

	Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
1.	New Zealand should consider follow-on support for its national partners to combat Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle (CRB) in areas where additional work is needed to consolidate gains, confirm the broad-based efficacy of the biocontrol agents (BCAs), and deliver these to the affected communities and sectors.	Agree This is being considered. However, future funding will depend on (a) partner country commitment to combatting CRB and (b) internal agreement in MFAT that combatting CRB is a priority for the IDC programme given current fiscal constraints and competing funding priorities. We note and agree with the recommendation that the focus of any future MFAT funded work should focus on confirming the efficacy of the biocontrols through further field releases, and monitoring of impact and spread of the most promising candidates in research trials.
2.	Should a multi-country, multi-partner structure be maintained, then MFAT should engage a Team Leader to improve program oversight, delivery, cohesion, reporting, and communications.	Partially agree We see value in increasing resourcing for programme management such as a Team Leader role and a MERL role (see recommendation 3 below). However, these positions are expensive to fill, and our ability to to fund them will depend on funding availability under the IDC programme. We would also need to balance the level of programme management resourcing with the level of funding for the overall programme.
3.	Any future work must include enhanced upfront and ongoing investment in MERL, including dedicated resources to support partners develop and implement an agreed MERL Framework.	Agree See response to Recommendation 2 above on resourcing. We certainly agree that there would need to be a clearer MERL framework agreed prior to any future phase, including realistic and measurable short and medium term outcomes.

	Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
4.	Future MERL work should include a nuanced analysis of the economic, environmental, and social impacts of the CRB incursions on the various livelihood groups and their management practices.	<p>Agree</p> <p>We agree that some form of up front social and economic impact analysis on the impact of CRB would be beneficial in determining the scope and focus of any future programme.</p>
5.	The public awareness, data sharing, and communication of progress and impact need to be better resourced and more sophisticated.	<p>Agree</p> <p>SPC's work to raise public awareness has been sound, but improvements can always be made drawing on lessons learned. We agree that, for any future phase, there needs to be better use of trapping and other data to determine the degree to which CRB-G is spreading or populations growing. Visual maps and databases are a useful tool for conveying this information to programme decision-makers and should be more actively used by implementing partners in a future phase.</p>

	Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
6.	In future, programme oversight, including the associated structures and roles, needs better planning and clear Terms of Reference.	<p>Partially agree</p> <p>Programme oversight was provided by a Steering Committee comprising MFAT, SPC, Ag Research and country representatives. TOR were in place, and meetings held regularly with an agenda covering programme progress, high level risks and results reporting. In MFAT's view, there were (and are) issues with implementing agencies being involved in programme governance as it is harder for them to be objective and vocal about performance of their teams. Consequently, MFAT needs to rethink membership of programme governance groups. We are also attracted by the evaluation team's suggestion on national task forces.</p>
7	MFAT could consider parallel investments that address the significant Pacific domestic quarantine legislative gaps, and strengthen the leadership, planning, and other core capacities of the relevant agencies.	<p>Agree</p> <p>The evaluation notes the importance of Vanuatu government regulations on the movement of vessels at night as being a factor in limiting the spread of CRB beyond Efate. Any national biosecurity agency needs (within reason) to have legislative authority to (a) regulate the movement of people, animals and plant material in the event of a pest or disease outbreak and (b) enter people's property to take steps to manage an outbreak. So we agree that addressing quarantine legislative gaps should be factored into national and regional biosecurity programmes, but think that they can also be considered for pest specific programmes.</p>

	Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
8	MFAT could work with other regional development partners and regional agencies to advocate for a long term, emergency response mechanism that can rapidly deliver the 'surge capacity' that is essential for Pacific countries to effectively combat new pest incursions.	Agree This is worthy of consideration and is something that SPC has raised with us in the past. There is merit in having a regional response mechanism with strong technical expertise and funds/personnel that can be mobilised quickly to support national emergency biosecurity responses.