all interviews, an interview transcript will be created. At the conclusion of each interview, the transcript will be completed, and at the bottom of the transcript additional notes written capturing initial reactions and observations, key points, as well as any important contextual factors that may have affected the validity of the interview.

The transcripts will then be coded, with data entered in an Excel spreadsheet. Coding will be kept simple as an overly complicated coding system may result in less usable data. Coding will be done by the placement, in the margins of the transcript, of a number from one through five next to interview data, the numbers representing the five evaluation questions (set out above). Where interview data goes towards answering one or more of the questions, the corresponding number(s) will be placed in the margin next to the relevant text. The same coding process will be applied to analysis of documents. Next, coded data will be interpreted and synthesised according to the evaluation questions, manipulating Excel to make meaning of quantitative results. Illustrative quotations will be used to make further meaning of the data and to enhance the narrative.

LIMITATIONS OR CONSTRAINTS FOR THE EVALUATION

- There is a risk that some interviewees may articulate (or seem to be articulating) what they feel the evaluators or DFAT wants to hear.
- In the absence of face-to-face meetings, it may be more difficult for the evaluators to build a connection with the interviewee, so they speak freely and frankly.
- Risk that informants are not available or willing to participate in the evaluation.
- DFAT capacity to respond within the timeframes allocated in this evaluation plan.

To help mitigate the above, the focus is on triangulation of data: multiple accounts, multiple types of data and methods of data collection will be used to confirm or challenge findings. The strategy is to consider a variety of perspectives to test the reliability of claims.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The evaluators will start each interview with a clear and concise description of the purpose of the evaluation and the use of information and opinions provided, including confidentiality/non-attribution as applicable. All evaluation participants will be informed that their participation in the evaluation is entirely voluntary and can be terminated at any time. Informants will be thanked for their time and willingness to participate in the evaluation as an important courtesy, demonstrating appreciation of effort.

The evaluation prioritises reporting findings accurately and truthfully. The results of the evaluation will be shared with all who participate in the evaluation. The full final evaluation report will be shared with the PMB Partner Consortium (the report will be sent to DFAT for distribution) and a summary version may be developed for other evaluation participants.

EVALUATION OUTPUTS/PRODUCTS

- Final evaluation report that is no longer than 30 pages and that complies with DFAT monitoring and evaluation standards (standard 6).
- Short summary version of the final evaluation report for distribution by DFAT to all evaluation participants. This is intended to support wide readership of the report’s key messages, and knowledge of key evaluation findings. It also aligns with ethical evaluation practice whereby findings are shared with participants.
- Results in both the final evaluation report and the summary version will be fully de-identified for online publication.

APPROACH TO THE USE OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

Intended users of the evaluation

The evaluation findings will support the information needs of stakeholders, as follows:

- DFAT to inform any future support on maritime boundaries in the Pacific
- Organisations involved in the evaluation and working on maritime boundaries in the Pacific
- Other donors in support of harmonisation and to avoid duplication

EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation will be conducted jointly by a team of three independent evaluators: Team Leader, Monitoring & Evaluation and Inclusion Specialist, and Senior Advisor.

EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND ALLOCATION OF DAYS

Completion Date	Output/Activity	Team Leader	M&E and Inclusion Specialist	Senior Advisor
3 September	Inception meeting	0.5	0.5	
14 September	Draft evaluation plan submitted to DFAT	1	0.5	

Completion Date	Output/Activity	Team Leader	M&E and Inclusion Specialist	Senior Advisor
28 September	Evaluation plan finalised following DFAT feedback	0.5		
28 September	Summary version of evaluation plan submitted to DFAT for distribution to PMB Partner Consortium			
28 September	Document review	4	3	
5 October	Consultation with Australian government partners	2.5	2	1
12 October	Consultation with Pacific regional organisations, other Australian partners and select PIC reps	2.5	2	1
Throughout	Regular update meetings between DFAT and evaluators to analyse and distil thinking	1.5	1.5	
19 October	Validation meeting(s)	1.5	1	
26 October	Draft Evaluation Report	5	5	1
2 November	Final Evaluation Report following DFAT feedback	1	0.5	
Sub-totals		20	16	3
Total		39		

ANNEX 3: INTERVIEW GUIDE

The following list gives examples of questions that will be posed during interviews. The questions are intended as a guide only as the Evaluator(s) may choose to follow up specific lines of enquiry with different questions, and tailor the questions more specifically to each interview respondent. Each interview is expected to take between 45 minutes to one hour.

Introduction, to begin each interview:

Purpose:

DFAT has engaged us to lead an evaluation of the performance of the Pacific Maritime Boundaries Project. We have asked to interview you as you have been involved with the project.

Ethics:

- We expect this meeting will take between 45 minutes and one hour.
- The information you provide will be included in a report that will be made available publicly, but your identity will be kept private.
- If we want to attribute any statements to you then we will ask for your approval before doing so.
- You can let us know if you do not want to answer any question and you can end the interview at any time.
- The information you provide will be used to inform DFAT and partners of the effectiveness of the project and will assist in planning for any future DFAT support.

Interview questions:

To begin, could you please tell us about your role in your organisation? How have you been involved with the project? Can you please tell us about the nature of your involvement?

EVALUATION QUESTION 1: How relevant was the work of the PMB Project to the needs of PICs?

1. How relevant would you say the work of the PMB Project is to the needs of PICs?
2. Are there any new issues, challenges or priorities that have emerged over the past three years that any future support around maritime boundaries should consider?

EVALUATION QUESTION 2: What progress was made in the delivery of outputs and achievement of outcomes described in the PMB Project framework? What factors affected the achievement of results?

3. Since July 2017 (so over the last 3 years), what progress do you think there has been in terms of Pacific Island countries securing maritime boundaries consistent with international law?
 - a. Can you give any specific examples of the progress made?

- b. What has been the contribution of the project?
- c. Focusing specifically on the project's two stated expected end-of-project outcomes (directly below), what progress do you think there has been?
 - Outcome 1: greater certainty in relation to maritime boundaries and limits, and the rights, responsibilities and restrictions related to them (including shared boundaries, high seas and extended continental shelf)
 - Outcome 2: improved systems for the capture, storage and public use of authoritative maritime boundary and other marine regulatory information.
- d. If progress is not occurring, are there any reasons why change is not occurring?
- e. To what extent are the results achieved sustainable? Will the benefits last?
- 4. What is something that has surprised you, or that you did not expect, with any of the project activities/initiatives in which you have been involved?
- 5. What are the things that have supported or strengthened progress?
- 6. What things have slowed or limited progress?

EVALUATION QUESTION 3: To what extent were the PMB Project's budget and institutional arrangements fit for purpose?

- 7. Do you think that the project's budget and implementation arrangements were suitable?
 - a. Were sufficient funds allocated to the right inputs and activities?
 - b. Did the project's implementation arrangements work well (consider partners/organisations involved and the way technical inputs were provided)?

EVALUATION QUESTION 4: What contribution, if any, did the PMB Project make to gender equality and social inclusion?

- 8. To what extent do you think gender equality has been considered in the project's implementation?
 - a. Can you give any examples of positive actions and results?
 - b. Are there any examples of missed opportunities or even negative results?
- 9. Has the inclusion of people with disabilities been a consideration for the project?
 - a. Can you give any examples of positive actions and results?
 - b. Are there any examples of missed opportunities or even negative results?
- 10. Could anything be changed going forward with respect to gender equality and/or disability inclusion? Have there been missed opportunities that going forward could be considered, for example, is support and advice needed to feel confident and able to address gender and disability more effectively?

EVALUATION QUESTION 5: What are the lessons learned from PMB Project support for maritime boundaries in the Pacific?

11. Have you learned any important lessons through your involvement with the project?
12. How might the support of the project be strengthened? Are there any aspects of the support which need to be changed or improved?

To conclude each interview:

- Is there anything further that you would like to comment on or emphasise that has not been covered in this conversation?
- Are there any other people / organisations that you would recommend we meet with to interview?
- Are there any documents, such as reports, research pieces or policies you think we should read that might help us with the evaluation?

That concludes the interview. Thank you for your time and willingness to speak with us, the information you have provided is useful and we appreciate it.