

Component 3	3,215,000	3,215,000	100%	-	1370551.65	-	3,215,000	4,581,101	142.5
Component 4	100,000	100,000	100%	-	41460	-	100,000	109,534	109.5
Component 5	460,000	442,436.40	96%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	4,960,000	4,942,436.40	99%	-	1660576.65	-	460,000	2,047,949	445.2

Source: UNDP MCO and SRIC project office.

Personnel from all OPM and Island Government, NGOs, Community groups were involved in this project and community members were found satisfied and they were advocating achievement of the project. Relevant Government officials, Island council authorities, UNDP MCO and local communities also expressed commitment to continue support to the project activities. Similarly, they also noted that there is already another project which will continue outcome of this project and also government has programs to replicate lessons from this project.

TABLE 7: Total disbursement of National and Island Governments of Cook Islands co-funding (US\$) (detail breakdown per year was not available)

In US\$	2012-2015 Mid-term Evaluation	2016-2018 Terminal Evaluation	Total
Component 1	0	107105	107,105
Component 2	0	41460	41,460
Component 3	613020.65	857531	1,470,551.65
Component 4	0	41460	41,460
Total	613,020.65	1,047,556	1,660,576.65

Source: UNDP MCO

TABLE 8: Total disbursement of AF funds (US\$) by Component by year against budget as per Project Document

	2012			2013			2014		
	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%
Component 1	60,000	6,391.62	11%	133,000	96,724.90	73%	30,000	45,031.62	150%
Component 2	93,000	1,811.21	2%	176,000	99,899.16	57%	173,000	95,566.71	55%
Component 3	106,000	11,875.15	11%	710,000	122,891.07	17%	953,000	796,510.64	84%
Component 4	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	44,000	11,192.19	25%
Component 5	124,700	27,422.34	22%	79,700	69,450.11	87%	99,700	68,490.53	69%
Total	398,700	47,500.32	12%	1,098,700	388,965.24	35%	1,299,700	1,016,791.70	78%

TABLE 8: Continues

	2015			2016		
	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%
Component 1	14,000	38,015.71	272%	182,455	112,575.76	62%
Component 2	168,000	164,106.53	98%	140,635	169,979.34	121%
Component 3	820,000	285,860.32	35%	1,253,467	1,271,708.21	101%
Component 4	9,000	7,399.17	82%	18,470	14,834.55	80%
Component 5	77,700	92,136.54	119%	66,752	75,714.18	113%
Total	10,88,700	587,518.27	54%	1,661,779	1,644,812.04	99%

TABLE 8: Continues

	2017			2018			Total		
	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%	Budget (Based on approved workplan)	Actual	%
Component 1	102,146.97	101,260.39	99%	-	-	-	400,000	400,000	100%
Component 2	182,731.78	133,353.17	73%	120,283.88	120,283.88	100%	785,000	785,000	100%
Component 3	864,513.65	661,336.13	76%	64,818.48	64,818.48	100%	3,215,000	3,215,000	100%
Component 4	40,645.39	33,377.21	82%	33,196.88	33,196.88	100%	100,000	100,000	100%
Component 5	84,305.55	54,158.82	64%	72,627.48	55,063.88	100%	460,000	442,436.40	99%
Total	1,274,343.34	983,485.72	77%	290,926.72	273,363.12	94%	4,960,000	4,942,436.40	99%

SOURCE: UNDP MCO

Table 8 shows the actual funds spent for each component by year for the AF funds. These show clearly that the management cost i.e. component 5 has exceeded budgeted amount in the year 2015 and 2016 but in other years it is less than budgeted so in total only 84% of the budgeted amount spend in management. Central government agencies and Island council also contributed in kind in management. Component 1, funded by AF, peaked disbursement in 2015 and Component 2 in 2016. Component 3 funding by AF peaked disbursement in 2016 and component 4 peaked in the year 2015 & 2017. Detail breakdown of budgeted and actual expenses of each year of GoCI contributions were not available and assumed equal disbursement in all year. These expenses correspond to the work accomplishment in respective years. The remaining 0.1% is for the Terminal Evaluation.

At all times, the chair of the Project Board has been kept abreast on the project's progress though good reporting and this has allowed the necessary budget revisions to be made on a sound basis.

Conclusion

The SRIC-CC Program was a well-rounded Pa Enuu program. To give justice to the intentions of the program, it required at least six years to deliver this project and expect full impact. The project was slow to start with delays in recruitment, later recruitment of a second finance officer prior to the Midterm Evaluation and several resignations five months prior to the end of the Program from the Program Manager, Program Coordinator, Focal Points, and Finance Officer were amongst some of the key constraints faced.

To address the climate change and disaster related problems, the project intervened in four main areas: review and improvement of policies, awareness generation, infrastructure development and improvement of rural household economy with adaptive agriculture, tourism, fishing etc. The Program implementation picked up in the fourth and fifth years of implementation with consecutive high project delivery of 100% for majority of the projects. The project was able to accomplish most of the activities and targets, with follow up support from the implementing and executing agencies.

As also noted in the Terminal Evaluation, there is a need to encourage evidence based planning, awareness programs for decision makers were conducted and also developed database. Likewise, regular Climate Change review and analysis in key development sector policies (agriculture, water, tourism and infrastructure) conducted to and determined the 'entry point' for CC policy development. Project produced discussion papers on CCA's implementation in policies, codes and standards. Infrastructures facilities like water tanks both at community and individual household were developed and weather stations for early weather information transmission were developed. Without addressing livelihoods of the people it is not possible to address Climate Change and disaster issues and make communities resilient to climate change. Hence, the project promoted climate resilient and cost effective agriculture and fisheries practices which provide the dual benefit of improving household economy and also make them resilient to climate change. These activities included majority of women so it also helped to decrease labor of women and build their leadership.

To reach a large audience, the information generated by the program was aired on television, radio, newspapers, uploaded in social media and websites of Government of the Cook Islands and UNDP and also networking with like-minded institutions within the country and internationally was facilitated by the project.

The SRIC-CC Program was designed with provision for appropriate management arrangements but few of the targets were ambitious and were change following the recommendation of MTR. Some of the activities were delayed and initiated at the latter part of the project so result of these activities were not seen by the evaluation consultant. Indicators of some of the activities were ambitious and were changed as per recommendation by the MTR. Though the project has been underpinned by good science and a technical approach of good caliber, there is still room for further technical improvement.

To make the outcomes and interventions sustainable, the project enhanced capacity of the community groups, through various relevant trainings and with material supports. The community members were made aware of the benefits of using weather information from early warning systems for farmers and others' decision making.

The project enjoyed a strong team, support from responsible government ministries and UNDP for project implementation. The project tested participatory planning and implementation approaches. Since these approaches showed very positive impact, the lessons learned from this should be replicated in other areas of the Cook Islands and beyond it.