 

***Maldives***

## Terms of Reference for the Mid-term Evaluation

Integration of Climate Change Risk into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives

**1. Project background**

The small, low-lying atoll islands of the Maldives are highly vulnerable to flooding and coastal erosion. More than 44% of settlements, including 42% of the population, and more than 70% of all critical infrastructures are located within 100m of the shoreline. Intensive rainfall events, storm surges and swell waves are expected to be aggravated through sea level rise and climate change effects on weather patterns. This will compound underlying trends of increasing coastal erosion and pressure on scarce land resources, and the growing physical vulnerability of island populations, infrastructure and livelihood assets. The most serious underlying driver of increasing vulnerability to climate change in the Maldives is the absence of systematic adaptation planning and practice. Climate change risks and long-term resilience are not adequately considered when developing island land use plans or designing coastal protection measures, and past, autonomous risk reduction efforts have sometimes had mal-adaptive effects.

The project supported by the LDCF was developed and has been implemented with an aim to enable the Government of Maldives to systematically assess the costs and benefits of different adaptation options in the fields of land use planning, coastal development and protection, and to develop the necessary institutional and individual capacity at national, provincial, atoll and island levels to enable decentralized and well-informed decision-making. In order to strengthen the enabling environment for such decentralized planning, climate risk reduction measures will be anchored in key environmental, land use, decentralization, privatization and disaster risk reduction policies. Detailed technical guidelines on climate resilient coastal protection, coastal development and land-use planning relevant to the Maldivian context will be developed to assist planners, decision-makers and technical specialists evaluate climate risks when making development and investment decisions. Tangible research cooperation’s will be set up to address key knowledge gaps on climate change effects on the Maldives, and a climate risk information system, linked to the national Geographic Information System, will be established to allow universal access to different government datasets needed for adaptation planning. The project will demonstrate practical, locally prioritized adaptation options for flooding and erosion control on at least four islands in four different atolls The 9.3 million USD project which was signed in December 2009 and will be implemented until 2013 is being implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Environment. The demonstration part of the project will be implemented in HA. Kulhudhufushi and GDh. Thinadhoo.

**2. Project objectives and expected outputs**

1. The overall goal to which the project will contribute is: *“To increase the resilience of the Maldives in the face of climate change and improve country capacity to respond effectively to climate related hazards”.*
2. The project’s objective is *“To ensure that climate change risks are integrated into resilient island planning and that national, provincial, atoll and island authorities[[1]](#footnote-2) and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures”*

**3. Mid-Term evaluation objectives**

The purpose of Mid-Term evaluation is to examine the performance of the project since the beginning of its implementation. It aims to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify corrective actions, if needed. It aims to provide manager, the project team UNDP-Maldives Country Office and UNDP-GEF at all levels with strategy and options to more effectively and efficiently achieve the project’s expected results and the ways to replicate the results. The Evaluation will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.

More specifically, The review will include both the evaluation of the progress in project implementation, measured against impact indicators under each outcome and planned outputs set forth in the Project Document in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The review will also address underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

The Mid-Term evaluation is intended to identify strengths and weaknesses of the project design and to come with recommendations for any necessary adjustments in outputs and indicators. MTE will focus on the assessment of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing the project progress in terms of delivering outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the review mission is also expected to be forward looking and provide directions for corrective measures and redirection of project focus to ensure achievement of intended results and/or adjusted results. . It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of the project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

MTE should evaluate adequacy of the project implementation structure, including effectiveness of the Project Board, partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement and effectiveness of coordination and synergies with other highly related projects. Assessment should also include financial accountability and efficiency against achieved results. Given the status of the progress so far and available financial resources, MTE should determine if the timeframe remains realistic. A ratio between the committed and realised co-financing should also be identified.

The evaluation mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going projects.

**4. Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation**

The scope of the Mid-Term Review will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. The evaluation will diagnose problems and suggest any necessary corrections and adjustments. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

The evaluation will comprise the following elements:

1. Assess whether the project design is clear, logical and commensurate with time and resources available;
2. A summary evaluation of the project and all its major components undertaken to date and a determination of progress towards achievement of its overall objectives;
3. An evaluation of project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the project document
4. An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the projects outputs produced to date in relation to expected results;
5. An analysis of the extent of cooperation on gender sensitivity and synergy created by the project in each of its component activities;
6. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the PROJECT BOARD, the Technical Support and Advisory Team and working groups;
7. Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the project document;
8. Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first two years of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the Project Board and their appropriateness in terms of overall objectives of the project;
9. An evaluation of project coordination, management and administration provided by the PMO. This evaluation should include specific reference to:
   * Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions involved in project arrangements and execution;
   * The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the project managers in monitoring on a day to day basis the progress in project execution;
   * Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project and present recommendations for any necessary operational changes; and
   * Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.
10. A qualified assessment of the extent to which project outputs to data have scientific credibility;
11. An assessment of the extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have influenced the execution of the project activities;
12. A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met;
13. Lessons learned during project implementation;
14. Recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall project work plan and timetable for the purposes of enhancing the achievement of project objectives and outcomes.

**5. Evaluation methodology**

The Mid-Term evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions.

The mission will start with a desk review of project documentation and also take the following process:

1. Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports such as Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Board and Technical Support and Advisory Team meetings, Project Implementation Report, Quarterly Progress Reports, mission reports and other internal documents including financial reports and relevant correspondence);
2. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications, audiovisual materials, other materials and reports;
3. Interviews with the Project Managers and other project staff; and
4. Individual or group interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including governments representatives, local communities, NGO’s, private sector, donors, other UN agencies and organizations.

**6. Roles and Responsibilities in the Evaluation**

**Independent Evaluator**

A consultant with the following qualifications shall be engaged to undertake the evaluation working concurrently according to the planned schedule. An international consultant, who will have in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience, will have the overall responsibility of carrying out the evaluation and submitting the final report. The Consultant has the overall responsibility for completing the desk review prior to the country mission, and for submitting the final report following the country mission. The consultant will sign an agreement with UNDP Maldives and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement. The consultant will be expected to adhere to the Code of Conduct for evaluators of UN supported projects, UNDP Evaluation Policy and produce an evaluation that meets quality criteria, as outlined in the UNDP guidelines, including GEF evaluation guidelines. (UNDP is expected to provide such guidelines.)

Qualifications, Skills and Experience of the Consultant

1. International consultant with academic and professional background in fields related to Climate Change Adaptation/Disaster Risk Management. A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience is required;
2. Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors;
3. Excellent English writing and communication skills. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment;
4. Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
5. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
6. Ability and experience to lead multi disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
7. Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in adapting to climate change;
8. Familiarity with the Maldives or similar countries (in the SIDS context); and
9. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.

**Ministry of Energy and Environment – Implementing Partner**

The collection of documents is to be led by PMU prior to commencing the work, and it is the Ministry’s responsibility to disclosure requested information for the purpose of the evaluation.

**7. Proposed schedule**

The Evaluation will take place in October 2012 and it requires a total of 20 days. 10-day country mission in Maldives as well as a desk review. The drafting and finalization of the report (will be done following to country mission. The draft Final Report should be submitted to UNDP and UNDP/GEF-LDCF for circulation to relevant agencies within two weeks after the completion of the review mission to Maldives. The consultants will finalize the report within two weeks upon receiving comments and feedback from stakeholders compiled by UNDP and UNDP/GEF-LDCF.

**8. Deliverables for the consultant evaluator**

The consultant will produce the following deliverables to UNDP, UNDP/GEF-LDCF and the Project Board:

1. A presentation of the findings to key stakeholders;
2. An executive summary, jointly prepared by the consultants, including findings and recommendations;
3. A detailed evaluation report covering Scope of the Mid-term review with detailed attention to lessons learnt and recommendations; and
4. List of annexes prepared by the consultants including TOR’s, itinerary, List of Persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, questionnaire and summary of results, co-financing and leveraged resources, etc.

The report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

**9. Estimated costs**

The total costs for the Mid-Term Review is estimated at US$15,000 which includes consultant fee, daily subsistence allowances, transportation costs including international air fares.

**10. Rating project success**

The evaluators may also consider assessing the success of the project based on outcome targets and indicators and using the performance indicators established by GEF for Climate Change Adaptation projects. The following items should be considered for rating purposes:

* + Achievement of objectives and planned results
  + Attainment of outputs and activities
  + Cost-effectiveness
  + Coverage
  + Impact
  + Sustainability
  + Replicability
  + Implementation approach
  + Stakeholders participation
  + Country ownership
  + Acceptability
  + Financial planning
  + Monitoring and evaluation
  + Impact on disaster risk management

The evaluation will rate the success of the project on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest (most successful) rating and 5 being the lowest. Each of the items above should be rated separately with comments and then an overall rating given. The following rating system is to be applied:

Rating: Achievement:

1= excellent 90-100%

2= very good 75-90%

3= good 60-74%

4= Satisfactory 50-59%

5= unsatisfactory 49% and below

**Annexes**

Annex 1 Evaluation Report: Sample Outline – Minimum GEF Requirements

Annex 1a Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Annex 2 Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Annex 3 UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation

**Annex 1**

**EVALUATION REPORT: SAMPLE OUTLINE**

**Minimum GEF Requirements**

**Executive summary**

* Brief description of the project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

**Introduction**

* Project background
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation

## The Project and its development context

* Project start and its duration
* Implementation status
* Problems that the project seek to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected
* An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;

**Findings**

**Project formulation**

* Implementation approach
* Analysis of Logical Framework Matrix- LFM (Project logic/strategy, indicators)
* Country ownership/Driveness
* Stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* Cost-effectiveness
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements

**Implementation**

* Implementation approach
* LFM used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnership arrangements established for implementation
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Financial planning
* Monitoring and evaluation
* Execution and implementation modalities
* Management by the UNDP country office
* Coordination and operation issues
* Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)

**Results**

* Attainment of objective
* Prospects of sustainability
* Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

**Conclusions and recommendations**

* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks

**Lessons learned**

* Good and bad practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.

**Annexes**

* TOR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used and summary of results

**Annex 1b**

**Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations**

**Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project’s logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

* The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

**Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

* Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
* Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
* Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
* The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
* The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworksin line with the project’s objectives
* Project’s collaboration with industry associations

**Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies thathave an interest orstake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

* Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

* Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

* Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
* Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
* Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

**Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

* Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy**.**
* Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives).
* Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector**.**
* Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives**.**
* Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
* Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.)**.**
* Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)**.**
* Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities**.**
* Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

**Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

* Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
* Expansion of demonstration projects.
* Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project’s achievements in the country or other regions.
* Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project’s outcomes in other regions.

**Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

* Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing*[[2]](#footnote-3)*.
* Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
* Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

*Co financing includes:* Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

*Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

**Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

* Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
* The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
* The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

**Monitoring & Evaluation**. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project’s logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project’s achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

## Annex 2

## **Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct o their business.

**Evaluators:**

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

1. As noted earlier, the decentralized governance structure for the country is currently being debated in parliament. It remains to be seen whether the country will retain the current administrative structure, which includes provinces, atolls and islands, or replace it with a new structure, which may not include provinces. The project will work with all levels of formal governance and administrative structures that are in place. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)