Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives

UNDP/GEF Project

Mid-Term Evaluation

Report

December 2012

Table of Contents

List Acronyms and Abbreviations

AFWP	Increasing Climate Resilience through an Integrated Water Resource Management in HA Ihavandhoo, ADh. Mahibadhoo and GDo. Gadhhbhoo Islands
APR	Annual Project Review
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CCD	Climate Change Department
CO	Country Office
DNP	Department of National Planning
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environment Protection Agency
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoM	Government of Maldives
HD	Housing Division
IR	
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on the Climate Change
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
LGA	Local Government Authority
LUPS	Land Use Planning Section
MACI	Maldives Association of Construction Industries
MEE	Ministry of Environment and Energy
MEEW	Ministry of Environment, Energy & Water
MEMP	Maldives Environment Management Programme
MOFT	Ministry of Finance & Treasury
MHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MHAHE	Ministry of Home Affairs, Housing & Environment
MHI	Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure
MHTE	Ministry of Housing, Transport & Environment
MoSD	Ministry of Security and Defence
MMS	Maldives Meteorological Services
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NDP	National Development Plan
NDMC	National Disaster Management Centre
NEAP	National Environment Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSDS	National Sustainable Development Strategy

PB	Project Board
PC	Project Coordinator
PD	Project Director
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management Unit
ProDoc	Project Document
SLM	Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in the Maldives Project
SNAP	Strategic National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation
SOP	Standard Operational Procedures
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was to examine the performance of the project "Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives" (ICCR), aiming to determine the progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and to provide the project team, UNDP-Maldives Country Office and UNDP-GEF with strategy and options to more effectively and efficiently achieve the project's expected results and the ways to replicate the results.

ICCR's o**verall goal** is contributing "to increase the resilience of the Maldives in the face of climate change and improve country capacity to respond effectively to climate related hazards". 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 and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures"

ICCR seeks to increase institutional capacity by supporting the integration of climate risk reduction measures into key environmental, land use, privatization and disaster risk reduction policies and plans. Detailed guidelines relevant to the Maldivian context will be produced on these topics to assist planners, technicians, decision makers and the civil society to evaluate climate risks in order to make more appropriate development and investment decisions. The project intends to strengthen institutional capacity by training government stakeholders at national, provincial and island levels to understand and prioritize adequate measures, taking into account long term resilience and climate change related risks. In order to build a reliable foundation to align policies, plans and practices to Climate Change Risks, ICCR intends to produce and consolidate climate related data and information, addressing key knowledge gaps, and fund demonstration projects to prove the cost-benefits of "soft" adaptation measures that are potentially ecosystem based.

ICCR is a UNDP/GEF project, funded with resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) was launched in February 2010[1] and will be implemented for a period of 4 years, until March 2014. The total project budget is 9,3 million dollars, including funding coming from GEF (US$ 4.485.000), UNDP (U$ 100.000) and other parallel and in kind contribution. A total of US$ 353,112 had been spent up to July 2012, which represents 8% of the total GEF budget. It is important to note that around 58% of the resources allocated from GEF/LDCF funds will be spent with the implementation of the demonstration activities, rescheduled for 2013.

The project was developed in 2008-2009 by GEF/UNDP with straight collaboration with the GoM, taking into consideration the priorities identified in Maldives' NAPA, and included consultations with a wide range of stakeholders. The intervention's relevance

[1] Project starting date was initially planned for December 2009.

continues to be highly satisfactory as mainstreaming climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into countries policy, planning and action to increase natural and social resilience is still coherent and aligned with Maldivian needs and priorities indicated in the NAPA and the SNAP.

The level of achievement of results is low compared to the targets set in the LFM and activities scheduled in the Annual Work Plans every year since 2010. In general, project rating and effectiveness is moderately unsatisfactory. This rating confirms the judgment of ICCR team, expressed in the Quarterly reports in 2011 and 2012, as well as the UNDP's ratings in the APR of 2011-2012. However, it is important to point out that most of the key activities for the achievement of outputs are in the pipe line, and therefore, the likelihood of achieving project's outcomes and objective is high, if corrective measures are implemented as pointed out in this report. During this last phase of implementation, it is important to concentrate on consolidating and linking all project achievements towards achieving the outcomes.

The main findings can be summarized as follows:

- Project design's main shortcomings are: (i) lack of an advocacy strategy and promotion of policy dialogue, crucial activities to facilitate the integration of project's finding into policy and practice; (ii) limited approach to capacity development, considered mostly in terms of training; (iii) logic chain of cause-effect between Outcomes 1 and 2, and respective outputs and activities could have been clearer.
- Country ownership and stakeholder participation are moderately unsatisfactory. Even though the Ministry hosts the project, and Project Director and Coordinator are part of the Ministry, project's activities are being implemented with limited involvement of key stakeholders, even the ones that had a coordinating role in the ProDoc. Stakeholder participation has been moderately unsatisfactory, in relation to what had been planned in the ProDoc.
- Replication and cost effectiveness are well designed in the overall strategy of ICCR. Successful replication will depend on the consolidation of the outputs to date, and on the effective implementation of demonstration projects, capacity development and awareness raising. LGA involvement and develop of ICCR website are two issues that should be addressed as soon as possible.
- This management arrangement planned in the Inception report did not function effectively because of contextual external factors linked to the institutional changes and structure, in addition to the characteristics of ICCR's project management.
- Limited use of project management tools, such as planning, M&E and risk management have limited the adoption of adaptive measures to correct problems during implementation. Planning, management, monitoring and evaluation are considered to be Moderately Unsatisfactory.

- Project Manager is not dedicated full time to ICCR. This has contributed to reducing time available to analyzing implementation progress, solving problems or finding the adequate alternatives to achieve results.
- PMU (staff + temporary consultants) is not aligned with project implementation needs.
- Delays in project implementation were due to a series of internal (project management) and external factors (i.e. political instability, changes in government leadership and staff). Implementation of procedures to procure individuals and companies to carry out activities had a specific burden in meeting project schedule and targets

The following recommendations have been proposed as corrective actions to improve project implementation:

Recommendation 1: review Logical Framework Matrix and project budget. The targets for the outputs should be revised in order to reflect the changes made in the number of demonstration activities and other changes in the context as suggested in Annex 8.

Recommendation 2: re-launch the project through a participatory work planning event. The formulation and validation of the 2013 Work plan might be taken as an opportunity to involve key stakeholders (project partners and beneficiaries and key actors such as the LGA), revise or ratify the agreements for project implementation and ensure that project concepts, strategy, objectives and schedule of activities are clear and agreed by all the parties involved.

Recommendation 3: reformulate project management arrangements to increase ownership and coordination. The project management structure should be simplified in this final stretch of implementation, aiming at maximum efficiency and closely linked to project activities and outputs. The revised structure should be formed by the Project Board with the objective of providing strategic direction and oversight, and a Coordination Committee that needs to be reinstated with a revised structure.

Recommendation 4: revise project manager position. ICCR should have a full time, dedicated Project Manager in order to ensure that project activities are implemented as planned, stakeholders are kept involved and adaptive measures are promptly taken if necessary.

Recommendation 5: strengthen the policy and capacity development components.
Effective "scale-up" of project's findings into policies and plans, depends highly on the generation of an active political debate on the key topics (such as land use planning, EIA, coastal protection). The project design should be revised in order to foster policy dialogue and advocacy, engage and influence key decision makers at national and local levels.

Recommendation 6: align PMU (permanent staff and temporary consultants) with project's needs. The division of tasks in the PMU should be clarified so that each staff member understands clearly his/her tasks and responsibilities. Staff management tools such as performance monitoring, should be introduced to ensure accountability and continuous feedback, in order to identify capacity gaps to improve performance. The project should have a dedicated and knowledgeable management staff, and in accordance with the Work Plan, international and national consultants/ advisors with relevant expertise in the main topics covered by the project, should be contracted.

Recommendation 7: strengthen project management tools, focusing on RBM approach to increase effectiveness and accountability. The project management should formulate and effectively use plans with realistic timeframes and targets, and monitor the progress, such as short term planning, M&E, risk management plan, procurement plan.

Recommendation 8: **speed activities to strengthen project visibility and raise awareness.** High visibility activities are needed in a project to create an enabling environment that will support achievement of project results. This should be made initially by launching the project website and by participating in Climate Change Networks and forums.

Recommendation 10: improve internal and external communications to increase involvement and generate commitment in the project. The project needs to strengthen the communication efficiency within the project (PMU, UNDP and MEE) and with key stakeholders.

Recommendation 11: strengthen linkages with other projects and networks dealing with Climate Change. Project should foster coordination and synergies, and contribute to building momentum needed to influence policies and practice.

Recommendation 12: maximize *"lessons learned, lessons exchanged and lessons implemented".* GEF should ensure that the general knowledge accumulated in the projects is channeled to new projects.

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the ICCR Mid-Term Evaluation

The objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was to examine the performance of the project "Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives" (ICCR) aiming to determine the progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and to provide the project team, UNDP-Maldives Country Office and UNDP-GEF with strategy and options to more effectively and efficiently achieve the project's expected results and the ways to replicate the results.

1.2 Key issues addressed

The MTE covers all activities undertaken by the project since it started in February 2010. It evaluates the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation determines the likelihood of achieving outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

The MTE analyses the specific aspects of the project, and provides ratings on the following aspects of implementation, as suggested in the Terms of Reference (ToR):

a) Achievement of objectives and planned results
b) Attainment of outputs and activities
c) Cost-effectiveness
d) Sustainability
e) Replicability
f) Implementation approach
g) Stakeholders participation
h) Country ownership
i) Planning and management
j) Monitoring and evaluation
k) Impact on disaster risk management

1.3 Methodology of the evaluation

The evaluation process started on the 8th of November 2012 and was carried out for a period of 20 working days, including 8 working days spent in the Maldives.

The MTE overall methodology was developed based on the specifications set forth in the ToR, and on UNDP/GEF's evaluation policies and guidelines. Based on the main areas

identified in the ToR, the evaluation tools for collection and analysis of the information were organized in four main areas: (i) Project Design, considering the criteria of relevance and coherence; (ii) Project Implementation, taking into account the efficiency of project management; (iii) Project Results, accessing the effectiveness of progress in relation to the planned outputs and outcomes and (iv) prospects of sustainability and replicability. According to GEF evaluation guidelines, key project areas were rated considering the level of achievement. Annex 5 presents a summary of the rating comments throughout the text.

The evaluation approach was participatory, involving key informants to share views on findings and recommendations. The evaluation process ensured engagement of Project Management Unit (PMU) staff, UNDP staff, Project Board representatives, Project Coordinator (PC), Project Director (PD) and project partners. A total of 47 informants were interviewed, as shown in the table below and detailed in Annex 2.

Institutions	N° of Interviewees
Ministry of Environment and Energy	10
Other Ministries	11
Atoll and Island Council Kulhudhuffushi, and LGA	11
Private Sector	2
Related Projects	4
Civil Society	1
UNDP	4
PMU	4
Total	47

Table 1: Interviewees by category of Institutions

The field work included interviews in Male, with stakeholders and partners involved in the implementation of ICCR, as well as with actors working with Climate Change related issues. The evaluator also conducted interviews with local level stakeholders in Kulhudhuffushi Island (Haa Dhaalu Atoll), one of the two project demonstration sites (according to the planned reduction on the number of demonstration islands).

The evaluation methodology comprised of both inductive and deductive approaches, using quantitative and qualitative data gathered from a selected range of sources, using key evaluation questions, as indicated in Annex 4.

The evaluation work included the following steps and methods for data collection, triangulation, analysis and reporting:

a) Detailed desk research to understand the project and develop evaluation methodology. Documents reviewed included: project document, work plans, Inception Report, monitoring reports, minutes of Project Board and Technical Support and Advisory Team meetings, project Implementation Report, Quarterly Progress Reports and other internal documents including financial reports and relevant correspondence.
b) Formulation of an Inception report with initial findings and proposal of evaluation methodology.
c) Field Visit to Male and selected islands to conduct:
   - Briefing and scoping with UNDP's and PMU Managers and project staff;
   - Semi-structured and structured interviews with a range of key stakeholders including governments representatives at National, Provincial and local levels, NGO's, private sector, other relevant organizations.
   - Triangulation of information from interviews and discussion on the accuracy and consistency of preliminary findings and recommendations with UNDP and PMU project staff.
d) Review of specific project products and management tools, such as plans, publications, audiovisual materials and reports;
e) Debriefing of preliminary findings and recommendations to stakeholders in Male as part of validation process;
f) Data analysis and triangulation of evidence and information from various categories of stakeholder's interviewed and documents.
g) Development of findings and recommendations for the preparation of first draft of the report for comments from stakeholders and preparation of a second draft report incorporating the feedback.
h) Preparation of Final Evaluation Report based on feedback on the draft reports.

.

1.4 Constraints and limitations of the MTE

The main limitations encountered during the evaluation process were:

- Difficulty to organize meetings and interviews with key informants has limited the number of interviews initially planned. Several meetings were cancelled at the last moment and could not be rescheduled. Nevertheless, the interviewees are representative of the key stakeholders involved in the project and therefore the report could reflect a clear perception of stakeholder's involvement in the project.
- Time constraint limited the field visits and field work, allowing the trip to one of the two demonstration islands for interviews with local level stakeholders.

1.5 Structure of the evaluation report

The evaluation report was organized in five sections. After the introduction, which describes the evaluation context and methodology, section two gives a brief overview of project design and the situation in relation to the expected outcomes. Section three elaborates on the main findings of the evaluation, focusing on project design, implementation modality and achievement of results. Section four concentrates on the recommendations for the future, and finally section five provides the main lessons learned during ICCR implementation.

2. The Project and its development context

2.1 Project start and its duration

The primary aim of the project ICCR is to increase resilience of the Maldives, reducing the vulnerability of the population to climate related natural disasters, through adequate planning and prioritization of climate change adaptation measures.

This UNDP/GEF project, funded with resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), was launched in February 2010[2] and will be implemented for a period of 4 years, until March 2014. The total project budget is 9,3 million dollars, including funding coming from GEF (US$ 4.485.000), UNDP (U$ 100.000) and other parallel and in kind contributions, as detailed in the table 2.

Funding	RF	US$
Domestic		
Government (in kind)	48.037.617,60	3.738.336,00
External		
Donor 1: GEF (LDCF)	57.632.250,00	4.485.000,00
Donor 2: UNDP TRAC (cash)	1.285.000,00	100.000,00
Donor 3: UNDP TRAC (parallel)	9.995.693,75	777.875,00
Donor 4: UNISDR (parallel)	3.019.750,00	235.000,00
Total	**119.970.311,35**	**9.336.211,00**

Table 2: Project budget/ Source: Project document

2.2 Implementation status

A total of US$ 353,112 had been spent up to July 2012, which represents 8% of the total GEF budget, as described in Table 3. The remaining 92% is expected to be spent before the current finishing date in February 2014. It is important to note that nearly 58% of the resources allocated from GEF/LDCF funds will be spent with the implementation of the demonstration activities, rescheduled for 2013.

The status of the co-financing of the Government of Maldives (GoM) allocated to ICCR as of July 2012, is US$1.510.174. This amount represents 40% of the total planned in kind contribution of GoM. A large part of GoM's co-financing is comprised of MEMP's support

[2] Project starting date was initially planned for December 2009.

(2.933.000 US$), as described in the co-financing plan. The total amount spent from the co-finance of MEMP until September 2012 was 1.459.841 US$. [3]

	Total budget allocated	Yearly Expenditure				Balance	% Delivery
		2010	2011	2012	Total		
Outcome 1	328.360,00		39.137,62	57.171,23	96.308,85	232.051,15	29
Outcome 2	940.000,00	6.526,32	47.727,93		54.254,25	885.745,75	6
Outcome 3	2.605.060,00			81,67	81,67	2.604.978,33	0,003
Outcome 4	151.920,00	755,88	3.458,05	1.364,83	5.578,76	146.341,23	4
Project Management	373.320,00	49.329,10	66.816,53	39.730,40	155.876,03	217.443,96	42
M & E	86.340,00	41.012,90			41.012,90	45.327,10	48
Total	4.485.000,00	97.624,20	157.140,13	98.348,13	353.112,46	4.131.887,52	8

Table 3: Summary of expenditures per Outcome until July 2012. Source ICCR-APR 2011-2012 and PMU financial data.

2.3 Problems that the project seeks to address

Maldives is exposed to a series of climate related hazards, including windstorms, heavy rainfall, drought, sea swells, storm surge and *udha*[4]. Climate hazards are expected to be aggravated by climate change effects, increasing the risks of flooding and coastal erosion, and the vulnerability of 44% of settlements and 70% of the critical infrastructure, which are located within 100m from the shore line.

The project seeks to address the main causes of the increased vulnerability to climate change related risks in the Maldives, identified in the ProdDoc, as the absence of systematic adaptation planning and practice; the limited institutional and individual capacity on risk management and climate change adaptation issues; the financial constraints to implement adequate adaptation measures due to the geo-physical characteristics of the country, the limited data & knowledge on the actual risks of climate related hazards, and finally, the limited acceptance of most cost-effective options to increasing resilience, in alternative to hard infrastructure. Land use plans, EIA process and costal protection measures do not effectively integrate climate change risks assessment and long term resilience measures. In fact, inadequately planned construction of housing, infrastructure and other interventions on the physical characteristics of the islands has had negative impact in the past[5], aggravating

[3] The information received on co-financing allocation refers only to GoM's contributions, organized per year.

[4] *Udha* refers to the annual rise in the water surface on the coast during the Southwest monsoon which causes limited coastal flooding with a water depth of less than 0.6 m. Udhas are unique to the Maldives, but precisely how they originate remains unclear (Shaig 2006a; UNDP 2007). / ICCR ProDoc

[5] i.e. (1) The level of land reclaimed in Kulludhuffusi island was higher than the existing land, which is a cause of increased flooding during the rainy period; (2) the construction of the airport in Formulak island did not take into account the natural and pre-existing drainage channels, creating serious flooding problems),

or creating flooding and coastal erosion problems. Examples include the reduction of natural island resilience when sand ridges are leveled for land reclamation or used for sand mining, or increased coastal erosion and vulnerability after the conversion of coastal vegetation and wetlands into other uses.

ICCR seeks to increase institutional capacity by supporting the integration of climate risk reduction measures into key environmental, land use, privatization and disaster risk reduction policies and plans. Detailed guidelines relevant to the Maldivian context will be produced on these topics to assist planners, technicians, decision makers and the civil society to evaluate climate risks in order to make more appropriate development and investment decisions. The project intends to strengthen institutional capacity by training government stakeholders at national, provincial and island levels to understand and prioritize adequate measures, taking into account long term resilience and climate change related risks. In order to build a reliable foundation to align policies, plans and practices to Climate Change Risks, ICCR intends to produce and consolidate climate related data and information, addressing key knowledge gaps, and fund demonstration projects to prove the cost-benefits of "soft" adaptation measures that are potentially ecosystem based.

2.4 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The overall goal to which the project will contribute to 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".

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 and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures"

2.5 Main stakeholders

The ProDoc identifies four key stakeholders as coordinators of specific project outputs, considered as in-kind contribution for the implementation of ICCR[6]: the Climate Change Division (CDD) is the responsible for coordinating all activities in partnership with other stakeholders, and directly involved in the studies and policy recommendations formulated by ICCR; the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) main role is to coordinate Output 2.2, *Guidelines for climate risk resilient coastal protection* and Output 3.2, *demonstration activities;* the Housing and Land Department was identified as coordinator of output 2.1 *Guidelines for Climate Risk resilient land use planning*, and Output 3.1 *Climate Change Resilient Land Use plans*; and finally the Maldives Meteorological Service (MMS) role was to be involved in the design of the Information System for Climate Risk, and in the formulation of the Regional Climate change scenarios, providing data and insights.

[6] ProDoc, Annex 10 and Inception Report, Annex 3.

Additionally, the World Bank's Maldives Environmental Management Programme (MEMP) role would be to support coordination of Output 1.5 *Climate Risk Information System*, as well as providing logistical and technical support in several areas where there were synergies identified between the two projects.

Other stakeholders identified as members of the project Board, Coordination Committee or project teams are: Ministry of Environment and Energy (former MHTE), National Disaster Management Center, Ministry of Home Affairs (member project Board), Ministry of Finance, Marine Research Center, College of Higher Education, Ministry of Tourism, Maldives Association of Construction Industry, Built Environment Association and demonstration islands' Atoll and Island Councils. Finally, few other actors were identified in the ProDoc community representatives from the demonstration islands, the Climate Change Council, Privatization Committee, representatives from NGOs, the National Planning Council, and the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture.

2.6 Results expected

The Inception Report sets out the objectives, outcomes and outputs revised and amended for project implementation as described in the table 4 below.

Outcomes	Outputs
1: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions	1.1 Orientation, survey, training plan and training of trainers
	1.2 Regional climate change scenarios
	1.3 Demonstration island's stakeholders understand climate change risks and are able to prioritize land use planning and costal protection measures
	1.4 Technical training on coastal protection guidelines
	1.5 Climate risk information system
2: Integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development	2.1 Guidelines for climate risk resilient land use planning in the Maldives
	2.2 Guidelines for climate risk resilient coastal protection in the Maldives
	2.3 National Research Strategy
	2.4 Policy recommendations on climate risk management
3:Locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks demonstrated	3.1 Climate change resilient land use plans and specific measures demonstrated
	3.2 "Soft" measures for coastal protection demonstrated

	3.3 Replication strategy for adaptation measures
4: Project knowledge and lessons learned compiled, analyzed and disseminated locally, nationally and internationally	4.1 Project information availability
	4.2 Education and public awareness
	4.3 International collaboration

Table 4: ICCR Outcomes and Outputs

2.7 Analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy

Since project starting date in February 2010, Maldives has undergone important political changes. In June 2010, the full Cabinet of Ministers in President Nasheed's government, elected in 2008, resigned. The project's host Ministry (Ministry of Housing, Transport and Environment), was abolished and re-created as the Ministry of Housing and Environment. In February 2012 with the change in the presidency of Maldives, the MHE changed leadership, and in May 2012 it was split into Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure and Ministry of Environment and Energy (the government agencies that had coordinating role initially under project's host ministry, now are under two different ministries). The instability in the political scenario had a negative impact on the implementation of ICCR because there were changes in government leadership and staff, including the replacement of the Project Director and Board Members. During those uncertain moments, the Government's priorities were unclear and it was challenging to coordinate with stakeholders, convey meetings (including with the Project Board), receive directions, make decisions and carry on with project implementation, as well as its administration. Moreover, since project design, there continues to be a shortage of technical staff within the government's environmental and planning sectors and limited knowledge about climate resilient planning and adaptation measures (i.e. Planning Section-MHI has 3 professional staffers, focusing at the moment on supporting/revising island land use planning; EPA continues to have severe capacity constraints, due to the limitation in the technical staff able to work on scoping phase, usually carried out by the engineers of the MHI, and evaluation of EIAs, usually carried out by external consultants).

There have been few changes in the policy environment regarding climate change in Maldives since 2009-2010. The Strategic National Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan (SNAP) 2010-2020[7] was concluded and fully endorsed by the GoM in June 2011. It is the strategic framework, complementing the NAPA and the National Sustainable Development Strategy (2009), to orient actions to reduce the risk of disasters and enhance climate change adaptation in the Maldives. The aim of the SNAP is to be harmonized with the policies, plans and the Sustainable

[7] Strategic areas of action: (1) Enabling environment towards good governance; (2) Empowered and capable communities, (3) Resilient communities with access to technology, knowledge and other resources, (4) Risk-sensitive regional and local development.

Development Strategy, in order to consolidate programs and projects that can be undertaken with Government budget and considered for donor assistance. However, few government agencies' have already integrated climate disaster considerations into their plans[8] due to financial and technical capacity limitations.

In terms of regulations, EIA regulations were revised in 2011 and included some broad considerations on climate change. Nonetheless the regulation does not establish biding orientation for the assessment of impacts related to climate change risks, nor it includes the need for mitigation and adaptation measures to increase climate change resilience. The interviews conducted for this evaluation with EPA confirm that there continues to be a considerable concern about effective coastal protection measures to control the increasing problem of coastal erosion in the country, not effectively addressed in the EIA regulation and needed in Maldives' context. Evidence shows that coastal protection measures have been, in several cases, causing damage due to the limited understanding of the factors that need to be assessed when making interventions in the coastal areas and to the inadequate consideration of cost-effective options, with consequent coastal erosion and environmental impacts such as loss of biodiversity. One example of such interventions is the construction of sea walls that may cause long term negative impacts on island biodiversity as it might interfere with natural coastal dynamics.

During the past four years, although the decentralized governance system is still in the process of consolidation in terms of administrative and financial arrangements, the overall local government's regulatory and institutional set up was developed. In October 2010 the government announced the creation of 189 island councils, 19 atoll councils and two city councils, democratically elected in February 2011. In 2010 the Local Government Authority (LGA) was created, as established in the Decentralization Act, to coordinate and oversee the Atoll and Island councils. Guidance for the development of municipal regulations, plans and budgets were formulated. The LGA is a relevant institution for the achievement of project's outcomes, as well as for the effective implementation of the replication and sustainability strategies.

Local level development plans and land use plans started to be developed[9], but the quality of the plans reflects the limited planning capacity at local level and the inadequate level of understanding of Climate related risks. At the same time, the Planning Section is understaffed and has limited capacity to provide adequate technical assistance and training to a significant number of local level planners.

The LGA is in the process of formulating the guidelines for the SOPs, which details operational procedures in several sectors, such as environmental protection and waste

[8] National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013) - Interim, 31 October 2012. National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC)

[9] 20 Islands have formulated Development Plans and Land Use Plans.

management. Information from the interviews confirms that risk management and adaptation measures are not part of the SOPs due to lack of knowledge and information about the topic. Based on these guidelines, Atoll and Island Authorities will develop the Standard Operational Procedures (SOP). This is a key area that the project should look into.

The interviews and minutes from Board meetings show that continues to exist a prevailing idea, especially in some government institutions, that projects must provide tangible results over policy and capacity building work. This mentality has had negative influence on the implementation of ICCR, as there was a tendency to push forward the implementation of the demonstration activities in the selected islands. There has been a weak comprehension of the real purpose of ICCR to invest on fundamental and sustainable changes that might ensure that future development in Maldives take into account Climate Change Risks to increase resilience of the population and its assets. The resources for ICCR demonstration activities are focused on "Soft" measures, which conflict with the mainstream thinking of hard infrastructure to adapt to climate related risks. The interviews for this evaluation showed that in many cases "Soft" measures are often interpreted as "temporary" adaptation measures, such as sand bags. A positive note is that few stakeholders, including Island and Atoll councils' members (Kulludhuffushi island) consider the possibility of using "Soft" adaptation measures as an effective option for coastal protection. In fact the two Councils are planning the re.vegetation of a section of wetland in a portion of the island coast.

3. Evaluation Findings

3.1 Project formulation

3.1.1 Project Design, LFM and Implementation approach

The project was developed in 2008-2009 by GEF/UNDP with straight collaboration with the GoM, taking into consideration the priorities identified in Maldives' NAPA, and included consultations with a wide range of stakeholders. The analysis of the problems and the identification of actions to overcome the barriers identified in order to increase resilience against climate change risks, were coherent with Maldivian policies and context, as well as with UNDP/GEF's policies and priorities. The overall implementation approach proposes the strengthening of institutional and individual capacity, as well as policy framework, introducing "Soft" measures as a cost-effective, locally prioritized, adaptation to climate change risks, in order to increase resilience.

The intervention's relevance continues to be highly satisfactory today, as confirmed by the totality of the interviewees. Mainstreaming climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into country's policy, planning and action to increase natural and social resilience is still coherent and aligned with Maldivian needs and priorities as indicated in both the NAPA and the SNAP. The continued relevance of the project will depend on the adequate formulation of a capacity development response, based on the needs of stakeholders, and the inclusion of important stakeholders in the present decentralized governance system, such as the Local Government Authority and more actively, the Atoll and Island Councils.

ICCR's main activities and outputs are still highly relevant for the following main reasons:

- Addresses coastal protection and adaptation to climate related hazards such as flooding and coastal erosion, two of the main risks affecting the Maldives;
- Addresses information gaps in the areas mentioned above and provides guidance to formulate climate resilient land use plans and policies, a topic considered crucial for building resilience, by all interviewees;
- Responds to the need to develop individual and organizational capacity and raises awareness on climate related risks and adaptation measures. These were considered by the interviewees as key issues to be addressed at national and local levels, in order to influence the mentality of Maldivian authorities and communities, as well as policies and actions at national and local level. Provincial and local level councils are still new in the office and have a low level of understanding of alternatives to deal with climate related risks and adaptation measures.
- The project is in line with and contributes to GoM's policy framework SNAP, NAPA and NSDP.

In terms of overall concept, the project design is well structured and based on a good analysis of the situation and proposes an innovative approach in the Maldives for climate change adaptation. In outcome 1, the aim is to strengthen institutional and individual capacity with the necessary skills and tools to prioritize climate risks and appropriate adaptation measures, and to integrate climate risk into policies, planning and action. In Outcome 2, the formulation of studies and guidelines would provide the clarity and inputs to support alignment of policies and plans to climate change risks. Building capacity and an information base, would give guidance for the implementation of demonstration activities in Outcome 3, while in Outcome 4, the focus would be on awareness and knowledge building based on the outputs of the project.

A detailed analysis of the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) revels that at output and activity levels, the project logic is less clear than the links between outcomes and objective. In Outcomes 1 and 2, the outputs and activities have a complicated cause-effect logic chain with each respective Outcome. In order to have a clear and immediate understanding of the project's logic, these two outcomes should have been designed with outputs strictly linked to its achievement: Outcome 1, should have focused on building capacity of individuals, according to a broad set of activities, including training, technical assistance, coaching, etc. while Outcome 2, should have focused on building organization capacity, which would have included addressing information gaps and building the information base useful for Output 2.4, and Outcomes 1, 3 and 4. In terms of implementation sequencing, it would have been more understandable if the two outcomes were scheduled to be implemented in an opposite sequence. It would have been more comprehensible if the completion of the information base (reviews, guidelines, etc.) would have been the foundation for the capacity development activities.

Additionally, it can be noted that Output 1.1 is not stated as a tangible result, but rather as an activity. Considering the text of this output, the focus should be on orientation and training, yet the Survey on Adaptation Measures (a new activity introduced in the Inception Report) appears as an activity of this output. The survey's main purpose was "to provide specific information on coastal protection and soft low cost climate change adaptation measures", which has stronger correspondence with Outcome 2. Although the Survey's main purpose was to provide illustrated examples of "Soft" adaptation measures that could be implemented by communities, and was meant to provide information to the ToT, it was directly related and could have been part of the activity "Review of Coastal Protection and erosion control practices, including "Soft" and "Hard" measures" (Activity 2.2.1).

There has been unclear understanding of project logic and its intended achievements, in addition to the limited understanding of project's implementation approach on adaptation measures. This is the perception of a large number of stakeholders involved in project implementation, as indicated by the interviews carried out during the evaluation, and might

be an indication that project logic needs revision. An example of this revision is presented in Annex 6.

The LFM does not make an effective description of risks and assumptions identified in the ProDoc and in the Inception report. Most of the information in the Assumptions and Risks column is related solely to Assumptions. Risks were not further developed from the ProDoc at outcome and output levels. Moreover, some of the identified assumptions depend on project's achievements, therefore should not be considered in the LFM (i.e. assumption in output 1.4 states: "The technical guidelines meet user needs and are designed in a user-friendly manner").

The design of ICCR had a few addition shortcomings, as described hereafter:

- Project design did not foresee the need to support a strong advocacy strategy and promote policy dialogue to facilitate the integration of climate change risks into policy, planning and practice. These activities would have played an important role in complementing and increasing effectiveness of Outcome 2.
- Effective strategy for capacity development to ensure achievement of Outcome 1 should have received a more focused attention, with preparatory and follow up activities, following UNDP's approach to capacity development. The training plan included in the Inception Report, as well as the training activities identified, should have been part of a broader approach in order to effectively empower the individuals to prioritize and integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and decisions. Some examples of a more comprehensive approach to capacity development could have included: continuous technical assistance through coaching and mentoring national, atoll and island authorities and planners (this is one of the purposes of the PMU working within the Ministry's office), facilitation to information and experiences in the same topics, etc. During the Inception Phase there was a good attempt to overcome this weakness through the inclusion of Output 1.1: formulation of the training plan and the organization of a ToT. However, as it will be discussed later in the report, the ToT implementation approach was not detailed, and during implementation, it was conducted in only 2 days, lacked follow up and did not build in the right incentives for the participants and institutions to value it as a resource.
- The project design planned activities for dissemination of Studies and Guidelines; The project design included dissemination & training activities in some of these Outputs, but it usually referred to punctual activities. Greater emphasis on designing a set of activities over a longer period to promote and build capacity on specific topics related to Studies and guidelines could have helped in promoting the documents and its use into practice, increasing involvement of stakeholders in ICCR.
- The budget allocated for demonstration activities was underestimated. Initial allocation was 2,100,000 US$ to implement "soft" adaptation measures in at least four islands in four different Atolls, as follows: H. Dh. Kulhudhuffushi ($600,000); G. Dh. Thinadhoo

($500,000); K. Thulusdhoo ($500,000), Dh. Kudahuvadhoo ($500,000). Results from the 3 rounds of procurement carried out for this activity reveled that the costs would be significantly higher than planned. An example is the project in G. Dh. Thinadhoo (Restoration of 1.2 km natural ridge system & re-vegetation of 47,000 sq. m of EPZ & 'climate-change proofing' of drainage system). The lowest cost option presented by the winning bidder[10] in the second round of procurement was twofold higher than the budget planned.

- The project work plan was ambitious when scheduling three months to conduct activities such as *Modeling Review* (activity 1.2.1), *Review of land use planning issues* (activity 2.1.1) and *National Research Strategy* (activity 2.3.1). These activities required contracting of consultants through a procurement process, which following government procedures take at least three months.

3.1.2 Country Ownership/Driveness

Ownership and driveness were well emphasised and built into project design and implementation arrangements. In order to ensure strong ownership and driveness, the project formulation process was based on National policies and priorities, and carried out through wide consultation with stakeholders. The idea was that key stakeholders, such as the Land Use Planning Section and the EPA, would have a strong coordination role because of their strong connection to project outputs. The implementation arrangements were a very important way to attempt ensuring country ownership and promoting active involvement of key stakeholders in project decisions and achievements. The governance structure was planned to keep government institutions involved in strategic and operational decisions. The project management unit is placed within Ministry's office, in the Climate Change Division, which also stimulates ownership. Moreover, relevant government agencies were members in the project Board and Coordination Committees, as well as Technical and Training teams.

The country ownership is high in theory, also given the relevance and alignment of the project to countries policies. In practice, the MEE is driving the project through the presence of the Project Director and Project Coordination, who are part of the Ministry. However, considering the planned project implementation approach, the overall country ownership is moderately unsatisfactory, as discussed hereafter.

[10] Upper South Utilities Limited, presented two options for adaptation measures, one costing around 1,124,000 US$, and the second, 2,240,000 US$. The proposal included Survey and design of coastal protection and drainage measures, EIA report and the construction of Coastal protection and drainage system. The difference between the first and second options was due to the coastal protection method, sand-cement bag revetment against the construction of a raised ridge.

The political instability over the past four years resulting in significant changes in the institutional set up[11] of project's partners and its representatives, partly explains the low level of ownership by project partners. At the higher levels of leadership the information about ICCR was transferred to the newly appointed authorities due to the efforts of UNDP/PMU to organize the Project Board and maintain it active. The Board Meetings were organized twice a year since the project started, as it was planned. However, due to the delays in project implementation and the inoperative governance structure of the project at operative level, the Board discussions were usually related to routine management and administrative issues, rather than strategic decisions. In this regard, the influence that Board members had on their respective sectors was very limited and did not have the expected positive repercussion in country ownership and driveness.

The nature of project agreements, objectives and plans related to ICCR were not effectively passed on to the managers and staff of partner institutions. In fact, when interviewed, partner agencies with co-financing function in the project did not have recollection of the responsibilities agreed when the project was formulated. The agreements with ICCR were not effectively registered and the handover to new staff and managers was not done properly. There is an overall perception that it is a project that "belongs" to MEE-CCD. It is also important to point out that the Land Use Planning Section (LUPS), initially part of the MHTE, was moved to the new Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure (MHI) in May 2012, and consequently was embedded into a new institutional context and political priorities.

Despite the efforts made by the PMU/UNDP to introduce ICCR to newly appointed managers and members of` staff, a large portion of key stakeholders do not have an adequate understanding of the project concepts and are not aware of project's progress and outputs. As mentioned earlier, there has been a misconception that the project should have the focus on hard infrastructure rather than "Soft" adaptation measures, which is still not recognized by many, as a long term solution. This prevailing idea of focusing on concrete results over institutional and individual capacity development, seems to have overshadowed the importance of ICCR as a contribution to better policies, plans and actions to improve resilience to climate related risks in the Maldives, and therefore has also had negative impact on the motivation to be involved and support ICCR implementation.

The project coordination committee and the technical team did not meet frequently, which contributed to the weak involvement of partners and key stakeholders. The frequency of the meetings was low firstly because of the slow implementation of the project activities, and secondly because of the difficulties to engage its members. The institutions in Maldives continue to be understaffed and individuals are overwhelmed with too many tasks,

[11] The Ministry of Housing, Transport and Environment (MHTE) existed from November 2008 to June 2009. In June 2009 all 13 Cabinet Ministers resigned. MHTE was abolished in July 2010, when it was split into Ministry of Transport and Communication and Ministry of Housing and Environment (MHE). The MHE was operative from July 2010 to February 2012. In February 2012 MHE had a change in leadership and in May 2012 it was split into Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure and Ministry of Environment and Energy.

accumulating several roles. Ensuring their active involvement in these conditions is challenging and depends greatly on the incentives to participate, in terms of personal and institutional development.

Communications with the partners have mainly been done through emails or correspondence, usually aimed at asking opinion on the ToRs or sending project documents. Very little feedback was usually provided, and most of the interviews show that individuals do not remember receiving the documents or were not interested in reading it. They have stated that only e mails are not the most efficient way to send important documents, as they usually fall into the overloading mass of e mails received. Additionally, ICCR implemented only few punctual activities (training sessions on adaptation measures, land use planning, climate change scenarios and climate extremes) to give visibility, communicate and follow up on project products. The website was not uploaded, project documents were not published and its dissemination and follow up with key stakeholders was not effective. The documents produced by ICCR were uploaded in the MEE's website, but because of the design of the Website it gives very low visibility to the project. ICCR's visibility is one element that could have contributed to higher ownership.

Most project outcomes, outputs and products are not known even by key institutions such as EPA-MEE, MMS-MEE and PS-MHI. The Office of Programmes and Projects, mentioned in the targets of Output 2.2 as a user of the Guidelines for coastal protection and land use planning had very little information about the project, this issue needs to be specifically addressed to revise targets or ensure the participation of important stakeholders so that targets can be met. Most of these stakeholders stated that there was no update on the status of implementation, achievements or the products formulated until this moment. Some of the interviewees at the ministerial level did not know the project existed, because they had recently joined the organization or had never received communications about the project. At local levels, interviews with one of the demonstration islands Atoll and Island councils with elected representatives reveled the little understanding of the project (although a presentation was given by the PMU's technical advisor in 2012) and the lack of information about project products. In some cases, key stakeholders were aware of the activities directly related to their institution, but are not certain of the name of the project that was benefiting them, given that there are other projects supporting similar actions (i.e. NGIS and Information System in MMS). The result is that the documents produced are not owned by the key institutions that should be promoting and using it.

The only exception that needs to be pointed out related to Output 1.5, which has recently started implementation. The interviews for this evaluation have captured a great deal of interest and engagement of MMS in participating in this activity because of the net benefit that it will bring to the institution. However, all the same, there is limited understanding of the overall objectives of ICCR and how the Climate Risk Information System links to the rest of project strategy.

3.1.3 Stakeholder participation

Stakeholder participation was also well planned in the ProDoc and in the Inception report as a result of a significant stakeholder analysis and Stakeholders Involvement Plan, which identified a wide range of stakeholders at National, provincial and island levels, and their interaction with the project. The project's organizational structure considered the participation of representatives from all key stakeholders to deal with strategic (in the project board), coordination (Coordination committee) and operational (Technical and Training teams) issues. In such a way, decision makers, managers and technicians would be involved in relevant areas of implementation.

One important aspect of the project formulation and inception phases was the strong emphasis on the participation of stakeholders at local level, such as the involvement of community representatives, and Atoll and Island Authorities[12] to influence climate change risk related planning and actions. During the interviews for this evaluation, the majority of informants confirmed that the involvement of local level stakeholders is a key aspect to achieve project's objective and outcomes. However, during project implementation the participation of these stakeholders at national and local levels has been very limited and therefore moderately unsatisfactory.

The main reasons for the low level of participation of key stakeholders were explained in the previous section. Additionally, it can be stated that there was little interaction with local level stakeholders. The PMU visits to the islands were very limited to the ICCR's technical advisor who visited Kulludhuffushi Island in September 2012 and consultation meetings in G. Dh. Thinadhoo in the context of the procurement for demonstration activities. The activities planned to be carried out at island level involving governments and civil society leaders, included climate change risks and adaptation awareness raising and education campaign, demonstration of "Soft" adaptation measures, training and the review or formulation of land use plans. Few of these activities were delayed because it depended on outputs that had not yet been achieved, such as the climate change risk management training and awareness building (Output 1.3) that depended on the Regional Climate change scenarios (Output 1.2). Another such case is related to the demonstration activities. The reduction on the number of demonstration islands was under discussion [13] and therefore it was not adequate to involve local stakeholders in the 4 islands before a final

[12] Atoll and Island Councils were identified in ProDoc as key local stakeholders, even though these institutions were actually elected only in February 2011, according to the 2010 Decentralization Act .

[13] The problems related to failed procurements due to the high costs of proposals compared to the budget allocated, was described in the 2011 Q4 ICCR Report. This issue was pointed out in the minute of the Project Board meeting of 22/01/12 and the decision by the Project Board to reduce the number of demonstration islands to 2 was made in the meeting on the 14/08/12.

decision was made and approved by the donor[14] on this issue. Nevertheless, there were activities that could have been implemented, such as the education campaign on climate change risks and community-based adaptation options (Activity 4.2.2, initially planned for October 2010, February 2011 and Jan/Mar 2012) planned in at least 4 Atolls. This campaign could have been formulated based on the findings of the Survey of Adaptation Measures (concluded in June 2011) and on other relevant studies at International and National levels. It would have contributed to informing local level actors and communities on the climate risks and adaptation options.

Training sessions were organized (as detailed in the next sections) by ICCR to form trainers (ToT) and to disseminate the findings of the reports on Land Use Planning and Climate Change Scenarios, which was an important opportunity for stakeholders' participation. Government officials at national and local levels (50% were representatives of provincial offices[15]) in total were part of these activities; however, these opportunities were punctual and did not reflect on increased participation in project activities.

One important note is that the Local Government Authority, an important stakeholder that did not exist when the project was formulated, has not yet been involved in ICCR's activities. Their involvement is crucial to reach local level authorities in demonstration islands and for the replication of the "Soft adaptation" measures and adequate land use plans.

3.1.4 Replication approach

Replication is well designed in the overall strategy of ICCR, within each Outcome and as a separate output (3.3) aimed at developing a replication strategy for demonstrated adaptation measures. The objective and outcomes of ICCR are focused on the institutional and individual capacity development for the integration and prioritization of climate risk and adaptation measures into plans and actions. Therefore, it is expected that the individual capacity and guidelines for land use planning and coastal protection will guide the formulation or revision of inhabited island plans and investments, to take into account climate change risks and adaptation to increase resilience. The demonstration activities, awareness raising and exchange visits were also planned to promote the uptake of adaptation measures. It is important to keep in mind that environmental characteristics change considerably in each island, and adequate adaptation measures will highly depend on the correct assessment of these factors.

[14] As of end November 2012, there was no official approval for the reduction in the number of demonstration islands.

[15] List of ToT participants

Considering the first phase of project implementation, it can be said that the basis for replication will depend on the consolidation of the outputs to date, and the effective implementation of planned demonstration activities. Looking forward over the rest of the project implementation period, there are a number of project activities that are likely to promote the concepts pushed forward by ICCR and the potential appropriation of these concepts for replication in other areas. Such activities include:

- Increasing the involvement of the Local Government Authority to promote the use of the Guidelines for the adequate integration of climate change risk into land use planning and SoPs.
- ICCR Website fully developed and updated, alongside with a stronger awareness raising and capacity development components.

3.1.5 Cost-effectiveness

The cost-effectiveness of project results has been moderately unsatisfactory, due to the significant delays accumulated during the first 31 months since the project started. ICCR has not yet implemented the "Soft" Adaptation measures, which was considered in the ProDoc as one of the key aspects to measure the cost-effectiveness of the project and represents 58% of total GEF funds. Considering the high costs of hard infrastructure to increase climate risk resilience, the project approach provides an option which is lower in costs and has potentially high benefits. In the ProDoc, it was assessed that demonstration activities would have high impact in protecting 50% of critical infrastructure, 50% of households, with an estimate $20 million worth of private assets better protected from climate related risks. Even considering the reduction of demonstration activities from 4 to 2 islands, if the revised targets are met, there will be a high internal rate of return on investments, in addition to the increased individual and institutional capacity to replicate these measures in other islands.

The net value of the information produced by the project is potentially high, given that it has produced valid information that can be used to guide Risk Reduction Management and Adaptation Planning, as for example on Climate Change Scenarios. However its full benefits, as well as the results of the institutional capacity development, can be analyzed once the project consolidates the outputs and supports its integration into planning and practice of relevant institutions.

3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

As the implementing agency, UNDP's key advantages is its consolidated experience with GEF supported projects, as well as its expertise in implementing capacity building and

development initiatives, as its core contribution to development[16]. Moreover, UNDP has a long presence in the Maldives, and built a long experience in Climate Change and other related priority areas for the country. UNDP's has developed a number of project management strategies and tools and is part of a global institutional set up, which helps ensuring accountability and effectiveness.

3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

In general, the project has had very little interactions with other interventions, networks or forums related to Climate Change topics. One of the relationships fostered by ICCR was with the Regional Integrated Multi-Hazard Early Warning System in Africa and Asia (RIMES) for the development of the Regional climate change scenario (Output 1.2) and related training. RIMES made a 50.000 US$ in kind contribution to formulate the Modeling Review, and has provided technical assistance to ICCR for the development of the ToR for the Review.

The ProDoc and the Inception Report established the linkages between ICCR and the Maldives Environmental Management Programme. Although the activities between the two projects did not match in terms of timing, due to the considerable delays in ICCR implementation, some of the activities carried out have laid the ground for future implementation of ICCR. An example is the work for the integration of adaptation measures as a subject in the Environmental Management undergraduate course curriculum, which was carried out by MEMP when ICCR was not ready with the education materials. Nevertheless, the introduction of the documents produced by ICCR as reference material in the undergraduate course may still be organized during this last year of implementation.

During the last year of project implementation there is a strong potential to significantly increase interactions and synergies with other projects and networks, as the studies, modeling and guidelines planned in the project will be finalized and can be used and promoted by other projects and agencies working in the same sector. There are few projects related to climate change and adaption issues that have similarities with ICCR, which might facilitate synergies and collaborations. One of these is USAID's project "Enhance Climate Resiliency and Water Security" that have already had a certain level of information exchange with ICCR, when USAID was formulating the project proposal.

[16] UNDP Strategic Plan (2008-2013)

3.1.8 Management arrangements

The project is implemented under UNDP's National Execution Modality[17], which establishes that the Project Management Unit is hosted within a government institution. The Climate Change Division, now under the Ministry of Energy and Environment, was designated as the institution responsible for the overall coordination of project implementation in partnership with other key stakeholders, such as the Land Use Planning Section in the Housing Division and the Environment Protection Agency.

Initially in the ProDoc, the management structure comprised of:

- Project Board, with 17 representatives of key stakeholders,
- Project Director who was directly responsible for project execution within the MEE (previously MHTE and MHE)
- Project Coordinator within the CCD and responsible for the coordination and involvement of stakeholders:
- PMU (PM, Senior Technical Officer, Finance Assistant, Administrative Assistant)
- Project Technical support and advisory team (international and national consultants and advisors).

This structure was modified during the Inception phase as to reduce the size of Project Board to 7 members (originally it was composed of 17 members), and to set up a Coordination committee (composed by 11 members + demonstration islands councils) and two Project Teams (Technical Team with 9 members & Training Team with 6 members). The valid idea was to separate stakeholders in three main groups: (i) Board members having executive authority and responsibility over project implementation; (ii) stakeholders providing overall technical guidance and advice in a Coordination Committee; and (iii) two project teams (Technical and Training) directly involved in routine support and guidance.

This management arrangement did not function effectively, as it was mentioned before. The main reasons were: (i) the changes in the institutions participating in the project, which determined the change of project Board and Coordination Committee' representatives. Sometimes members were not appointed for a period of time, making it difficult to convey the meetings; (ii) institutions in the Maldives are usually understaffed with qualified technical professionals, and those available are overwhelmed with different tasks and commitments. Interviews have highlighted that the same professionals were required to participate in more than one project management structure (Coordination Committee and teams), and therefore participation in meetings was very low. As it will be mentioned, considering these contextual factors, the management arrangement could have tested a reduced structure, composed of Project Board with the present composition, and a coordination committee, with few focal points as permanent representatives from the

[17] UNDP NEX Guidelines 2011

institutions that have a direct role in project implementation (list of institutions is described in the Inception report), in addition to invited guests as required.

The PMU has been working with four professionals, three of which (PM, FA and AA) are also hired to work in another project, AFWP. The project has hired short term consultants to conduct the specific studies and guidelines. National and International consultants, with expertise in specific topics that can give stronger support to the achievement of project results, such as the capacity development at individual and institutional levels related to Land Use Planning integrating climate change risks.

Summary of key findings:

1. The project is highly relevant to the needs and priorities of the Maldives. The continued relevance of the project will depend on the successful formulation of a capacity development response, based on the needs assessment, and on the inclusion of important stakeholders in the decentralized governance system, such as the Local Government Authority and Councils. ***(Recommendations 2 and 5)***
2. Project design's main shortcomings are: (i) lack of an advocacy strategy and promotion of policy dialogue, crucial activities to facilitate the integration of project's finding into policy and practice; (ii) limited approach to capacity development, considered mostly in terms of training; (iii) logic chain of cause-effect between Outcomes 1 and 2, and respective outputs and activities could have been clearer. ***(Recommendations 1/Annex 6 and 5)***
3. Country ownership and stakeholder participation are moderately unsatisfactory. Even though the MEE hosts the project, and Project Director and Coordinator are part of the Ministry, project's activities are being implemented with limited involvement of other key stakeholders, including the ones that had been given a coordinating role in the ProDoc. ***(Recommendations 2, 3, 5 and 10)***
4. Replication and cost effectiveness are well designed in the overall strategy of ICCR. Successful replication will depend on the consolidation of the outputs to date, and on the effective implementation of demonstration projects, capacity development and awareness raising. LGA involvement and develop of ICCR website are two issues that should be addressed as soon as possible.
5. In general, the project has had very little interactions with other interventions, networks or forums related to Climate Change topics. (***Recommendation 11)***
6. The management arrangement planned in the Inception report did not function effectively because of contextual external factors linked to the institutional changes and structure, in addition to the characteristics of ICCR's project management practice. (***Recommendation 3)***

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1 Inception and changes to the ProDoc

The project Inception phase was carried out between February and May 2010, facilitated by an external consultant. The Inception phase included a review of the project proposal and a set of project management tools (2010 Work plan with identified activities for each Output, M&E plan, organizational structure, etc.). The process was conducted through consultations with stakeholders, and finalized with the organization of two workshops with stakeholders in April 2010.

The main modifications from the original project proposal were:

- The project governance structure was modified, as mentioned in the previous section (3.1.8).
- Inclusion of Output 1.1 (Orientation, training plan and training of trainers) in order to give the necessary emphasis to training and awareness building, which was followed up with the revision of the ToR of the PMU's Administrative Officer to include training/knowledge management tasks.
- The Inception Report called attention that the planned downscaling of global climate change models to use at local level (Output 1.2 Regional climate change scenarios for the Maldives analyzed and updated to provide more accurate climate risk data for national and local planning) would have to "be subject to the usefulness and precision of the modeling" to enhance disaster risk profiles in the islands.

3.2.2 Implementation approach

The overall implementation approach is moderately unsatisfactory mainly due to the challenges to ensure key stakeholder's participation; a central issue to project's strategy of increasing institutional and individual capacity for climate risk planning and policy level work. The implementation approach proposed in the ProDoc expected key project partners to take a coordinating role in project implementation, because of their strategic position to influence policy, planning and practice. This assumption did not materialize due to several reasons, including the constant change in project counterparts and lack of proper communication and handover when these changes occurred. As previously mentioned, the interviews conducted for this evaluation point out that some project partners have no recollection of their responsibilities in the implementation of the project.

The project Board could have been an important structure to ensure that the project strategy was effective and relevant to Maldives context. However, it was also subject to the political changes occurred in 2011, as it changed the Board's directions, reflecting the priorities of GoM. As an example, while in the meeting organized in January 2011, the decision was "to

prepare all studies prior to outcome 3", in the next meeting held in May 2011, the Board decided that "demonstration activities in the islands had to start immediately otherwise the project would be closed".

The PMU's efforts to conduct the project, despite the challenges mentioned so far, have been significant, and a serious concern is the inadequate setting of the PMU, with a shared system of project management. According to the interviews, only around 50% of PM's time is dedicated to ICCR, while 50% is spent on the other two projects. This has had an obvious significant negative impact in the implementation performance. Given that during the final phase of implementation starting in 2013, the work load will increase significantly, UNDP and the MEE should ensure optimal management of ICCR for the effective achievement of project outcomes.

3.2.3 Project Management tools

There was a very limited elaboration and use of the management tools proposed in the ProDoc and further revised in the Inception Report, such as the M&E plan, risk management and mitigation measures.

In terms of planning, the project has used only the Annual work plans, which derives from the four year Work Plan formulated in the Inception Report and on the outputs/targets contained in the LFM. The annual Work Plans have not been the result of an analytical and participatory exercise, but rather the activities planned in the overall project work plan for each year were transferred into the yearly timeframe, and the activities not carried out during the previous year, were pushed forward into the following year's WP. There is no indication of revision of Work Plans, despite the delays and the modifications that occurred in the project, such as the elimination of Activity 4.1.2, Project's Bimonthly Newsletter.

There has been no short term planning, which could have helped in detailing tasks, activities and short term targets. The requests for disbursement prepared on a quarterly basis gave an indicative idea of the activities to be carried out in that quarter. However, it was not a plan with detailed activities, tasks and guidance for implementation and monitoring. The short term planning formulation could have been an opportunity to involve partners, and used as a source of information to monitor the achievement of short term targets, and consequently identify problems and promptly implement adaptation measures.

Other management tools such as a detailed procurement plan were not formulated. UNDP had a procurement plan, but it was not detailed enough as to set up all the steps needed to activate the procurement procedures in time for effective implementation, starting from the preparation of the ToR, so it was not useful to implement and monitor procurement procedures. It might have facilitated the work of ICCR's team to have a Project Management and Administration Guideline. In ICCR's case, considering that it is a NEX

project, this document would have compiled GoM's administrative procedures and standards applicable to the project. Additionally it would contain M&E requirements and templates, and UNDP's procurement and reporting formats. This document would have provided easy reference for staff training and implementation of activities, on the adequate administrative instrument and procedures to use within the given legal framework, in order to avoid cases such as cancelling of procurement processes (i.e. Output 2.2 in October/November 2011) because the correct procedures were not followed.

UNDP produces a series of management tools for the project's portfolio management, as for example the project Dash Boards, which are very useful if regularly updated and shared with stakeholders. It includes the activities and its original schedule, implementation status, as well as planned procurements and contracts. The 2010 Project Dash Board however, was not updated with the delays in the activities planned for the year, or with the forecast implementation period, so presumably it was not useful as a project management tool.

3.2.4 Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation

The project has not fully applied the M&E framework proposed in the ProDoc and Inception Report (i.e. routine tracking of output completion to manage risks, measurement of means of verification of project results, measurements of means of verification of project output and activities, reporting on co-financing), please see details of planned against implement M&E activities in Annex 7. The LFM has not been used for M&E, and other management tools were not developed to monitor progress towards project targets due to weak project management practice and support from implementing agency. The M&E related activities were generally limited to the production of the quarterly reports and the Annual Project Review (APR/PIR).

In terms of reporting, the quarterly project reports were generally poor in terms of analysis and contents, despite the slow progress made by the project. In the first quarter of 2010 ICCR report was prepared jointly with other projects, and the report was comprised of a brief list of activities carried out during the period. Starting from the second quarter of 2010, the reports were formulated with a specific format, containing financial information, tender details, description of activities implemented per Output, degree of achievement of objectives and problems faced. That format improved the overall quality of the reports, as it made project progress more comprehensible and linked to the outcomes, even though the quarterly report does not use the same numbering of outputs as indicated in the Inception Report and LFM, which is something that should be revised. It should also be noted that especially from 2011 onwards, the information on progress of each outcome was written in a "cumulative" way, each report repeats the information written in the previous reporting period, adding just a few lines related to the activities of the actual reporting quarter.

The other level of reporting used was the UNDP/GEF Annual Project Review, a format that includes several levels of inputs and assessment from the implementing and the executing agencies, GEF and the PD, in addition to information about implementation progress and financial issues, and it is the basis for GEF Global reporting. Particularly in the APR 2011-2012, it can be noted a disparity between the ratings given by the implementing agency and GEF Operational Focal Point (ICCR PD), compared to the ones given by the executing agency, in relation to the progress towards meeting the development Objective and to the implementation progress. The implementing agency rates vary from Moderately Satisfactory to Satisfactory, while the executing agency rated both aspects as unsatisfactory. The positive ratings given by the implementing agency and the GEF operation focal point are explained in terms of the actual problems that affected the project such as the political instability, inefficiency in procurement, etc. However the ratings miss an objective assessment of the implementation delays. This uneven assessment of project's progress and therefore, the implementation of effective curative measures, could have been adequately addressed through systematic monitoring meetings, such as the one being organized since October 2012.

In terms of meetings organized at strategic and operational levels to monitor project progress and to critically reflect with stakeholders on the implementation, there have been mainly the Project Board's biannual meetings. In general, the decisions made by the project Board were implemented by the project. One example is the decision to start with the demonstration activities before other activities were implemented, the decision was taken on the 19th of May and on the 30th May the procurement notice was issued. In May 2012 there was a Mid-Term review meeting held with high level managers from the implementing and executing agencies and since October 2012, biweekly monitoring meetings with UNDP started to be organized, as it will be commented later.

It is important to note that project documentation could have been more systematically kept in order to capture project activities such as meetings held (Coordination Committee, staff, consultations, etc.), training (land use planning) and field trip (even though it was limited in number). The practice of systematically registering discussions and operational decisions made in meetings, feedback from field trip and consultations with stakeholders, helps to keep record of activities implemented, analyze results and identify lessons for the project. Although the activities implemented were limited in the past, this would be an important practice in the future.

Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Implementation of M&E activities have been very limited and therefore little feedback or adaptive measures were identified as a result of an M&E system. The quarterly reports have repeatedly pointed out issues that were hindering implementation, such as lack of capacity in government for procurement and need for proactive action. However, there is little

evidence of feedback on the issues raised. These problems were dragged for large periods of time, which indicates that proactive and adaptive measures were not promptly adopted to solve administrative and implementation issues such as procurement inefficiency and quality of results. In fact, the training plan and manual had such bad quality that was not useful for the project.

The PMU, with the guidance of UNDP and endorsement of the Project Board, has taken measures to adapt to few unexpected situations during implementation, such as the decision to hire a consultant to design the demonstration activities, before re-launching a tender process for the fourth time, and utilization of UNDP's tender procedures instead of the MEE's, to hire the hydrologist that will make the design of demonstration projects.

3.2.5 Financial Management and project efficiency

The project document is clear when defining the budget planned for each output. The financial planning has been prepared on an annual basis, linked to the Annual Work Plan for each output, which facilitates management and administration, and there has been no revised allocation registered so far. The Funding authorization and certificate of expenditures are required by UNDP to authorize disbursements, and is regularly used in ICCR. There have been cash flow issues on two occasions, Q4 in 2010 and last two quarters of 2012 because of the procedures to the return of advanced funds not used in the period July 2011- July 2012 for implementation of demonstration activities (3,1 million MRF) . In these occasions, cash flow issues did not cause delays of activities as the project used the direct payment request through UNDP to meet payment commitments (with an administrative cost paid to UNDP).

Overall, because of ICCR's significant implementation delays, there has been a negative impact on project efficiency as the costs of implementation are higher than the investments to produce project's outputs. The level of expenditures of GEF's co-financing has been low related to the original allocation, 20% in 2010 and 11% in 2011. These low levels are mainly explained by the problems in finalizing procurement procedures and not implementing the planned demonstration activities, as detailed in the next sections. Total project expenditure as of July 2012 was calculated in 353.112,46[18] (considering only GEF resources and expenditures recorded in the MEE accounts), out of which 44% was spent with project management and 12% with M&E activities, while most of the resources in activities were spent on Outcome 1, nearly 27%. Even though it can be estimated that nearly half of the activities under Outcome 1 were implemented, only 29% of the funds originally allocated was spent for this Outcome. This difference is explained by the lower costs of the Survey and Climate change modeling studies. It is important to note that

[18] Source: quarterly reports and table composed by ICCR PMU for this evaluation with total amounts spent per Outcome per year.

project efficiency can significantly improve during the last year of implementation, if the demonstration activities and the other project outputs, already under implementation, are c concluded effectively.

3.2.6 Execution and implementation modalities

As mentioned previously, one of the critical issues related to ICCR implementation is the fact that the PM was contracted to coordinate two environmental projects (SLM and ICCR), and since April 2012 has had an additional project to supervise (AFWP), even though each of these projects has a separate budget line for the payment of a dedicated Project Manager. This decision was made by the executing agency, and endorsed by the project Board (Minute Board Meeting 21 January 2011) because of the evident difficulties to find qualified technical staff for the position; in fact ICCR and SLM remained without PM for several months. Although there are synergies related to land use planning between the two larger projects, SLM and ICCR, the projects are not complementary in terms of outputs, and have implementation modalities that require a high degree of involvement of different government agencies in the implementation. This last issue asks for an intensive daily work to promote coordination and participation of stakeholders, a task that should be performed intensively by the PM in collaboration with the PC. The fact that the PM is not focused full time on ICCR has contributed to reducing time available to analyzing implementation progress, solving problems or finding the adequate alternatives to achieve results. According to the interviews, UNDP showed reservations due to the uncertainties about the effectiveness and efficiency of such an arrangement. It was not possible to ascertain the apportionment of resources for the PM from each of the three projects in order to analyze the relationship with the estimated time dedicated to each project.

Moreover, the division of tasks and responsibilities in the PMU is not clear and shared by everyone, nor it is accompanied by a performance measurement. As a result the PM dedicates large part of the time on micro management, following up on communications and financial reports.

The project team is not adequately equipped to conduct the activities planned by the project with effectiveness. The team has one Technical Officer, whose expertise can obviously not cover all project topics, specially related to Land Use Planning, Climate Change Adaptation and Information Systems. Moreover, as observed previously in this report, in addition to the need of improved technical assistance to work in close hands with technicians within government institutions, there is need for strong advocacy work and policy dialogue in order to promote the integration of climate change risks into policy, planning and practice. The present configuration of the PMU cannot address these needs therefore the configuration of the PMU should be revised, including permanent and temporary staff.

Finally, the PMU does not have a dedicated person to develop knowledge and learning systems, and supervise awareness raising activities. The Administrative Assistant for ICCR and AFWP accumulated the role of Knowledge and Learning officer. In practice, his tasks are mainly administration, coordination of meetings, and e mailing of document to stakeholders. The consequence is that little has been done in the field of Knowledge and Leaning.

3.2.7 Management by the UNDP country office and GEF backstopping

Management by UNDP CO was concentrated on negotiations with partners in times of political instability, organization and facilitation of Board meetings and decisions that would correct implementation issues. UNDP CO support was heavily concentrated on solving management and administrative issues. However, there is little evidence of technical support provided to the project in for example, developing the ToRs. It must be noted that UNDP's Environmental Unit has been understaffed to effectively respond to the demands of technical support.

In addition, little support was given to effectively implement the M&E plan and a risk management system. The quality assurance role of UNDP, as specified in the Inception report, with specific activities for ICCR (regular monitoring activities, including field visits, risks management, lessons learned log, etc.), was performed with limitations due to the reasons above. It is important to point out that since October 2012 biweekly monitoring meetings have been carried out in the MEE to review the UNDP's project in the Environmental portfolio, as already mentioned before. This was a valid initiative that has been improving the communication amongst UNDP, the PMU and the PD, and as the participants[19] have executive decision making power, it is likely to provide prompt identification of issues and decisions to improve effectiveness.

GEF backstopping has been conducted through UNDP CO and GEF Regional Center advisor. During project design and Inception, GEF advisor was very active in refining the project document, setting work plans and negotiating with donors and the implementing agency. The support during implementation, focused mainly on solving administrative and management issues due to the characteristics of ICCR implementation. GEF Regional Office advisor visited Maldives's projects twice a year to monitor GEF supported projects since the start of ICCR. However, the interaction and technical support to the PMU, as well as the promotion of linkages with other GEF projects around the world, have been limited. This could have helped the PMU to overcome difficulties related to preparing adequate ToRs and evaluating the quality of the studies carried out in the project.

[19] Meetings are held with PD and PM of projects in the E&E Portfolio, UNDP DRR and UNDP's ARR for Environment and Energy Programmes.

GEF has a focal point in the Maldives, who is also the PD of ICCR. Although the Focal Point for GEF project has to be a knowledgeable person, as it is the case of ICCR PD, it creates a superposition of roles that limits the full use of GEF's Focal Point's role, as an additional a person that can provide technical support and oversight.

3.2.8 Coordination and operation issues

Coordination has been a challenge and generally is moderately unsatisfactory. The low level of project achievements and the limited number of meetings held in the Coordination and Technical committee impacted the motivation of partners to participate more actively in the project. Project partners and key stakeholders have had little opportunities to meet and coordinate actions at the operational level, as explained before.

Coordination in the last phase of project implementation should increase, as the scale of activities implemented will also increase, demanding contact and partnering of key stakeholders in the project. Good communication with stakeholders should also be ensured to allow optimal level of involvement and motivation.

3.2.9 Identification and management of risks

As mentioned in previous sections, a risk management strategy was proposed in the ProDoc and in the Inception Report. The major risks identified in the Inception Report (as an amendment of the Risk Log in the ProDoc) actually coincide with the main causes of delay in project implementation. The risks identified in the IR included: high staff turnover, reluctance of other ministries/agencies to participate without incentives for what is seen as additional work load, political pressure for conventional coastal protection infrastructure, and possible limitations on project co-financing contributions. The IR proposed three preliminary strategies that could have oriented project implementation: clearly defining and widely communicating viable adaptation measures and engaging local authorities and communities; implementing a high level project management implementing the accountability and oversight procedure and promoting wide stakeholder support for the project. It can be assumed that an effective risk management system, considering the risks management strategies in the IR, could have facilitated the solution or mitigation of problems at an early stage, avoiding protracted issues and delays.

Even though the LFM does not adequately reflect the risks indentified, the information contained in the ProDoc and IR could have been used as an initial input for the formulation of a detailed risk management plan, which was not developed. Risks monitoring is part of the UNDP's risk log in the ATLAS system identified in the ProDoc as part of project's risk management strategy. However, despite that instrument, there has not been a risk management practice in the project, whereby the main risks could have been mitigated through adaptive measures. The inadequate risk management of ICCR happened mainly

due to weak project management and excessive focus on micro management issues, dealing with routine administrative tasks.

Adaptive management usually refers to prompt reactions to issues found during implementation to avoid delays, inefficiency and ineffectiveness regarding administration, management arrangements, partner's relations, etc. In ICCR's case, a few cases can be mentioned in terms of adjustments made in the project management and implementation after a certain period of protracted problems: replacement of the Ministry as the chair of project board by MEE State Ministry August 2012; the introduction of bi-weekly monitoring meetings in October 2012. In the next phase of project implementation, a detailed assessment of risk and systematic risk management practice with well identified mitigation actions will be needed in order to avoid unnecessary delays in the implementation.

Summary of key findings:

1. The overall implementation approach is moderately unsatisfactory mainly due to the challenges to ensure key stakeholder's participation; a central issue to project's strategy. ***(Recommendations 2, 3, 5, 10)***
2. Limited use of project management tools, such as planning, M&E and risk management have limited the adoption of adaptive measures to correct problems during implementation. Planning, management, monitoring and evaluation are considered to be Moderately Unsatisfactory. (***Recommendations 7)***
3. Project Manager is not dedicated full time to ICCR. This has contributed to reducing time available to analyzing implementation progress, solving problems or finding the adequate alternatives to achieve results (***Recommendations 4)***
4. PMU (staff + temporary consultants) is not aligned with project implementation needs. (***Recommendations 6)***
5. GEF/UNDP backstopping was effective in providing administrative support, but too little was done on technical advice. The promotion of linkages with other GEF projects around the world has also been very limited. (***Recommendations 12)***
4. Low level of coordination between partners and low level of linkages with other related interventions and actors. (***Recommendations 3)***

3.3 Project Results

Overall, the level of achievement of results is low compared to the targets set in the LFM and activities scheduled in the Annual Work Plans, every year since 2010. In general, project rating and effectiveness is moderately unsatisfactory, as only an estimated thirty per cent of the activities were carried out. This rating confirms the judgment of ICCR team, expressed in the Quarterly reports in 2011 and 2012, as well as the UNDP's ratings in the APR of 2011-2012. However, it is important to point out that most of the key activities for

the achievement of outputs, are in the process of implementation and therefore the likelihood of achieving project's outcomes and objective is high, if changes are made in project implementation approach and management, as pointed out in this report (see also Annex 8). During this last phase of implementation, it is important to concentrate on consolidating the achievements so far and linking all project achievements towards achieving the outcomes.

As previously mentioned, project implementation has suffered significant delays in relation to the work plans, even though Climate Change related topics were important in the political agenda and the Inception Workshops involved all stakeholders to launch the project and create momentum. Some of the main causes for the delays were:

- **Late engagement of a Project Manager**: the PM position was advertised three times, because of the difficulty to find qualified candidates for the position, which reflects a capacity constraint in the country, as pointed out in other parts of the report. The PM was hired in September 2010[20] to work as PM in two government projects, LSM and ICCR, and not as a dedicated manager to ICCR. Until the PM was hired, the Senior Technical Officer was working as the acting PM.

- **Challenges due to the changing institutional context**: as explained earlier, the project has suffered delays due to institutional changes and late replacement of project counterparts, including appointment of Board Members during the institutional changes occurred in 2010 and 2012.

- **Procurement process usually slow and conducted more than once:** the project has carried out a total of seven large procurements for individual consultants and companies[21], four of which were launched more than once:

    - Four rounds of procurement (twice for National research Strategy, Guidelines for Land Use Plan and Guideline for Coastal Protection) were cancelled in 2010 because of the weak understanding of Government Officials about the Public Financial Regulations. Even though the regulations (October 2010) allow evaluation of tenders when just one qualified proposal is presented, the tender processes did not receive clearance from the Agency Tender Committee because the number of bidders was lower than three.

    - Three tender processes were cancelled due to inadequate quality of the technical proposals (twice for the Guidelines for Coastal Protection and once for the "Soft"

[20] Project started in February 2010 and Inception phase was concluded in May 2010

[21] (i) National Research Strategy, launched 3 times; (ii) Adaptation Survey; (iii) Guidelines for Formulation of Climate Resilient Land Use Plan, launched 2 times, (iv) Guidelines for Climate Resilient Coastal Protection, launched 6 times; (v) ToT and Training Plan; (vi) Regional Climate Change Model; (vii) Demonstration Activities in the Islands, launched 3 times, changed scope and launched a 4th time.

measures for demonstrations). This problem was caused partly because of bidders did not meet the required technical profile, but also because the ToRs were not sufficiently clear on the technical specifications required or outputs expected. In the case of the Guidelines for Coastal Protection, the ToRs were revised to incorporate those specifications. During the procurement process for "Soft" adaptation measures, after two attempts, it was understood that a detailed design of the demonstration projects was required prior to procuring a company to execute the "Soft" measures. Based on this finding, it was decided to hire a hydrologist, who was contracted in October 2012 to formulate the appropriate designs.

- Two tender processes (Guidelines for Coastal Protection and "Soft" measures for demonstrations) were cancelled because the financial proposal from the bidders exceeded project financial allocation. In the case of the demonstration activities, after 10 months invested in repeating the tender process, it was decided that due to the budget limitation, the number of demonstration islands had to be reduced to 2. Until this moment there has been no official approval of this modification.

- In at least three cases (i.e Adaptation Survey, Regional Climate Model, Training) a considerable time was spent to conduct the evaluation committees, from 50 to 88 days. This is partly due to the difficulty of getting experts capable of evaluating proposals and willing to give their time to these processes. As noted in other parts of the report, there is a technical capacity constraint in the country, the government is understaffed with technical experts, overburden with commitments from many projects and government tasks.

- A note needs to be made as to the time spent in trying the same path several times before changing procurement strategy. Particularly in the cases of the Guidelines for Coastal Protection, it took 5 rounds of procurement processes following Government procedures and more than 12 months, until the procurement was handed over to UNDP.

  It is important to consider that government procurement process for goods and services above 25,000 MRF takes 2 months to process within the Ministries' offices (MEE and MOFT), from the Submission of the evaluation of proposals to the Tender Committee up to the contracting of the winner party. The total time needed from the advertisement of the tender to the signature of the contract is around 3 months. When procurement exceeds 1,5 million MRF, the procedure is undertaken by the Central Procurement Office in the MoFT. Efforts have been made to improve coordination between project's host Ministry and the MOFT to avoid delays in procurement, as pointed out in the Project Board meeting in January 2011.

UNDP's procurement procedures could be a more efficient alternative especially for contracting individual consultants. An additional advantage is that UNDP's procurement office in the Maldives, could use the resources of its Regional Office to support expediting procurement processes. The main advantage of procuring through UNDP is the international reach and potential to find a wider number of experts in the required areas, even though the cost for the project would be higher due to UNDP's administration fees. This option would be a good alternative specifically for procuring consultants in the next phase of project implementation.
It must be noted that in two cases the procurement process took time to be carried out through UNDP. The interviews and reports state that the main causes for the long procurement included: non adequacy of procedures to UNDP's regulations for the contracting companies (Coastal Protection) and miscommunications between project staff and UNDP's CO on the steps to be followed (i.e. procurement for the land use planning peer review), therefore better communication is needed to avoid these issues.

- **Technical capacity for preparation of ToRs:** the project team has had difficulties to prepare ToRs for the tenders as it requires specific technical expertise in various different areas (Land use planning, coastal protection, modeling, information systems, etc.). This was an issue also due to the little support given by project counterparts with technical expertise. In a few cases, there was a long time invested in developing the ToRs (i.e. Information System) and in some cases there was a mismatch between the needs/expectation of the project and the contracted services, as it happened with the Review of Land Use Planning. In regard to the last case, the Planning Section of MHI was expecting from this first Review, very specific technical specifications (measurements for buffer zones, etc.), which was supposed to be contained in the Land use planning guidelines.

- **Limited utilization of management tools**: planning tools and effective monitoring were not adequately used in order to promptly identify problems and find suitable alternatives and adaptive measures to overcome the causes of delays in a reasonable timeframe.

- **Project's operational decision making**: according to government's regulations, it is the role of the PD to authorize administrative operations (i.e. payments, contracts), even though the Work/Financial Plan is approved yearly by the Board. This requires that the PD and PM spend a certain amount of time a month for these transactions. Although the PD is very efficient in expediting authorizations and ensuring that this task is delegated to a government officer in his absence, there is a certain amount of project time used in authorizing the transactions.

- **Change in project implementation sequencing**: in May 2011, a top down decision from the Project Board determined that the demonstration activities (Outcome 3) had to

be implemented immediately, despite the studies and guidelines not being formulated yet, with the exception of the Survey on Climate Change Adaptation Measures. According to the project logic and strategy, those studies and guidelines would have given the necessary information to the design appropriate "soft" measures in selected demonstration islands. Implementation of these demonstration measures without the technical studies and guidelines has been a decision that could have compromised the whole project approach. The purpose of the studies was to provide evidence of effective problems and the most adequate adaptation measures for the Maldives. Without the studies, there is a higher risk that the "soft" adaptation option project is not adequate to the natural characteristics of the island and not cost effective. This decision took the project logic and time sequence out of balance. The other components of the project were delayed and with this decision, the activities had to be accumulated during the same timeframe affecting further project effectiveness. In terms of formal planning of activities, there were no modifications made, as the demonstration activities were already part of the 2011 Work Plan (in addition to the ones pushed forward from 2010).

ICCR has produced very relevant documents: Survey on Climate Change Adaptation Measures in Maldives, National research Strategy on Climate Change, Development of High Resolution regional Climate Model for the Maldives, and Review of Land Use Planning in Maldives. The two first documents, together with the Coastal Protection Guidelines and Land Use Planning Guidelines, will provide information to better guide the identification of adequate adaptation measures, as it will be described in the section below. ICCR's demonstration activities will be identified also based on an assessment carried out by a hydrologist, as decided by the Project Board.

The project has been less effective in consolidating these important achievements, through the dissemination of products and an efficient follow up on the use of the information by the stakeholders. Information and training sessions need to be integrated into a broad and longer term capacity development approach in order to produce concrete effects in climate change risk resilience building.

The main outputs and products to date (November 2012) are summarized hereafter and in assessed against each target in Annex 8.

Output 1.1 Orientation, training plan and training of trainers

Targets: By the end of Year 1 2nd Quarter, a description and illustrations of low cost, 'soft' adaptation measures will have been disseminated; (2) By the end of Year 1, 10-15 qualified local trainers will have been produced.

The Survey on Climate Change Adaptation Measures in the Maldives was conducted in 40 islands and submitted in January 2011 after a six month delay in relation to the Work Plan.

The Survey provides baseline information on adaptation measures activities in Maldives, and identifies options currently being used in the country to guide project activities. The Survey was not published yet and was poorly disseminated amongst the stakeholders.

The training plan and the training manual were not at good standards and therefore could not be used. The "Four year training plan for the training component of ICCR" was a three page document suggesting a training method, with no indication of needs assessment, activities, timing, responsibilities, and all fundamental parts of a plan. This document did not bring any useful information to the project. The training manual was a superficial guidance for generic training sessions, not applicable or related to the ICCR's ToT, and therefore not useful to be replicated. The reformulation of the training plan and manual was put on hold to wait for project outputs to be achieved (i.e. Land use Guideline), but there has been no further discussion about reformulating it. This is an issue that deserves attention in the next phase of implementation.

The Training of Trainers was conducted in a two day session in January 2011, involving 16 public officials from provincial and National government levels. Training was on topics related to 'soft' adaptation measures for coastal protection and land use planning. The two days session was a very limited time to create a team of trainers on the selected topics, as targeted by the project. As there has been no follow up on the training, or training manuals to assist on the replication of the training sessions, this activity has not produced the desired results. However, given the importance of this Output for the achievement of Outcome 1, a more comprehensive capacity development approach (training/technical assistance, etc.) should be considered. A capacity development plan, including longer term support, should be formulated to incorporate all capacity development initiatives that the project plans to carry out in the selected topics, in order to achieve targets.

This output is likely to be achieved, as a considerable portion of the activities were carried out, although the training of trainers must be reorganized with a more effective approach in order to achieve effectively develop capacity of potential trainers.

Output 1.2 Regional climate change scenarios for the Maldives analyzed and updated to provide more accurate climate risk data for national and local planning

> **Targets**: (1) By the end of Year 1, existing climate change scenario information for Maldives have been reviewed, gaps identified and at least one state-of-the-art regional climate change scenario is available (subject to Modelling Review). (2) By the end of Year 2, **disaster risk profiles** of 10 islands revised to incorporate updated regional climate change scenarios and communicated to the relevant authorities and island communities.

The document on the regional climate change scenarios was delivered in a set of four reports during the period from July 2011 to March 2012 (initially planned for Q3 2010, and revised in Q2 2011). In the project work plan the expected time for the completion of this study was 3 months, however, due to the complexity of the study it took around 9 months to be completed. The activity was successfully achieved but there has been no further follow up, publishing and dissemination of the study, which limited its appropriation and use by stakeholders.

The quality of the reports is high as it responds to the ToR and presents an extensive analysis and presentation of the climate change scenarios, which is a new tool to help formulate better plans and revise island risks profiles. Report 1, reviews the existing climate change modelling information giving a preliminary assessment of the data sets available and the existing data gaps. Report 2, provides an review of existing data quality and gaps, and evaluates General Circulation Models and green house gas emission scenarios, which are useful for climate downscaling. In Report 3 there is a presentation of the climate change downscaling process, and Report 4, provides the climate change scenarios for the Maldives and the report on the training and workshop carried out.

After the completion of these reports, ICCR organized with RIMES a specialized training session to14-18 participants, on Geo-Climate Information System and a Workshop on Analysis of Climate Extremes that helped to disseminate the information of the report. It is important to note that even though there were these important training sessions, most of the interviewees had not received the documents sent by e mail. Amongst those, is the National Disaster Management Centre, a key stakeholder in this specific Ouput. The application of the study has been very limited by partners and stakeholders in general. As already mentioned, on the one side project design did not detail the follow up activities needed to ensure the information produced was published and widely disseminated, and training given was follow up with other capacity development activities to ensure application of the information. On the other, the communication of these reports from the project side was generally weak, mainly through e mails. The guidelines were uploaded in the Ministry website, but as already explained, without visibility. Finally, as the project website was not functioning, it could not be used as a dissemination mode.

This output has been partly achieved, even though the documents need to be published, disseminated and the training given, needs to be followed up with stakeholders, and work on target 2 is on-going.

Output 1.3 Provincial/atoll authorities, island authorities and civil society leaders for at least 4 islands understand climate change related risks and are able to prioritize appropriate land use planning and coastal protection measures

> **Targets:** (1) By the end of the project, at least 12 civil society leaders and 40 provincial/atoll and island government officials responsible for the demonstration and their respective provinces/atolls are **trained to assess** climate change risks and to prioritize, **plan and implement** locally appropriate measures for resilient land use planning and coastal protection; (2) By the end of the project, the development plans of at least **4 islands** integrate climate change resilient **land use planning** and coastal protection principles.

There has been no awareness or training activity tailored for this Output, considering the target participants described in the project. The project has had limited impact in raising awareness on Climate Change related risks and soft adaptation measures. This is an output that needs to be organized in parallel with the implementation of demonstration activities, so that communities and local stakeholders of selected islands can understand and support the implementation of "Soft" measures adaptation measures. Awareness building at local and national levels should have been a process implemented throughout project implementation in order to ensure that climate related risks and adaptation were understood, highly considered in the political and social agendas, and easily linked to international and national priorities.

This output needs to be reviewed to reduce the number of target islands in order to be achievable. Moreover it is advisable that this activity is outsourced to a company specialized in awareness campaign, in order to be more effective.

Output 1.4 Technical specialists in government departments responsible for land use planning, coastal zone management, coastal infrastructure development and land reclamation trained in the application of guidelines developed under Outputs 2.1 and 2.2

> **Targets:** (1) By the end of Year 2, at least 75% of technical specialists in MEE and MHI are trained in the application of guidelines on climate change resilient land use planning and coastal protection; (2) By the end of the project, at least 4 key government departments in MEE and MHI are applying the guidelines on climate change resilient land use planning and coastal protection regularly and systematically; (3) By the end of the project, the guidelines have been used to integrate climate change risk considerations into the land use plans of at least 6 non-demonstration islands; (4) By the end of the project, the EIA process undertaken by EPA incorporates the guidelines for climate change resilient erosion control; (5) By the end of the project, the Programmes & Projects Department had applied the

guidelines for the planning of all new harbour and land reclamation projects that are planned during the project lifetime

A one day training session was conducted with technicians from the Land use planning department, EPA and Atoll Councils on the land use planning guidelines formulated by the project. There has been not reporting on this activity. The training sessions were not evaluated and no follow up was given to support the application of the information provided during the training.

This output is achievable if a great deal of efforts is directed by a capacity development response plan, with very precise assessment of needs, setting of objectives and activities. The targets might need revision as to size the number of islands and government departments to a realistic number. Programmes & Projects departments have no information about ICCR and their main role is to monitor government's project implementation and management, it is important to reassess their role in the project, and revise the targets involving this Department. EPA's needs and commitment should also be reassessed and the agreement to clarify their role and responsibilities redesigned and formalized.

Output 1.5 A climate risk information system established that enables universal access to meteorological and oceanographic data for adaptation planning purposes

Targets: (1) By the end of the project, climate relevant data sets from MMS, EPA, MRC, NPD/MFT have been integrated into the national GIS system; (2) By the end of the project, at least 10 major stakeholder groups (government departments, provincial/atoll and island authorities, research institutions and civil society organizations) are actively retrieving information from the system for adaptation planning purposes.

It depended in part from the achievement of Output 1.2, and therefore it was delayed from the original schedule on the two last quarters of 2011. A ToR was prepared and sent for comments in November 2012 to hire a consultant that would develop the needs assessment of MMS in order to establish the database and information system and to formulate the framework for the information system / dissemination.

.

This output is achievable because of the full interest and engagement of MMS, however after the development of the Information System it is fundamental to place emphasis on the promotion of the information contained in the system and its utilization, in order to achieve project targets. The targets need revision as some of the agencies mentioned in the project have already integrated their datasets into the NGIS (i.e. EPA, MRS and ES/MEE) with the support of the Land Survey Department, which has also provided training on the

management of the System. The information available in the government agencies database needs to be selected and made compatible to the NGIS information standards, as well as the standardization of collection methods at council and national levels.

Output 2.1 Guidelines developed for climate risk resilient land use planning in the Maldives

> **Targets: (1)** By the end of Year 1, **existing findings and recommendations relevant to climate risk-resilient land use planning** have been collated, analyzed and disseminated to national authorities, 4 provincial/atoll and island authorities, civil society leaders and other key stakeholders; (2) By the end of Year 2, an **intermediate draft of a technical manual on climate risk-resilient land use planning, outlining different land-use planning options** for Maldivian islands and including a dedicated chapter on the design and management of EPZs, has been produced and reviewed by technical specialists in MHTE; (3) By the end of the project, a comprehensive **technical manual** on climate risk resilient land use planning is published in English and/or Divehi and made available electronically and in printed format to MoF; MEE , MHI ; and the 4 Provincial/Atoll and Island Offices targeted by the project; (4) By the end of the project, at least **3 additional sets of information materials on climate risk resilient land use planning produced** in English and/or Divehi, targeting different non-technical audiences including policy makers, politicians, NGOs, students and the media.

Land use planning and EIA regulations were reviewed from a climate risk resilient perspective under this activity. The document was submitted in April 2011 and was a general review of existing regulations from the perspective of reducing risks associated with climate change impact, and providing recommendations to include climate change risks and adaptation measures into land use planning regulations. The study was received with a certain degree of discontent by project partners, as it did not provide the detailed technical information to support the review of existing land use regulations (i.e. specifications for construction of harbours, etc.). It must be said that the ProDoc had identified two activities for this output, the review of land use planning and the planning guidance document, therefore the activities were carried out as planned. In any case, this study will be peer reviewed by an international consultant, who is expected to produce the guidelines that will be used to review Land Use planning regulations. The ToR for the Peer Review was sent to UNDP for advertisement in September 2012. The consultant will complete the activities planned to achieve this output.

This output is likely to be achieved as the activities are partly concluded, and the procurement of the consultant for formulation of the guidelines is on the way. The dissemination of the Land Use Plan Review document needs to be strengthened. In order to achieve the targets, the documents need to be published and disseminated.

Output 2.2 Guidelines developed for climate risk resilient coastal protection in the Maldives

Targets: (1) By the end of Year 1, existing findings and recommendations from recent assessments and studies undertaken by EPA and Programmes & Projects relevant to coastal protection (including lessons learned from past harbour development, land reclamation, and erosion control efforts) collated, analyzed and disseminated to national authorities and 4 provincial/atoll and island authorities, civil society leaders and other key stakeholders; (2) By the end of Year 2, an intermediate draft of a technical manual on resilient coastal protection with separate chapters on harbour development, land reclamation and erosion control produced and shared with relevant stakeholders; (3) By the end of the project, a comprehensive technical manual on resilient coastal protection published in English and Divehi and made available electronically and in printed format to MoF (the Department of Planning); MHTE (EPA, Programmes & Projects, NDMC, Land Use Planning Section); MHA; and the 4 Provincial/Atoll and Island Offices targeted by the project; (4) By the end of the project, at least 3 additional sets of information materials on resilient coastal protection in the Maldives and adaptation options in relation to harbour development, land reclamation and coastal erosion control produced in English and/or Divehi targeting different audiences including policy makers, politicians, NGOs, students and the media

The PMU received 3 reports (Inception, Field Mission and Framework), from a total of 9 reports. The deadline for submission of the whole setoff reports is January 2013. There will be 3 sets of guidelines targeting 3 levels of stakeholders: political, technical and island council. After submission, a period of consultations will take place and the final document will be presented in a Cabinet Working Session. The final product, due in February 2013, will be a handbook for wide dissemination.

This output is achievable as the reports are being produced and will be concluded in short timeframe. Publishing and dissemination should receive proper attention once the Guidelines are completed.

Output 2.3 A national research strategy to address information gaps on climate change impacts in the Maldives

Targets: (1) By Year 2, national climate change research strategy published; (2) By the end of project, the national climate change research strategy is being used by the Planning Department, EPA, MMS, MRC and relevant research institutions to guide and prioritize climate change related research in the country; (3) By the end of the project, at least 2 international research institutions have established collaborations with

counterpart Maldivian institutions to conduct joint work on priorities identified in the national climate change research strategy.

The National Research Strategy on Climate Change was drafted through a wide consultative process. The NRS aims at positioning the Maldives as a climate change impact research hub and a testing ground, particularly specializing in Small Island States.

The NRS draft was submitted in June 2011and given for the endorsement of the Climate Change Advisory Council in July 2011 for Council's endorsement but there has been no response until this date. The draft document was presented at National Commission on Protection of Environment, but there has been no publication or follow up on the partnership building to link this research to Country initiatives.

This output is partly achieved, as the document has been produced but not yet published or used to build partnerships. However, considering that the focus of 2013 should be on consolidating the guidelines for coastal protection and land use planning into institutional planning and practice, and demonstrating it in selected islands, the project should make an agreement to hand over the Research Strategy to the Maldives National University. The University would be in a better position to effectively network and build partnerships to operationalize the Strategy. ICCR through the MEE and relevant government agencies could support the University to promote and support the implementation of the strategy. In the stakeholder analysis contained in the ProDoc, the plan was to provide support to the University's (previously known as the Maldives College of Higher Education) environmental management course by furnishing information on climate change risk and adaptation. This idea contained in the ProDoc lays the foundation for the handover of the Strategy to the University. The Project should revise the targets for this output.

Output 3.1 Climate change resilient land use plans designed and specific measures demonstrated on at least four islands

Targets: (1) Climate change risk considerations integrated into at least 2 island land use plans by the end of Year 2 and into at least 4 island land use plans by the end of Year 3 (including two islands that do not yet have land use plans); (2) The EPZs of all 4 demonstration islands are redesigned in line with the technical guidelines developed under Output 2.2.

There has been no activity carried out for the achievement of this output. However, once the Guidelines for Land use planning are finalized, this activity can be implemented by ICCR consultants. The land use plans in the demonstration islands were formulated, but need revision to integrate the climate change risks aspects. Additionally the SoPs offer an additional opportunity to integrate Climate Risk related measures.

This output is achievable if the Island Councils and LGA are effectively engaged in the next phase of project activities. The targets might need revision to reduce the number of islands.

Output 3.2 "Soft" measures for coastal protection that incorporate future climate risks demonstrated in at least three islands

> **Targets**: (1) By the end of the project, at least 3 different, locally appropriate, "Soft" coastal protection measures that address future climate change impacts are under implementation.

After changing the strategy for the implementation of this output to include the design of the adaptation measures, a Hydrologist was hired and has started working in the 2 demonstration islands and 3 other islands, from end November, for a period of 3 months. The output will be the detailed design and costing of adequate soft adaptation measures in the two demonstration islands, as well as an assessment of adaptation options in other three islands affected by flooding. In February ICCR will be able to start procurement for the construction of demonstration activities in the two islands.

This output is achievable, assuming that the design will be adequately identified with local stakeholders and if the procurement procedures are well planned in order to increase efficiency. There are several risks for the effective achievement of this output, such as lack of political and community support and difficulty to ensure construction materials for the projects. It is fundamental that an accurate risk management strategy is formulated to deal with the problems and activate mitigation measures. Awareness raising and community mobilization activities should be carried out to prepare the ground for the implementation of these projects.

Output 4.1 Information generated by the project publically available through a web-based portal

> **Targets**: (1) By the end of the project, at least 10 major national and subnational user groups including Island and Atoll Offices, key sectors, research institutions, NGOs and environmental consultancy companies, make use of the web-based portal; (2) The web-based portal is actively linked and connected with other climate change-related initiatives that are relevant for SIDS

ICCR's host Ministry argued against the project web site as projects are temporary interventions. The idea was to incorporate project documents and information into the Ministry's web site so that it would be kept by the institution even after project end. Project documents and products were uploaded in MEE website. However, the categorization of documents is very poor. Documents are displayed in a chronological order, without specific

references to the project. The interviews carried out at national, Atoll and Island level have highlighted that the project have not had a good outreach. This contributes to low visibility of project activities and its products.

In March 2012, following the original plan, the design for the ICCR's website was approved, but not yet uploaded because it needs refinement of the contents, which was on-going at the time of the evaluation. This is an activity that needs attention and fast implementation to promote project's achievements and increase its visibility. Climate Change is a topic that attracts attention worldwide, therefore there is a great opportunity to use ICCR website to provide information about experiences elsewhere, raise awareness and promote debate on climate change related issues, as well as activating stakeholders, such as the Climate Youth Network.

The project newsletter was not developed because the MEE has already a Newsletter called Memphis, which could be used by the project. ICCR has published 2 articles since 2010.

This output is achievable if there is a person from PMU dedicated to post information material that will raise interest from the target audience. Achievement of the targets for this output will depend on the relevance, usefulness and promotion of the information uploaded. Website needs to be linked to other means of communication such as social media website in order to increase dynamism and outreach of the information posted. The project website should also be linked to MEE's website, as a "climate change" related site, in order to address MEE's concern that after the project ends, the website would lose importance.

3.3.1 Prospects of sustainability

Project implementation has not yet started to produce the conditions that will enable the sustainability of the outputs and outcomes, and therefore it is rated as moderately unsatisfactory. The prospects of sustainability are high if project outcomes are achieved, given that project strategy and implementation modality are relevant and funded on the alignment with GoM's policies and on the institutional and individual capacity development to review policies, prioritize, plan and implement climate change risk adaptation measures, land use planning and coastal protection. However, the project will require a great deal of effort in this last phase of implementation to increase ownership and coordination of key stakeholders. This is a challenge that needs to be rapidly addressed with to the revision of project organization structure, and its strategy to include advocacy and policy debate, awareness and broad capacity development approach, as suggested in this report.

Summary of Main Findings:

1. Project implementation has been delayed and implementation rate is moderately unsatisfactory. Project achievements are of important for the Maldives, even though are isolated and have produced little impact in changing behavior. Most of the outputs are likely to be achieved if recommendations are adopted.
2. Delays in project implementation were due to a series of internal (project management) and external factors (i.e. political instability, changes in government leadership and staff). Implementation of procedures to procure individuals and companies to carry out activities had a specific burden in meeting project schedule and targets. ***(Recommendation 8)***
3. Prospects of sustainability will depend on the increased engagement of stakeholders in project implementation, which is also a crucial condition for the achievement of outcomes and objectives. ***(Recommendations 2, 3, 5, 10)***

4. Key Recommendations

Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

Recommendation 1: review Logical Framework Matrix and project budget.

The targets for the outputs should be revised in order to reflect the changes made in the number of demonstration activities and other changes in the context. The revision should also include an adequate identification of risks and the introduction of activities suggested in this report in Outcomes 1 and 2: capacity development, more emphasis on the promotion of guidelines/studies and lobbying and advocacy. Moreover, it would also be recommendable a revision in project logic, as suggested in Annex 6. The budget must be revised according to major changes that occurred particularly in relation to the demonstration activities and the allocation of saved funds initially planned for preparation of the guidelines.

The LFM should be considered as a dynamic project management tool, it should be updated during project implementation in consultation with stakeholders, in order to reflect the changing conditions of internal and external contexts, and be useful for implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendation 2: re-launch the project through a participatory work planning event.

The formulation and validation of the 2013 Work plan might be taken as an opportunity to involve key stakeholders (project partners and beneficiaries and key actors such as the LGA), revise or ratify the agreements for project implementation and ensure that project concepts, strategy, objectives and schedule of activities are clear and agreed by all the parties involved. There is need to build a clear understanding by all stakeholders about how strategically important ICCR is to advance climate resilient planning and management in the Maldives. The "notion of urgency" for the implementation of ICCT should be shared by all key stakeholders, in the perspective of the relevance of the expected outcomes to the country and in prospective of continued GEF supported projects in Maldives.

Specific attention should be placed in reassessing the role of the Office of Programmes and Projects, and revise the targets involving this Department. In the same line, this planning exercise should be used to understand EPA's needs and commitment so that an agreement to clarify their role and responsibilities can be redesigned and formalized.

The formulation of the work plan should take into consideration the National election planned for September 2012. Activities that need coordination and management decisions at National level should be carried out preferably before elections. A well designed set of activities to introduce the project to new elected leadership and new appointed staff should be included in the WP.

In the first 6 months of the year 2013, it is recommended that project concentrates on the following: (i) carrying out all the procurements, (ii) finalizing all guidelines and Information system; (iii) preparing a capacity development response plan, which will help reassessing project's partners and beneficiaries needs in terms of capacity development; (iv) starting implementation of demonstration activities and combine these two experiences with local level capacity development; (vi) starting an awareness raising campaign.

After elections in September, it is suggested that the project focuses on: (i) completing demonstration activities; (ii) continuing implementation of awareness campaign; (iii) implementing training and technical assistance on the topics and modality contained in the training plan; (iv) promoting policy dialogue and advocacy.

Recommendation 3: reformulate project management arrangements to increase ownership and coordination.

The project management structure should be simplified in this final stretch of implementation, aiming at maximizing efficiency. Representatives in these project governance structures should have a close link to project activities and outputs. The revised structure should be formed by the Project Board with the objective of providing strategic direction and oversight, and a Coordination Committee that needs to be reinstated with a revised structure. The Coordination Committee should be operational to monitor progress and ensure technical collaboration on the implementation of activities, while promoting horizontal and vertical coordination and ownership of key institutions. ICCR focal points should be appointed within key institutions that are useful for project implementation. The members of the CC should include: Project Coordinator, Project Manager, ICCR senior technical advisor, EPA (MEE), MMS, Land Use Planning Section (MHI), Local Government Authority (MHA), NDMC (MoSD) and experts in the relevant fields as appropriate. The Committee should meet at least monthly to review implementation status and advice on specific issues. Members of the committee and invited guests could be called for specific technical advice or assistance.

Recommendation 4: revise project manager position.

ICCR should have a full time, dedicated Project Manager in order to ensure that project activities are implemented as planned, stakeholders are kept involved and adaptive

measures are promptly taken if necessary. The experience of ICCR and LSM projects[22], have proven that the management arrangement of a shared PM is not effective.

Recommendation 5: strengthen the policy and capacity development components.

The purpose of Output 2.4[23] is to produce policy notes, based on the information formulated with ICCR's support, to guide the integration of Climate Change Risk management into existing policy framework. The results of ICCR have so far been somehow disconnected and isolated. Effective "scale-up" of project's findings into policies and plans, depends highly on the generation of an active political debate on the key topics (such as land use planning, EIA, coastal protection). The project design should be revised in order to foster policy dialogue and advocacy, engage and influence key decision makers at National and local levels.

Building up on UNDP's solid experience and expertise in capacity development, the project should formulate a capacity development plan, with a more effective and integrated approach to include adequate methods of capacity development (training, coaching, technical assistance), according to the needs of the project's partners and in line with project outcomes.

Recommendation 6: align PMU (permanent staff and temporary consultants) with project's needs.

ICCR should focus on three main lines of action in order to achieve results in this last period: (1) organization capacity development; (2) capacity development of authorities through and (3) awareness of communities and civil society. The demonstration activities in the two islands will be functional to strengthen these three main lines of action.

It must be considered that there will be a concentration of activities that need to be carried out effectively in 2013, and if the project is to be effective and efficient, the set up of the PMU should reflect that, with three main actions:

- The division of tasks in the PMU should be clarified so that each staff member understands clearly his/her tasks and responsibilities. Staff management tools such as performance monitoring, should be introduced to ensure accountability and continuous feedback, in order to identify capacity gaps to improve performance.

[22] The presentation of preliminary findings of LSM Final Evaluation, held in November 2012, Male also highlighted this issue in the context of LSM effectiveness.

[23] Output 2.4: Recommendations developed on how to integrate climate risk management into land use planning, coastal zone management, decentralization, privatization and disaster risk reduction policies.

- The project should have a dedicated Knowledge and Management staff to coordinate all activities related to training and awareness. The Administrative assistance should be a separate figure to deal only with administration (authorizations, communications, organization of meetings, etc.).

In order to achieve project's objective, the PMU should have (in accordance with the Work Plan) competent International and national consultants/ advisors with relevant expertise in the main topics covered by the project, such as Climate risk management, land use planning and coastal protection. These consultants should be able to provide technical inputs on specific project activities, provide training to civil servants and technical assistance in the form of coaching to ensure that key institutions understand and are able to integrate concepts into their work. A senior advisor should be hired to lead the activities related to policy dialogue and advocacy.

Recommendation 7: strengthen project management tools, focusing on RBM approach to increase effectiveness and accountability.

The project management should formulate and effectively use Plans with realistic timeframes and targets, and monitor the progress. In addition to the Annual Work plans/budget the following plans would be recommendable:

- Short term plan: it should be developed and linked to monitoring exercises, in order to measure progress, identify implementation problems in time and timely implement adaptive measures. The plans should be formulated with the participation and endorsement of the key stakeholders of the coordination commitment, and should have detailed activities, tasks, responsibilities and budgets.

- Risk management plan: risks identified in the Inception Report should be assessed to evaluate its pertinence, and analysis of the context should indicate other eventual risks. Mitigation measures should be identified and promptly applied to reduce negative impact to the project, taking into consideration high probability risks that Elections in September 2013 will affect some activities.

- Procurement plan: with UNDP support, the plan should rapidly set out all procedures that are planned to take place in 2013, with detailed activities, considering all the steps needed from the preparation of documents to launch the tender to contracting. While formulating the plan, it is important to take into account different procurement modalities, and select UNDP's or GoM's procedures, depending on the one that will produce best results for each particular case, considering the emergency mode that the project should be entering in order to achieve its results with minimum extension. According to the this evaluation's findings, UNDP's procedures are adequate to hire individual consultants, as UNDP's advertising capacity has broader reach and more

capacity to procure through the Country or Regional Offices. GoM's would be more indicated to procure companies for example for the execution of demonstration activities, as the Ministry has experience and good knowledge of contractors.

The implementing and executing agencies should collaborate with MTE to improve coordination mechanisms and set up a clear agreement with relevant sections of MEE and MFT to expedite procurement processes. An analysis of the most adequate options to expedite the next procurements in ICCR should be carried out and integrated in the procurement plan, in order to improve efficiency.

- Monitoring should be a systematic and continuous exercise. In addition to the bi-weekly meetings with UNDP's senior management, the Coordination Committee meetings should be used to objectively monitor activities based on what was planned for that period. Regular planning and monitoring staff meetings could be used to foster reflective thinking, identify and integrate lessons learned into management.

- Reporting should be made more analytical, discussed and shared with project stakeholders to receive appropriate feedback.

Recommendation 8: **speed activities to strengthen project's project visibility and raise awareness.**

High visibility activities are needed in a project to create an enabling environment that will support achievement of project results. This should be made initially by launching the project website (regularly updated with articles of interest and other potential forms of communications such as a blog linked to the project web site). Moreover, ICCR's participation in Climate Change Networks and forums, as well as the publication and dissemination of project's products would be an important way to increase project's visibility.

Awareness raising is a fundamental part of involving and getting support from communities and government authorities about the issues raised in the project. This activity should be outsourced to a professional company able to design and coordinate implementation of these activities.

Recommendation 10: improve internal and external communications to increase involvement and generate commitment in the project.

There is need to strengthen the communication efficiency within the project (PMU, UNDP and MEE) and between the project and key stakeholders, using different techniques in order to motivate, increase involvement and share project information efficiently. Communications should be made systematic and consistent in order to keep all stakeholders updated.

Recommendation 11: strengthen linkages with other projects and networks dealing with Climate Change.

Project should foster coordination and synergies, and contribute to building momentum needed to influence policies and practice. Examples of the synergies that can be created are: (i) the Youth Climate Network, which has a mobilized Youth groups in Kulludhuffushi island, and (ii) the USAID Enhance Climate Resiliency and Water Security Project, which has activities in 2013 to build the capacity of MMS staff.

Recommendation 12: maximize *"lessons learned, lessons exchanged and lessons implemented".*

GEF should ensure that the general knowledge accumulated in the projects is channeled to new projects. GEF projects being implemented around the world should be virtually linked to each other to allow an effective exchange of experience and information sharing in real time. This would allow project staff around the world to tap into experiences, ensuring that lessons are not only learned but also implemented. Additionally, it would be useful to have a database of lessons learned on critical technical and management issues, so that it could be easily accessible to project managers and staff.

5. Lessons learned

It is expected that the project will produce lessons and good practices when implementation of demonstration activities and other project outputs are concluded. These measures have the potential to pave the way for the integration of Climate related risks into policy, planning and practice in various sectors, and intend to introduce "Soft" adaptation measures into the options to be considered in improving resilience of islands, with locally prioritized, cost-effective and ecosystem based alternatives.

The main lessons learned in terms of project implementation and management can be summarized as follows:

- Adequate planning and M&E practice are necessary to better control project implementation and identify adaptive measures; especially in a changing institutional and political environment like has been the case in the Maldives for the past 4 years.
- Management arrangements should reflect institutional culture and capacity in order to be effective. In Maldivian case, it was proven that Ministries are understaffed, and as the technical capacity is limited, the technical staff is used to cover several different roles. In this context, the management organization should favour simplicity of form and operations, while highlighting accountability.

- As the project intended to bring changes in policy, planning and practice, it should have ensured that mechanisms were put in place to generate policy dialogue and keep engagement of national and local stakeholders and decision makers.

6. ANNEXES

Annex 1: ToR

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*[24] *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.

[24] 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.

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:

a. Assess whether the project design is clear, logical and commensurate with time and resources available;
b. 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;
c. An evaluation of project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the project document
d. An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the projects outputs produced to date in relation to expected results;
e. An analysis of the extent of cooperation on gender sensitivity and synergy created by the project in each of its component activities;
f. 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;
g. Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the project document;
h. 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;
i. 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.

j. A qualified assessment of the extent to which project outputs to data have scientific credibility;
k. An assessment of the extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have influenced the execution of the project activities;
l. A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met;
m. Lessons learned during project implementation;
n. 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:

a. 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);
b. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications, audiovisual materials, other materials and reports;
c. Interviews with the Project Managers and other project staff; and
d. 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 day - 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:

a. A presentation of the findings to key stakeholders;
b. An executive summary, jointly prepared by the consultants, including findings and recommendations;
c. A detailed evaluation report covering Scope of the Mid-term review with detailed attention to lessons learnt and recommendations; and
d. 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 cost for the Mid-Term Review is estimated at US$15,000 which includes consultant fee, daily subsistence allowances and 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 2: List of persons interviewed

	Name	Organization	Position
Interviews in Male			
1.	Mr. Abdul Matheen Mohamed	MEE	State Minister and Chair of ICCR Project Board
2.	Mr. Ahmed Saleem	MEE	Permanent Secretary and ICCR Project Director
3.	Mr. Amjad Abdulla	MEE, Climate Change and Energy Department	Project Coordinator
4.	Mr. Amir Hassan	MEE, Climate Change Council	Project Coordinator
5.	Abdul Muhsin Ramiz	MEE, Maldives Meteorology Service	Director
6.	Abdulla Wahid	MEE, Maldives Meteorology Service	Assistant Executive Director
7.	Mr. Ibrahim Naeem	MEE, Environmental Protection Agency	Director
8.	Mr. Rifath Naeem	EPA	Senior Environmental Analyst
9.	Mr Andrew David Cox	UNDP	UN Resident Coordinator
10.	Ms Azusa Kubota	UNDP	Deputy Resident Representative
11.	Mr. Inaz Mohamed	UNDP	Assistant Resident Representative for Environment and Energy Programmes
12.	Ms. Aminath Shooza	UNDP	Project Assistant
13.	Ms. Najfa Razee	ICCR PMU	Project Manager
14.	Ms. Zumeena Aminath	ICCR PMU	Administration Officer
15.	Mr. Abdulla Waheed	ICCR PMU	Knowledge Management and Administration Officer
16.	Mr. Hussain Naeem	ICCR PMU	Technical Officer
17.	Ahmed Shareef Nafees	Ministry of Home Affairs	Director General
18.	Ms Aminath Athifa	MHI, Housing Department	Deputy Executive Director
19.	Mr. Mohamed Azim	MHI, Planning Section	Assistant Planner
20.	Mr Zuhurulla Sivad	MHI, Planning Section	Director
21.	Mr. Ibrahim Zameel	MHI, Office of Programmes and Projects	Senior Contracting Officer
22.	Mr. Abwar Ali	MHI, Office of Programmes and	Officer in Charge

		Projects	
23.	Mr. Hassan Shiyaz	MHI, Office of Programmes and Projects	Officer in Charge
24.	Mohamed Shafee	MHI, Land Survey Department	Assistant Director
25.	Ms. Fathimath Thasneem	Ministry of Defence and National Security, Disaster Management Centre	Deputy Minister
26.	Mr. Hisan Hassan	Ministry of Defence and National Security, Disaster Management Centre	Project Director and ICCR Focal Point in NDMC
27.	Farooq Mohamed Hassan	Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture, Tourism Adaptation Project	Project Manager
28.	Mr. Mohamed Imad	Ministry of Finance and Treasury - Department of National Planning	Director
29.	Mr. Yoosuf Rilman	Mnistry of Fisheries and Agriculture	Research Officer
30.	Mr. Adnan Haleen	Maldivian Association of Construction Industry	Vice President
31.	Mr. Fayaz Mansoor	Maldivian Association of Construction Industry	Board Director
32.	Imad Mohamed Imad	Local Government Authority	Planning Officer
33.	Zeena Ali	Local Government Authority	Director
34.	Mr. Mohamed Shan Ahmed	Maldives Environmental Management Project	Project Coordinator
35.	Mr. Gordon Gwers	Maldives Environmental Management Project	Technical Advisor
36.	Ms Zameela Ahmed	Enhance Climate Resiliency and Water Security Project - USAID	Deputy Chief of Party
37.	Mr. Mathew Boyer	Enhance Climate Resiliency and Water Security Project - USAID	Operations Manager
38.	Aysha Niyz	Youth Climate Network	Co-founder
Interviews in Kulhudhuffushi Island			
39.	Ali Mohamed	Haa Dhaalu Atoll Council	Council member
40.	Hussain Rafneed	Haa Dhaalu Atoll Council	Council President
41.	Adam Wali	Haa Dhaalu Atoll Council	Council member
42.	Mohamed Shulcoor	Haa Dhaalu Atoll Council	Council member
43.	Zahanyya Hassan	Haa Dhaalu Atoll Council	Council Vice President

44.	Jamsheed MOhamed	Kulhudhuffushi Island Council	Council member
45.	Ahmed Ali	Kulhudhuffushi Island Council	Council member
46.	Ibrahim Rammey	Kulhudhuffushi Island Council	Council President
47.	Ali Adam	Kulhudhuffushi Island Council	Council member

Annex 3: List of documents reviewed

Project Documents:

- Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives Project (ICCR). 2009. Project Document (without Annexes 1 to 5).
- _ 2010. Inception Report and Annexes.
- _ 2011. Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Report 2010 – 2011
- _ 2012. Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Report 2011 – 2012
- _ 2010. Project Quarterly Reports Q1 to Q4.
- _ 2011. Project Quarterly Reports Q1 to Q4.
- _ 2012. Project Quarterly Reports Q1 to Q4.
- _ Work Plans 2011 and 2012
- _ Project Board Meeting Minutes dated 10/01/2011, 19/05/2011, 22/01/2012 and 14/08/2012.
- _ Table on expenditure with total amounts per Outcome/year; and GoM co-financing table with total amounts per agency/year; table with project procurement process dates.
- _ Correspondence UNDP to GoM: Ref. No 72423/2012/01 dated 06/09/2012.
- _Correspondence GoM to UNDP: Ref. No 138/Priv/2011/24 dated 09/02/2011; Ref. 138/Priv/2011/12 dated 5 January 2011;
- Upper South Utilities Limited – Bid Proposal for Demonstration Activities.

Reference documents:

- Global Environmental Facility (GEF) Evaluation Office. 2010. Monitoring and Evaluation Policy.
- _. Community of Practice. 2011. A Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation Adaptation to Climate Change.
- Government of Maldives (GoM). 2009. The Strategic Action Plan. National Framework for Development 2009 -2013. Maldives.
- _ 2010. Strategic National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation 2010-2020. Maldives.
- _ UNDP/GEF. 2007. Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Maldives Project (LSM). ProDoc.
- _ UNDP. Strengthening Local Democracy and Governance in Maldives. ProDoc.
- Government of Maldives and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Disaster Risk Management Program. 2007. Detailed Island Risk Assessment in Maldives. Draft Volume III: Detailed Island Reports. December 2007. Maldives.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2012. Special Report of the Intergovernmental panel on Climate Change. Managing the risks for extreme events

and disasters to advance climate change adaptation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Male Declaration on the Human Dimension of Global Climate Change. November 2007.
- Ministry of Environment, Energy and Water of Maldives. 2007. Climate Change Thematic Assessment. Draft Report October 2007. Maldives.
- _ Memphis Environmental Newsletter numbers 1 to 37 (January 2010 to July 2012). Maldives.
- _. 2007. National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA). Maldives.
- Ministry of Housing, Transport and Environment (MHE) of Maldives. May 2011. Development of High Resolution Regional Climate Model for the Maldives, through statistical and dynamical downscaling of global climate models to provide projection for use in national and local planning. Report 1 Review of Existing Climate Change Modelling Information.
- _ August 2011. Development of High Resolution Regional Climate Model for the Maldives, through statistical and dynamical downscaling of global climate models to provide projection for use in national and local planning. Report 2 GCM and Emission Scenario Selection.
- _ November 2011. Development of High Resolution Regional Climate Model for the Maldives, through statistical and dynamical downscaling of global climate models to provide projection for use in national and local planning. Report 3 Downscaling process, results and uncertainties.
- _ February 2012. Development of High Resolution Regional Climate Model for the Maldives, through statistical and dynamical downscaling of global climate models to provide projection for use in national and local planning. Report 4 Climate Change Scenarios and their interpretation for Maldives.
- _ April 2011. Integration of Climate Change Risks into Land Use Planning.
- _ 2009. Maldives National Capacity Self Assessment Report and Action Plan for Global Climate Change, biodiversity and Land degradation conventions. Final Report January 2009. Maldives.
- _ April 2011. National Climate Change Research Strategy. Integration of Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives Project, Draft.
- _ January 2011. Survey of Climate Change Adaptation Measures in Maldives. Final Report.
- National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC). 2012. National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013) - Interim, 31 October 2012.
- Shaig, Ahmed. n/d Research paper: Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment of Maldives Land and Beaches. Centre for Disaster Studies. James Cook University. Townsville.

- Sovacool, B.K. 2012. Expert views on climate change adaptation in the Maldives. Springer Science Business Media BV January 2012.
- Sovacool, B.K. 2011. Hard and Soft paths for climate change adaptation. Climate Policy 11 pp. 1177-1183.
- Sovacool, B.K. 2011. Perceptions of climate change risks and resilient island planning in the Maldives. Springer Science Business Media BV. October 2011.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2012. Climate Change Adaptation Bulletin. Environment and Energy. Issue n°9. June 2012.
- _ 2009. Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results. New York.
- _ Evaluation Office. 2012. Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects. New York.
- United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP). 2012. Ecosystem-Based Adaptation Guidance. Moving from Principles to Practice. Working Document: April 2012.
- Wen-Wei, Christina Chen. 2012. Constructing EIA Mechanism in Response of Climate Change in Asia: a Driving Force Analysis. Draft Prepared for the 2012 International Conference on ICAPS.

Websites:

- http://www.thegef.org
- http://www.undp.org.mv
- www.climate-eval.org
- http://www.ipcc.ch
- http://www.rimes.int
- http://daraint.org/climate-vulnerable-forum
- www.mhe.gov.mv
- www.mee.gov.mv
- http://www.shareefweb.com
- http://www.maldivesmission.ch
- http://www.adaptationlearning.net
- http://www.unep.org
- https://www.gfdrr.org

Annex 4: Key Evaluation questions and Sources of Information

Guiding Evaluation Question	Analysis Criteria/information needed	Sources of information/data collection methods
1. Project Design: relevance and appropriateness		
What is the assessment of project's relevance and harmonization to Maldives' priorities, policies and plans?	Consistency or discrepancy between political framework and project proposal.	•Document Analysis •Key Informants Interview (KII) with key actors at community level and partners • KII with Government Authorities (MHE, EPA, MMS, MHA, CCC, MED, MTAC, MNU, MRC, LGA)
To what extent is the project a feasible and relevant alternative to address the problems and needs identified?	Characteristics of problems and needs identified against project actions; Perceptions of stakeholders on the level coherence between project approach and national needs and problems;	•Document Analysis • KII with key actors at community level and partners •KII with Government Authorities
How effectively have partners and beneficiaries participated in project design process? To what extent have this process improved coordination between actors involved in implementation?	History of meetings and discussions leading to project design. Perception of stakeholders on level of participation and integration of their views in the final ProDoc.	•Document Analysis •KII key actors at community level and partners •KII with MHE Departments and divisions involved in the project, and other Government Authorities at all levels
To what extent project design was appropriate and consistent in terms of intervention logic, implementation timeframe,	Consistency of intervention logic (results chain, clear outcomes and outputs, relevant and measurable indicators, risk	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF (technical and management staff),

identification of risks, management arrangements and resource allocation?	analysis) ; Appropriateness of time allocated for the delivery of outputs; Coherence between activities planned and resources allocated; Appropriateness of management and decision making arrangements.	MHE, key implementing partners.
Project implementation progress: efficacy		
What has been the progress of each outcome and output in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and work plans?	Perception of key actors on project progress and quality of outcomes to date. Planned actions against implemented actions to produce outputs. Analysis of RBM matrix.	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
To what extent is the quality and significance of project's outputs in line with plans and expectations?	Planned Outputs against analysis of results in terms of quality, scope and significance.	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
AnneDoes the outputs produced to date have scientific credibility?	Observation on quality of reports. Verification of comments and reviews received by climate change scientists.	•Document Analysis •KII with Project Board Members •Comments and publications about products •KII with other projects and professionals related to project topic •Web search
Have recent scientific and technical information and knowledge been incorporated or influenced the execution of the project activities? How?	Review of implementation process and changes on project activities due to recent scientific and technical information.	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners. •KII key stakeholders
Have any unforeseen outputs been produced? How does it contribute to the planned outcomes?	Description and analysis of unforeseen outputs produced	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.

To what degree the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met in the timeframe initially proposed?	Analysis of progress to date and of planned activities to reach outputs against planned timeframe	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
What have been the main challenges faced during implementation to keep project on track?	Perception of main problems.	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
To what extent coordination and communications amongst implementing actors influenced achievement of results?	Description and judgement of level of coordination. Perception of stakeholders	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
How effective was the coordination and collaboration with other similar projects?	Description and judgement of level of coordination that was useful to the achievement of products and outputs Level of synergy in each outcome	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners. •KII project managers of similar projects
How have gender issues been integrated in each of its component activities?	Analysis of the gender issues in the implementation process and activities	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners. •KII local level stakeholders
What are the lessons learned and good practices that can be highlighted?	Description of good practices	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
Project Management and Administration: Efficiency		
To what extent has the organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions been efficient to support project execution?	Analysis of Institutional structure Decision making structure Information and communication flux Adoption of decisions made by Board Characteristics of project	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.

	team: technical and managerial ability	
What is the assessment of functionality of the institutional structure (Project Board, Technical Support and Advisory Team and working groups) ? To what extent has it been helpful in addressing challenges during implementation with concrete proposals?	Identification of problems and proposal of viable corrective measures Availability and support given	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
How effective was GEF/UNDP backstopping to ensure project implementation was timely, appropriate and effective?	Type of support given Influence of backstopping in efficiency and efficacy.	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
To what extent the implementing partners and other key stakeholders have committed and driven the implementation process? What was the impact of their behaviour in the project implementation?	Level of participation in all aspects of project implementation	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
How were the M&E Plan and its tools used to keep track of project progress and address challenges during implementation?	Design and implementation modality of M&E plan and tools	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
What is the quality of reporting?	Analysis of reports contents Perception of key stakeholders on usefulness of reports	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
What were the main programmatic and financial variances and/or adjustments made during the first two years of the project?	Changes made during the project implementation	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
Was the project able to identify	Updated analysis of the situation	•Document Analysis

risks and take prompt and effective measures to adapt to external and internal challenges/changes in order to attain results? What was the role of Project Board? How appropriate were they in terms of overall objectives of the project and in terms of following agreed decisions?	against modifications made during project implementation;	•KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
What was the cost benefit or the activities implemented by the project?	Expenditure per project outcome and output, against results and products Human and financial resources to reach results.	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
What is the ratio between the expenditures on administration/overhead charges in relation to expenditures to achieve outputs?	Analysis of expenditures	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
What were the main problems and constraints that influenced project implementation in relation to: administration, management, decision making, technical support?	Description of practices and the problems encountered in each area	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.
Prospects of Sustainability and replicability		
To what extent have project results and products to date influenced behaviour and practices at central and local levels?	Description of any changes in behaviour and practices	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners
To what extent have the conditions for sustainability and replicability, as described in the prodoc, continue to hold true. Have political changes	Analysis of the sustainability criteria against any changes in the context	•Document Analysis •KII with project staff, UNDP/GEF, MHE, key implementing partners.

during 2012 impacted positively or negatively in the sustainability and replicability, as expected in project design?		

Annex 5: Summary of project Rating

The 3 tables below contain a summary of the rating given to the parameters suggested in the ToR, as commented throughout the text: (1) Objectives, Outputs and Activities; (2) M&E; (3) other parameters.

The project parameters and rating system were suggested in the ToR for ICCR MTR (pg. 6).

(1) Rating of achievement of Objectives, Outputs and Activities

Parameters	Rating	Comments
Achievement of objectives, outputs and activities	MU	The project had significant delays, and it was managed with limited effectiveness due to several external and internal issues such as political instability and institutional changes, inadequate use of management tools, including short planning and M&E. Several project outputs are partly achieved or under implementation. The project is therefore expected to achieve its objective and outputs, if corrective measures are adopted. It might be worth considering a brief extension due to the election period planned for 2013 that very likely will have a negative impact in the implementation of activities.

Rating	***Description***
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	*Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice".*
Satisfactory (S)	*Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.*
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	*Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.*
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	*Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.*

Unsatisfactory (U)	*Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.*
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	*The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.*

Source: UNDP/GEF's APR/PIR 2011-2012

(2) Implementation of M&E

Project M&E systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation

Parameters	Rating	Comments
Monitoring and evaluation	U	The M&E plan was initially designed in the Inception Report. Baseline information was included in the LFM. The M&E system was not further detailed during implementation. Quarterly reports and Board meetings were the activities carried out to monitor progress. Since October 2012 biweekly monitoring meeting have been held with representatives from Executing and Implementing agencies (PD, PM, UNDP CO) to monitor UNDP's environmental portfolio projects.

Rating	***Description***
a. Highly satisfactory (HS)	*There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.*
b. Satisfactory (S)	*There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.*
c. Moderately satisfactory (MS)	*There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.*
d. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)	*There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.*
e. Unsatisfactory (U)	*There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.*
f. Highly unsatisfactory (HU)	*The project had no M&E system.*

Source: the Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations (Evaluation Document N°3, 2008).

(3) Other parameters

Parameters	Rating	
Cost-effectiveness	MU	Significant delays were accumulated during the first 31 months since the project started, Soft Adaptation measures, considered in the ProDoc a key aspects of high cost-effectiveness was not yet implemented, but it is very likely to be attained as the preparatory activities have already started.
Sustainability	MU	Project implementation has not yet started to produce the conditions that will enable the sustainability of the outputs and outcomes, prospects of sustainability are high if project outcomes are achieved, given that project strategy and implementation modality are relevant and funded on the alignment with GoM's policies and on institutional development.
Replicability	MU	Replication is well designed in the overall strategy of ICCR and as a separate output (3.3). It is expected that the individual and institutional capacity development and the formulation of clear guidance at policy and planning levels to adapt to climate risks, as well as the demonstration of the cost effectiveness of "soft" adaptation measures, the will facilitate replicability. As these outputs have not been achieved yet, the pre-conditions for replication of project approach have not yet started.
Implementation approach	MU	The implementation approach Is based on good analysis of GoM's context, anchored on GoM's policies/plans. However, there have been challenges to ensure key stakeholder's participation, which is central to the implementation approach.
Stakeholders participation	MU	Stakeholder participation was well planned in the ProDoc and in the Inception report as a result of a significant stakeholder analysis and Stakeholders Involvement Plan. Partly due to the delays in implementation there was very little interaction with local level stakeholders, and the involvement of other stakeholder was not as expected during the design phase due to the limitations given by contextual factors and management arrangements/tools.
Country ownership	MU	Project design (based on GoM's plans and priorities) and implementation modality (NEX) should ensure ownership. However, due to the high level of

		political instability and changes in the management of key institutions, with the exception of the MEE-CCD, other partner government agencies have limited knowledge and involvement with the project.
Planning and management	MU	Only annual planning was developed, and these were not based on the analytical practice. No short term planning was formulated, other than the quarterly requests for funds that provided an idea of the activities to be implemented during the quarter. Procurement plans and risk management were not introduced in project management.

The following rating system was used:

Rating	***Description***
a. Highly satisfactory (HS)	*There were no shortcomings in the project regarding the parameter analyzed.*
b. Satisfactory (S)	*There were minor shortcomings in the project regarding the parameter analyzed.*
c. Moderately satisfactory (MS)	*There were moderate shortcomings regarding the project in the parameter analyzed.*
d. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)	*There were significant shortcomings regarding the project in the parameter analyzed.*
e. Unsatisfactory (U)	*There were major shortcomings regarding the project in the parameter analyzed.*
f. Highly unsatisfactory (HU)	*The project had severe shortcomings in the parameter analyzed.*

Annex 6: Proposal for revision of Outcomes 1 and 2 and recommended implementation schedule

Outcomes/Outputs	Main Activities	Planned/Recommended schedule
Outcome 1: Enhanced GoM organizational capacity to integrate climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development		
Output 1.1 Regional climate change scenarios for the Maldives analyzed and updated to provide more accurate climate risk data for national and local planning	Activity 1.1.1 – Modelling review Activity 1.1.2 – Revised modelling Activity 1.1.3 – Dissemination of model results and updated risk profiles	Follow up actions d be implemented in Q 3-4 - 2013
Output 1.2 Guidelines developed for climate risk resilient land use planning in the Maldives	Activity 1.2.1 - Review of land use planning issues Activity 1.2.2 – Land Use planning guidance document Activity 1.2.3- Support publishing and wide dissemination of guidelines	Procurement and development of guidelines should be concluded in Q2 2013. Dissemination Q3 - 2013
Output 1.3 Guidelines developed for climate risk resilient coastal protection in the Maldives	Activity 1.3.1 Survey of Adaptation Measures Activity 1.3.2 – Review of coastal protection measure (key policies Activity 1.3.3 – Coastal protection guidance document Activity 1.3.4 – Support publishing and wide dissemination of guidelines	Guidelines expected to be concluded in February 2013. Publishing and dissemination in Q2 - 2013
Output 1.4 A climate risk information system established that enables universal access to meteorological and oceanographic data for adaptation planning	Activity 1.4.1 – Capacity assessment Activity 1.4.2 – Information system development plan Activity 1.4.3 – Information system implementation Activity 1.4.4 – Support on design and implementation	Q 1 to Q3 - 2013

purposes	of IS promotion of campaign	
Output 1.5 A national research strategy to address information gaps on climate change impacts in the Maldives	Activity 1.5.1 – Research strategy Activity 1.5.2 – Research partnerships through hand over to the University of Maldives	Q1 - 2013
Output 1.6 Recommendations developed on how to integrate climate risk management into land use planning, coastal zone management, decentralization, privatization and disaster risk reduction policies	Activity 1.6.1 Formulate and implement an advocacy and lobbying campaign Activity 1.6.2 – Climate risk management policy notes Activity 1.6.3 – Climate risk management workshop Activity 1.6..4 – Climate risk management policy revisions and compliance strategy	Q3 – 2013 until the end of the project
Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions		
Output 2.1 Technical specialists in government departments responsible for land use planning, coastal zone management, coastal infrastructure development and land reclamation trained in the application of guidelines developed	Activity 2.1.1 Formulation of a Development Capacity Response (plan) based on a Rapid Capacity Needs assessment in the topics mentioned in this Output. Activity 2.1.2 – General training Activity 2.1.3 – Specialized training	Q1 – 2013 and activities based on the Capacity Development Response
Output 2.2 Group of trainers formed to train local level authorities and civil society representatives	Activity 2.2.1 Development of training program and selection of key trainers in key organizations Activity 2.2.2 Formulation of training manual on topics selected and implementation of ToT Activity 2.2.3 Coaching of trainers on training exercises	Q 2 - 2013 until the end of the project
Output 2.3		Q 1 to end of project in

Provincial/atoll authorities, island authorities and civil society leaders for at least 4 islands understand climate change related risks and are able to prioritize appropriate land use planning and coastal protection measures	Activity 2.3.1 – Design awareness campaign Activity 2.3.2 – Risk awareness building Activity 2.3.2 Risk analyses and adaptation training	phases depending on the awareness campaign design - 2013

Main Changes proposed:

- Switch between Outcome 1 and 2. Proposed Outcome 1 focuses on Organizational Capacity development and proposed Outcome 2 focuses on individual capacity development.
- Text of proposed Outcome 1 was modified.
- Activity 1.1.2 was incorporated into
- Outputs 1.2 and 1.5 were moved to proposed Output 1.3: Guidelines for climate risk resilience coastal protection, because if was complementary to Activity 2.2.1
- Introduction of Activities 1.2.3, A 1.3.4, A 1.4.4, A 2.1.1, A 2.3.1
- Part of Output 1.1 was converted into Output 2.2
- Text of Activity 1.5.2 was modified to: Research partnerships through the University of Maldives

Annex 7: Summary Table of M&E activities proposed in the ProDoc and Inception Report and its implementation status

Activity	Timeframe	Status
Inception Workshop and Report	Workshop conducted & report completed within two months of full Project Team being on board and no later than six months after project start up	Implemented
Routine tracking of Output completion in a manner that will assist in managing project risks	Routine and reported quarterly	Quarterly reports were prepared, routine tracking of output completion was not implemented in a shorter period.
Measurement of Means of Verification of Project Results/Impact (*Outcome & Objective Indicators*)	Start, middle and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually as required.	Not implemented.
Measurement of Means of Verification of Project Progress (*Output and Activities)*	Twice a year, during preparation of AWPs and APR/PIRs	Not implemented.
APR/PIR	Annually	UNDP/GEF formulated 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 APR/PIR
TPR & Minutes	Every year upon completion of the APR/PIR	No evidence
Project Board Meetings	Twice year, once on completion of the APR/PIR, and more frequently if needed	Project Board meeting were held twice a year.
ATLAS QPR	Quarterly	Implemented.
Co-Financing Reporting	Tracking of co-financing commitments in the quarterly Report in terms	This should have been reported including two elements: Personnel (est. person mths9 and facilities & equipment, which was not the case
Visits to field sites	Yearly	Not implemented.

Annex 8: Assessment of Outputs against planned targets

Integration of Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in Maldives			
Outcomes/Outputs	**Target**	**Assessment**	**Achievements**
Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions	By the end of the project, at least • 12 senior decision-makers and planners from national government including MoF (Planning), MHA and MHTE • 100% of senior decision-makers and planners in 4 provinces/atolls and 4 islands • 12 civil society leaders have been trained to assess and prioritize climate risks and prioritize locally appropriate adaptation measures. By the end of the project, climate risk reduction planning has been integrated into the work plans of staff in MHTE (LUPS, EPA, Programmes & Projects, NDMC), MHA, Department of Planning (MoF)		
Output 1.1 Orientation, survey, training plan and training of trainers	By the end of Year 1 2nd Quarter, all of the Project Board and Implementing partners will be familiar with the Project Work plan	Achieved	
	By the end of Year 1 2nd Quarter, a description and illustrations of low cost, 'soft' adaptation measures will have been disseminated	Mixed Achievement	Survey was concluded in 40 island,, but no launch or publicity was made to make people aware of the availability of the study.
	By the end of Year 1, 10-15 qualified local trainers will have been produced	Mixed Achievement	The training plan and training manual were not in good standard and could not be used. The training of Trainers was completed, but no follow up was carried out, therefore the group of

			qualified local trainers was not created yet. It is likely to be achieved if a well planned capacity development response in implemented.
Output 1.2 Regional climate change scenarios for the Maldives analyzed and updated to provide more accurate climate risk data for national and local planning	By the end of Year 1, existing climate change scenario information for Maldives have been reviewed, gaps identified and at least one state-of-the-art regional climate change scenario is available	Achieved	Four reports submitted (07/11, 08/11, 12/11 and 03/12) to MHE on Climate change scenarios.
	By the end of Year 2, disaster risk profiles of 10 islands revised to incorporate updated regional climate change scenarios and communicated to the relevant authorities and island communities.	Likely to be achieved	Planned for 2012
Output 1.3 Provincial/atoll authorities, island authorities and civil society leaders for at least 4 islands understand climate change related risks and are able to prioritize appropriate land use planning and coastal protection measures	By the end of the project, at least 12 civil society leaders and 40 provincial/atoll and island government officials responsible for the islands of Kulhudufushi, Kudhahuvadhoo, Thinadhoo and Thulusdhoo and their respective provinces/atolls are trained to assess climate change risks and to prioritize, plan and implement locally appropriate measures for resilient land use planning and coastal protection	Likely to be achieved	The activity in outcome 1 partly contributed to this output. It is likely to be achieved as the information base for this output is planned to be concluded in the next months, and if a well planned capacity development response is implemented.
	By the end of the project, the development plans of at least 4 islands	Likely to be achieved	It is likely to be achieved as the information base for this output is planned to be concluded in the

	(Kulhuduffushi, Kudhahuvadhoo, Thinadhoo and Thulusdhoo) and at least two of the concerned atolls integrate climate change resilient land use planning and coastal protection principles		next months and if a well planned capacity development response is implemented..
Output 1.4 Technical specialists in government departments responsible for land use planning, coastal zone management, coastal infrastructure development and land reclamation trained in the application of guidelines developed under Outputs 2.1 and 2.2	By the end of Year 2, at least 75% of technical specialists in MHTE (Land Use Planning Section, EPA, NDMC, Programmes & Projects) are trained in the application of guidelines on climate change resilient land use planning and coastal protection	Likely to be achieved	It will be done when the Guidelines will be reviewed by the international consultant. It is likely to be achieved if a well planned capacity development response is implemented.
	By the end of the project, at least 4 key government departments in MHTE (Housing & Land Use Planning, EPA, NDMC, Programmes & Projects) are applying the guidelines on climate change resilient land use planning and coastal protection regularly and systematically	Likely to be achieved	It is likely to be achieved if a well planned capacity development response is implemented.
	By the end of the project, the guidelines have been used to integrate climate change risk considerations into the land use plans of at least 6 non-demonstration islands	Likely to be achieved	It is likely to be achieved if a well planned capacity development response is implemented.
	By the end of the project, the EIA process undertaken by EPA	Likely to be achieved	It is likely to be achieved if a well planned capacity development response is implemented,

	incorporates the guidelines for climate change resilient erosion control		which means reassessing EPA's commitment.
	By the end of the project, the Programmes & Projects Department has applied the guidelines for the planning of all new harbour and land reclamation projects that are planned during the project lifetime	Likely to be achieved	It is likely to be achieved if a well planned capacity development response is implemented involving this Department from the outset of the activity.
Output 1.5 A climate risk information system established that enables universal access to meteorological and oceanographic data for adaptation planning purposes	By the end of the project, climate relevant data sets from MMS, EPA, MRC, NPD/MFT have been integrated into the national GIS system	Likely to be achieved	The needs assessment is under way, the activity is planned to be undertaken in the first two quarters of 2012. MMS is fully committed and interested in the activity. Target needs revision as some of these agencies have already integrated datasets into the NGIS (i.e. EPA).
	By the end of the project, at least 10 major stakeholder groups (government departments, provincial/atoll and island authorities, research institutions and civil society organizations) are actively retrieving information from the system for adaptation planning purposes	Likely to be achieved	The achievement of this target will depend on the promotion of the Information System and its use.
Outcome 2: Integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal	By Year 3, climate risk planning has been integrated into at least 2 key regulations and guidelines, including the EIA Regulation and the Guidelines for Land Use Planning. By the end of the project, project findings and relevant recommendations on climate risk management have been incorporated into at least 5 additional policies including NEAP 3, NSDS, the GIS Strategy and SNAP and the Decentralization and Regionalization Programme (DRP) and the Privatization Programme		

protection and development	(PP)		
Output 2.1 Guidelines for climate risk resilient land use planning in the Maldives	By the end of Year 1, existing findings and recommendations relevant to climate risk-resilient land use planning (including findings from the vulnerability & poverty assessments, DIRAM, NCs, NAPA, MEMP, Cost-Benefit Analysis of three Safer Islands) have been collated, analyzed and disseminated to national authorities, 4 provincial/atoll and island authorities, civil society leaders and other key stakeholders.	Partly achieved	Land use planning and EIA regulations reviewed from a climate risk resilient perspective, and report produced. Dissemination was limited to one day training in Male. Target needs to be revised based on the modification in project design (i.e. number of demonstration islands)
	By the end of Year 2, an intermediate draft of a technical manual on climate risk-resilient land use planning, outlining different land-use planning options for Maldivian islands and including a dedicated chapter on the design and management of EPZs, has been produced and reviewed by technical specialists in MHTE	Likely to be achieved	The contracting of an International Consultant is under way to produce the guidelines that should contribute to the achievement of this target.
	By the end of the project, a comprehensive technical manual on climate risk resilient land use planning is published in English and Divehi and made available electronically and in	Likely to be achieved	Same as previous

	printed format to MoF (the Department of Planning); MHTE (NDMC, Department of Climate Change, Land Use Planning Section; MHA; and the 4 Provincial/Atoll and Island Offices targeted by the project.		
	By the end of the project, at least 3 additional sets of information materials on climate risk resilient land use planning produced in English and/or Divehi, targeting different non-technical audiences including policy makers, politicians, NGOs, students and the media.	Likely to be achieved	Same as previous
Output 2.2 Guidelines for climate risk resilient coastal protection in the Maldives	By the end of Year 1, existing findings and recommendations from recent assessments and studies undertaken by EPA and Programmes & Projects relevant to coastal protection (including lessons learned from past harbour development, land reclamation, and erosion control efforts) collated, analyzed and disseminated to national authorities and 4 provincial/atoll and island authorities, civil society leaders and other key stakeholders. By the end of Year 2, an intermediate	Likely to be achieved	Received 3 reports (Inception, Field Mission and Framework) out of 9 reports; the 7th will be the draft report, due in February 2013 with 3 sets of guidelines targeting 3 levels of stakeholders: political, technical and island council. After that the guidelines will be validated through stakeholders' consultation. Attention should be made on publishing and dissemination of documents in English and Divehi, targeting different audiences, as stated in the project document and targets.

	draft of a technical manual on resilient coastal protection with separate chapters on harbour development, land reclamation and erosion control produced and shared with relevant stakeholders By the end of the project, a comprehensive technical manual on resilient coastal protection published in English and Divehi and made available electronically and in printed format to MoF (the Department of Planning); MHTE (EPA, Programmes & Projects, NDMC, Land Use Planning Section); MHA; and the 4 Provincial/Atoll and Island Offices targeted by the project. By the end of the project, at least 3 additional sets of information materials on resilient coastal protection in the Maldives and adaptation options in relation to harbour development, land reclamation and coastal erosion control produced in English and/or Divehi targeting different audiences including policy makers, politicians, NGOs, students and the media.		
Output 2.3 A national	By Year 2, national climate change	Partly	NRS draft submitted 06/11 to the Climate

research strategy to address information gaps on climate change impacts in the Maldives	research strategy published	achieved	Change Advisory Council 07/11. Presented at National Commission on Protection of Environment. Project is seeking their approval. It was sent last year for their comments, no comments. No follow up. Strategy not published or disseminated.
	By the end of project, the national climate change research strategy is being used by the Planning Department, EPA, MMS, MRC and relevant research institutions to guide and prioritize climate change related research in the country		Project should revise this target. NRS should be handed over to the University of Maldives. Project through the MEE and relevant government agencies could support the University to promote and support approval and implementation of the strategy.
	By the end of the project, at least 2 international research institutions have established collaborations with counterpart Maldivian institutions to conduct joint work on priorities		Same as previous.
Output 2.4 Recommendations developed on how to integrate climate risk management into land use planning, coastal zone management, decentralization, privatization and disaster risk reduction policies	By Year 4, 5 different policy notes with recommendations on how to integrate the major findings of the project into the existing policy frameworks for land use planning, environment, DRM, decentralization and regionalization, and privatization developed and disseminated to the President's Office, Department of Planning (MoF), MHA, MHTE.	Likely to be achieved	It is important that this output is guided by a broader framework of action that includes promotion of policy dialogue and advocacy work

Outcome 3: Locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks demonstrated	By the end of the project, at least 50% of households and 50% of critical infrastructure on 4 demonstration islands are better protected from flooding risks as a result of one or more coastal protection measures that have been designed and implemented by the project By the end of the project, at least 30 % of land area in the 4 demonstration islands is better protected through erosion control and coastal protection measures implemented by the project By the end of the project, public and private assets worth at least $20 million on the 4 target islands are protected through one or more adaptation measures implemented by the project. By the end of the project, at least 4 Atoll Development Plans covering 45 inhabited islands with a total population of 42,000 incorporate tangible actions and proposals related to climate risk planning, based on analysis and lessons learned from the project		
Output 3.1 Climate change resilient land use plans designed and specific measures demonstrated on at least four islands	Climate change risk considerations integrated into at least 2 island land use plans by the end of Year 2 and into at least 4 island land use plans by the end of Year 3 (including two islands that do not yet have land use plans)	Revised targets likely to be achieved	Project need to revise the target. Based on the strong need perceived by the stakeholders and considering that Output 2.2 is under way, this target is likely to be achieved.
	The EPZs of all 4 demonstration islands are redesigned in line with the technical guidelines developed under Output 2.2.	Revised targets likely to be achieved	Same as previous
Output 3.2 "Soft" measures for coastal protection that incorporate future climate risks demonstrated in at least three islands	By the end of the project, at least 3 different, locally appropriate, "soft" coastal protection measures that address future climate change impacts are under implementation as follows: H. Dh. Kulhudufushi: Strengthened natural resilience through restoration	Revised targets likely to be achieved	A hydrologist started working in November 2012 to design project of demonstration activities in 2 islands. Target of this output needs to be revised.

	of natural ridge system & 'climate-change proofing' of drainage system K. Thulusdhoo: Repair of breaches in coral sea wall with environmentally friendly alternatives G. Dh. Thinadhoo: Restoration of 1.2 km natural ridge system & revegetation of 47,000 sq. m of EPZ & 'climate-change proofing' of drainage system		
Output 3.3 Replication strategy for demonstrated adaptation measures developed	By the end of the project, a replication and up-scaling ('Exit') strategy for the project has been developed	Likely to be achieved	It will depend on the successful implementation of demonstration activities.
	At least 2 exposure visits between different demonstration islands.	Likely to be achieved	It will depend on the successful implementation of demonstration activities.
	At least 2 exposure visits bringing high-level decision-makers and planners to demonstration islands	Likely to be achieved	It will depend on the successful implementation of demonstration activities.
Outcome 4: Project knowledge and lessons learned compiled, analyzed and disseminated locally, nationally and internationally	By the end of the project: At least one report documenting project experiences and lessons learned produced in different formats for differet target audiences including decision-makers & planners, students, and island communities with selected reports available in Dhivehi and English One synthesis report produced in Dhivehi and English documenting project knowledge and lessons learned in the four project sites with island specific annexes All of the above and project evaluation reports available through the ALM		
Output 4.1 Information generated by the project publically available	By the end of the project, at least 10 major national and subnational user groups including Island and Atoll	Likely to be achieved	Design for website approved 03/12. Minor refinements needed. Achievement will depend on the promotion and usefulness of information

through a web-based portal	Offices, key sectors, research institutions, NGOs and environmental consultancy companies, make use of the web-based portal		uploaded. Information needs to be relevant, updated and website needs to be linked to other means of communication in order to ensure broad reach
	The web-based portal is actively linked and connected with other climate change-related initiatives that are relevant for SIDS	Likely to be achieved	Same as previous
Output 4.2 Increased understanding of climate change risks and community-based adaptation options among island communities in 4 provinces/atolls and within the national stakeholder groups	In Years 3 & 4, at least 4 exchange visits organized for demonstration and non-demonstration islands within the 4 target provinces/atolls to share and learn from the experiences generated by the project	Revised targets likely to be achieved	It will depend on the successful implementation of demonstration activities
	By Year 3, teaching materials on climate risk management in the Maldives and adaptation options for land use planning and coastal protection developed and integrated into the national curriculum through the environmental management certificate and degree courses developed by MEMP	Likely to be achieved	The environmental course is operative at the University, achievement of target will depend on the successful implementation of previous outputs.
	Each council undertakes at least one initiative on the 'soft' adaptation measures		Needs to be reassessed based on needs, interest and resources of councils.
Output 4.3 Adaptation knowledge	In Year 4, a SIDS/AOSIS workshop organized in Malé to exchange	Likely to be achieved	

and lessons learned shared through SIDS/AOSIS network, the ALM platform and other networks and platforms.	adaptation knowledge and experiences between SIDS		
	By the end of the project, both the national web portal and the ALM include codified 'lessons learned', technical reports and other major information materials generated by the project	Likely to be achieved	