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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Background**

The Support to Integrated Farming (2011-2013) is a three year US$ 471744 project of the government of Maldives implemented by the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture and Marine Research Centre with technical and financial support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). This project is the extension of the previous Support to Integrated Farming project (Phase I) implemented from 2008 to 2010. The thrust of the previous project was to pilot innovative agriculture technologies so as to provide long-term support for economic development of communities through agriculture extension and integrated farming. The current project focuses on commercialisation of innovative agricultural technologies piloted by the first phase of the project with the intention to contribute to create opportunities for diversification of economy in selected regions and strengthen food and income security through agriculture and fishery sector diversification and market integration. The main objective of this project is to assist in strengthening sustainability of livelihood activities of island communities and vulnerable groups including women and youth through expansion, commercialization, market integration through private sector partnerships and knowledge exchange. The project has four main outputs: production capacity strengthened and market integration facilitated through private sector partnerships; quality control and standardization of agriculture value-addition activities supported; mari-culture commercialization and knowledge exchange supported; and strengthen institutional capacity of Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture (MoFA).

**Evaluation Objectives and Methodology**

With the nearing of completion of the project, the terminal evaluation was conducted from October-December 2013 with the purpose of providing a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements in relation to project objectives endorsed by the project Board including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results. The main objectives of the evaluation are to: (1) promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments; (2) synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future interventions; and (3) provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.

This evaluation triangulated information from various sources: document review, stakeholder consultation, focus group discussion, interview, direct observation. The evaluation used DAC/OECD evaluation criteria and assessed the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project.

**Evaluation Findings**

The project was found relevant from the perspectives of community needs, Maldivian agriculture policy and plan as well as United Nations Development Assistance Fund (UNDAF) to Maldives. Regarding the effectiveness, the project produced mixed results in terms of achieving the stated outputs and outcomes, contribution to the diversification of agriculture, partnership strategies, gender equality, and project reach to target group and meeting their needs. The evaluation identified factors of success/unsuccess of the project. These included enabling environment, financial support for initial investment, linkage with market, timely availability of quality inputs, engagement of members, transparent management, business mind-set, complementarity, sense of ownership, clarity in roles and responsibilities and technical and managerial capacity. The project is found efficient to some extent when assessed from the perspective of cost-effectiveness; institutional capacity; coordination, complementarity and synergy; project monitoring; and cost-sharing arrangements. It was found cost-effective as it is operating quite below the limit of originally approved budget, institutional capacity is in place for developing policy and implementing plan, there is good coordination and cooperation among service providing stakeholders though need for further strengthening the coordination is there at policy as well as field levels. The cost-sharing mechanism practiced by the project with beneficiaries and between UNDP and other UN agencies helped to create synergy and bring project cost low. This evaluation assessed sustainability by looking at continuation of achievements, project design, level of capacity of stakeholders and replication of results. It is found that the likelihood of sustainability of good results is high in case of auto-pot and chilli sauce as technology as these are continuing in after the UNDP financial support is over in many places, though some places has some internal management issues. In case of poultry, the high price of imported feed makes the business non-profitable but with establishment of feed-mill it will be a profitable business. Thus potential of its sustainability is there which requires appropriate enabling environment. The evaluation also found that some of the results were replicated by other agencies.

The evaluation has identified good practices and lessons learnt. The good practices include shift from ad hoc to systematic approach, joining hands by prominent support agencies, ownership of project by the government, partnership for development forum, tripartite partnership, remodelling of innovation, good governance and use of existing information. Likewise, the lessons learnt takes account of context specific strategy, transparent management, internal strength necessary for successful partnership, presence of enabling environment, role clarity between and among partners, financial support for initial investment, engagement, and business mindedness.

The evaluation has come up with the conclusion that Support to Integrated Farming project has created opportunities for economic diversification in some islands of the Maldives by providing evidence that poultry, auto-pot and chilli sauce can be commercially produced and marketed given the enabling environment. The project has contributed to food and income security of some households through additional employment of vulnerable rural women in agriculture sector. It has demonstrated that alternate livelihoods activities can be replicated to other islands through expansion, commercialisation and market integration through private sector partnership. More importantly, the project has produced evidence based on which the government and other agencies can make the field level as well as policy level decisions. For UNDP, the information generated by this project can be an instrument for evidenced-based policy level advocacy with respect to commercialisation of agriculture.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations are divided into three major groups: Policy, strategy and partnership. There are a total of nine recommendations comprising of three recommendations to each major group mentioned above. Of the nine recommendations four are related to UNDP, whereas the remaining five recommendations are specific to MoFA.

**Recommendations regarding Enabling Environment**

* UNDP should continue paying greater attention to policy issues by decreasing its field level engagement.
* MoFA should come up with strong agenda for supporting the establishment of poultry feed-mill and expansion of poultry industry.
* MoFA should monitor input supply agencies for their timely supply of quality inputs of successfully demonstrated innovations.

**Recommendations regarding Strategies and Approaches**

* MoFA should coordinate with other agencies to support for institutional and individual capacity development of agriculture research centre as well as other island level organisations including cooperative societies.
* UNDP should allocate adequate amount of budget for monitoring and evaluation as per the evaluation policy of the UNDP.
* UNDP should develop a project exit strategy**.**

**Recommendations regarding Partnership**

* MoFA should develop a workable framework for ensuring coordination among related stakeholders.
* MoFA should strengthen linkages between agriculture research centres and organisations of farmers for technology utilization and feedback.
* UNDP should continue working for strengthening relations between and among resort (private sector), cooperative society and producers’ organisation.

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AECS | A-11 Cooperative Society |
| AMCS | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society |
| BDSC | Business Development Service Centre |
| BZG | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun |
| EEDWY | Employment and Enterprise Development for Women and Youth |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organisation |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| GOM | Government of Maldives |
| HIV/AIDS | Human immunodeficiency virus infection / acquired immunodeficiency syndrome |
| HPA | Health Protection Agency |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goal |
| MEC | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu |
| MED | Ministry of Economic Development |
| MFDA | Maldives Food and Drug Authority |
| MIS | Management Information System |
| MoFA | Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture |
| MoH | Ministry of Health |
| MRC | Marine Research Centre |
| MRf/MVR | Maldivian Rufiyaa |
| NGO | Non-Government Organisation |
| NIM | National Implementation |
| P4D | Partnering for Development |
| PB | Project Board |
| PIG | Policy and Inclusive Growth |
| PMT | Project Management Team |
| PPP | Public Private Partnership |
| SIF | Support to Integrated Farming |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNV | United Nations Volunteers |
| US | United States |
| VWCS | Veymandoo Women's Cooperative Society |
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# SECTION-ONE

# INTRODUCTION

This Terminal Evaluation of the Support to Integrated Farming Project is organised into five sections. Section One is about introduction of project which provides detail information of the project including background, objective, strategy, management and funds. Section Two entails the evaluation purpose, scope and evaluation criteria and question. In Section Three, details of methodology is presented. Section Four deals with findings of the evaluation. The Section Five which is also the final section, provides best practices, lessons learned, conclusion and recommendations.

## Project Background

Maldives is quite ahead of other South Asian countries in meeting the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) as shown by the recent Global Monitoring Report-2013. While the region as whole is on track of achieving only three MDGs (extreme poverty reduction, reduction in maternal mortality and access to safe water), Maldives has already achieved five MDG goals: eradicating extreme poverty and hunger (MDG1), achieving universal primary education (MDG2), reducing child mortality (MDG4), improving maternal health (MDG5), and combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases (MDG6).Though the progress has been relatively slower toward achieving gender equality and women’s empowerment (MDG3), ensuring environmental sustainability (MDG7) and developing a global partnership for development (MDG8), likelihood of achieving these remaining goals within the timeframe of 2015 is high (DNP, 2013)[[1]](#footnote-1). Not only that Maldives is quite ahead of other South Asian countries in MDG achievement, it has also left behind these countries in per capita income with almost US$ 6,567 per annum (World Bank 2012). Despite this, the Maldives has been constantly confronting with the transient poverty and vulnerability issues which are further aggravated by the environmental and climate change risks. Particularly, the socio-economic challenges that the country faces include widening the base of economic growth, promoting employment particularly for women and youth, and delivering a diversified and affordable service industry within and across its geographically dispersed islands.

The Maldivian economy is over dependent on tourism. Agriculture and fisheries form a small portion contributing 2.3% and 1.7% respectively to the gross domestic product (GDP) as reported in the Maldives Economic Diversification strategy (MED, 2013). Even the small sized agriculture is largely subsistent with low productivity leading to food import and food insecurity. Extension services are not well developed, nor are market infrastructure in place. Challenges in the agriculture sector are to provide producers, processors, market actors and consumers with services in the area of production, processing, marketing as well as consumption. The government intends to improve agriculture sector by reducing dependence on import and improve food security. In the area of fisheries, the government intends to promote exports and trade by creating enabling environment by developing infrastructure and providing financial services and promoting research, training and technical development (GOM, 2009).To address these issues and challenges, the Maldivian government has been taking different approaches and strategies including the diversification of agriculture, targeting of growth centres, community mobilisation and stakeholder participation. Based on the experiences of these initiatives, the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture (MoFA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) forged partnership to provide a long-term support for economic development of island communities through a series of collaborative interventions including the “Support to Integrated Farming” project. The first phase of the project which was started in 2008 focused on pilot demonstrations of innovative, modern agricultural technologies and business orientation with the aim of economic diversification. It provided technical assistance in piloting and demonstrating modern fertigation systems for introducing high value crops, processing of agriculture value added products, and poultry farming. The project also supported in institutional capacity building as well as in establishing and strengthening private sector partnerships to ensure sustainability and increase market linkages for the farm products. The capacity of these arrangements were strengthened through training in business skills and facilitating access to business development services.

Expansion of production capacity, establishment and strengthening of market linkages and developing private sector partnership were found the critical factors for sustaining useful results of the project particularly the auto-pot, poultry, processing and packaging, and mari-culture. In response to these findings and in support of government agenda for diversification of agriculture, MoFA and UNDP decided to continue partnership for additional three years from 2011 to 2013 to extend the project (Support to Integrated Farming). The new focus was mainly at a policy level, to facilitate the expansion of the existing community level activities from the initial demonstration level to a commercial level, encourage market integration through sustainable private sector partnerships, support the standardization and quality control of agriculture value addition activities as well as the commercialization and knowledge exchange of existing mariculture activities. The collaborative project was designed to address the common interest of both collaborators as well as their institutional interest. The common interest of both agencies was to strengthen livelihoods activities of island communities. The institutional interest of MoFA was to achieve priorities outlined in the agriculture and fisheries sector plans of the Strategic Action plan 2009-2013, whereas the UNDP interest was to achieve UNDAF outcomes which are aligned to national priorities outlines in the Strategic Action Plan 2009 – 2013.

## Objective of the Project

The project goal is to contribute to achieving the overall UNDAF outcome 6: Opportunities are created for diversification of the economy in selected regions and UNDAF Action Plan Output 6.2: Food and income security strengthened through agriculture and fishery sector diversification and market integration. To this end, the main objective of this project is to assist in strengthening sustainability of livelihood activities through expansion, commercialization, and market integration through private sector partnerships and knowledge exchange. This project contributes to the achievement of priorities outlined in the agriculture and fisheries sector plans of the Strategic Action plan 2009-2013.

## Project Strategies

The project strategy to achieve the above objectives has five folds: providing long-term assistance to the growth of agriculture and farming in the Maldives on the basis of the lessons from the earlier two projects (support to integrated farming project 2008-2010 and pearl culture project); direct support from project to island communities`(technical and grant assistance); engagement and linkage with private sector; complementing assistance provided by other donor agencies; and strengthening of vertical and horizontal coordination at sectoral, central and local levels.

The project has supported the delivery of four main outputs:

* Production capacity strengthened and market integration facilitated through private sector partnerships
* Quality control and standardization of agriculture value-addition activities supported
* Mari-culture commercialization and knowledge exchange supported
* Strengthened institutional capacity of MoFA

## Project Management

The project is implemented under national implementation (NIM) modality with MoFA as lead and implementing partner. A Project Management Team (PMT), which is also commonly known as Project Board (PB), comprising of representatives from MoFA, and UNDP has been in place to provide policy guidance and monitor the performance of the project. It, reviews progress on a periodic basis in terms of the delivery of project results and benefits, approves progress reports and end of project report, manages risks and ensures that project milestones are managed and completed[[2]](#footnote-2). There are other contributing partners including the Maldives Food and Drug Authority (MFDA)[[3]](#footnote-3) the Ministry of Economic Development[[4]](#footnote-4), and Live and Learn, Environmental Education[[5]](#footnote-5) who have also participated in the review meetings of the project as appropriate.

The day-to-day affairs are managed by the Project Manager on behalf of the PTM/PB within the purview of given responsibilities as per agreed plan and budget. The Manager is responsible for successful running of the project and delivering stated outputs. The role of coordinating with other agencies contributing to the same outcome also rests on the Manager. S/he is also responsible for producing project reports.

UNDP advance funds to MoFA as the lead agency as per the UNDP rules, regulations and guidelines. The progress on spending and on physical targets is consolidated by MoFA and sent to UNDP. As the lead agency, monitoring of the project and preparation of reports rests on MoFA.

## Project Fund

The total fund of this project is US$ 623,000.00 as per original project document. The budget is allocated under the core fund arrangement of UNDP. The total of the three years’ disperse US$ 471744 does not match with the total amount allocated. The difference is of $ 151,256. In the beginning more fund was allocated without detailing the activities against the fund. With the detailing of activities in annual plan, the funds approved in original project document was revised. Partnering of FAO for some activities also helped in reduction of budget. These arrangements brought the budget lower than what was approved which is a normal procedure for the project funded under core fund of UNDP.

Table 1: Budget allocation and expenditure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Allocation | Expenditure |  |
| 2011 | 223000 | 189869.39 |  |
| 2012 | 131619 | 130065.36 |  |
| 2013 | 117125 | 39,407.67 | as of Sept 2013 |
| Total | 471744 | 359342.42 |  |

 Poultry demonstration at Hanimaadhoo Agriculture Research Centre



Auto-pot demonstration at Hanimaadhoo Agriculture Research Centre

# SECTION-TWO

## Evaluation Purpose/Objective

The main purpose of the terminal evaluation is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements in relation to project objectives endorsed by the project Board including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results. As such, the evaluation aims to review progress towards the project’s objectives and outcomes, assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes, identify good practices and lessons learnt in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success, and on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature.

The main objectives of this assignment are to:

* Promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
* Synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future interventions; and
* Provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.

## Evaluation Scope

The assignment has broadly covered the following areas:

1. Assessment of the extent to which the overall project design remained valid in the context of national priorities and UNDAF. The evaluation has reviewed the project’s concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development and sustainability.
2. The evaluation has assessed the extent to which project management and implementation has been effective, efficient and responsive.
   * Asses and evaluate the results and impacts of the project;
   * Measurement of results based on set indicators and targets;
   * Assess the quality and relevance of project reporting;
   * Assess the mechanisms for information dissemination (advocacy and awareness raising)
   * Assess the extent to which project design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration: Gender, Equity, Institutional strengthening and Economic Diversification or added value to national development
3. Provision of recommendations based on findings, including suggestions on exit strategies and integration into other government led programmes
4. The evaluation has also assessed how and to what extent the project has built management, planning and operational capacity among the project’s stakeholders, particularly at the national and island level.
5. The evaluation has also highlighted lessons learned and best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance & success.

## Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation has used the universal evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability. Each criterion has been assessed with specific set of questions. The question against each criterion is given in the Table 2.

Table 2: Evaluation criteria and questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Question** |
| **Relevance** | * Are the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities and UNDP priority areas? |
| * Are intended outcome and outputs of the project relevant to national and community needs and priorities and did it help in diversifying the agriculture sector? |
| * Are the partnership strategies, plans, demonstration projects and mechanisms developed under the project relevant to national conditions and priorities? |
| **Effectiveness** | * Is the progress made to date on achieving the stated outcome or outputs of the project on track? And what factors are contributing to achieving or not achieving intended outcome? |
| * Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? |
| * In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluator should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether there are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects? |
| * To what extent have the project’s interventions mainstreamed to gender and contributed to gender equity? |
| * To what extent have the project’s interventions successfully reached the target groups and met their needs through design and implementation? |
| **Efficiency** | * Was the project cost effective? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness? |
| * To what extent is institutional capacity strengthened for the PMT to deliver results efficiently? |
| * Coordination, complementarities and synergies amongst UNDP projects, units, between line ministries and other partners to enhance efficiency and effectiveness? |
| * To what extent the project’s monitoring (and evaluation) activities have been efficient and effective? |
| **Sustainability** | * To what extent are contributions to outcome and achievement of outputs sustainable within the existing capacity and structures of the country? |
| * Has UNDP deliberately designed interventions and engaged partners to build in sustainability in the project? |
| * Are the results sustainable? (Will the outputs and outcome(s) lead to benefit beyond the lifespan of the existing programme(s) and project (s)? |
| * How the project outcomes and outputs replicated into other projects and government integrating this into the overall national development priorities of the country |
| * How might we do things better in the future? (Which finding may have relevance for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?) |
| * As part of the recommendations, the evaluator is expected to suggest proper exit strategies with a focus on integration of project initiatives into other government led programmes. |

# Limitation of the study

Information in this evaluation study is taken from various sources including secondary information from published and unpublished documents, consultations with critical stakeholders, interview with beneficiaries and on-site observations. Interviews with beneficiaries were conducted in local language, in most of the cases. The communication between evaluator and respondents was established through translation by local consultant and/or UNDP staff in field visit team. There might have been some information loss in translation. Some of the data necessary for comparing per output cost of this project with other similar projects were not available. This information would be useful for assessing cost effectiveness. This evaluation largely uses qualitative data, mainly due to unavailability of quantitative baseline data, therefore, readers and users should not expect evidence supported by quantitative data.

Interview with in-charge of Hanimaadhoo Agriculture Research Centre

# SECTION-THREE

# EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methodology was developed as guided by the ToR (Annex-1). The methodology includes the document review, interview, stakeholder consultation, project site visit and techniques and approaches used for gathering data, verification and analysis.

## Document Review

Project documents, annual budget and work plans, available board meeting minutes and other technical reports and documents, including field reports, annual and quarterly progress reports, partnership strategy, strategic plan of action of the government of Maldives (GOM), UNDAF action plan were reviewed together with other supporting documents (See reference at the end of this report for the list of the documents reviewed). To validate the findings from the document review and to get information on non-documented achievements, the evaluation conducted interview, focus group discussion, stakeholder consultation and undertook observations by visiting project sites.

## Interview

Interviews were conducted with stakeholders involved in poultry, auto-pot and chilli sauce production, processing and marketing. These included field officers of auto-pot operation, manager of poultry farming, chairperson and members of NGOs and cooperative societies, managers of resorts, UNDP staff, and staff of IFAD, FAO, MoFA, MRC, and in-charge and technicians of Hanimaadhoo Agriculture Research Centre. Care was taken to include different types of actors to capture maximum variability. The number and type of specific actors was decided while discussing with UNDP, MoFA and other relevant actors before moving to the field.

## Focus Group Discussion

There were four focus group discussions (FGD) conducted with specific group of women and men to better understand the gender and social issues that have impinged or fostered project achievement. The FGDs were conducted with women involved in poultry farming in Baarah Cooperative Society, auto-pot in Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun, auto-pot in Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu and chilli sauce production in Veymandoo Women's Cooperative Society. Similarly, general discussions were held with executive committee members of different NGOs and cooperative societies in islands.

## Stakeholder consultation/meeting

This was done with staff of MoFA, UNDP, members of board/PMT so as to discuss the evaluation design, inception report and preliminary findings. Consultations with FAO, IFAD, Live and Learn, MACCS and Seagull Food were also conducted in Male’, The consultations helped refine methodology, identify field level stakeholders for interactions, site selection for field visit and finalising the schedule for field mission.

## Direct Observation

The evaluation directly observed the activities and results in the field in different islands. The directly observed activities included poultry and auto-pot demonstration in Hanimaadhoo Agriculture Research Centre; poultry house in Baarah; chilli sauce plant in Veymandoo, and auto-pot in Addhu, Baarah, Meedhoo, and Kondey.

## Field visit

Field visit was carried out to observe the outputs and activities and discuss with beneficiaries

of the project. Sites visited include different islands in Haa Alif, Laamu, Thaa, Huvadhoo and Addu atolls. During the field visit discussions were held with field-based actors mainly the resorts and the agriculture producers, on-spot of activities. Detail of the persons met is given in Annex-2.

## Presentation

Inception report and preliminary findings were presented with Male’-based stakeholders. The presentations have helped get inputs for improving evaluation report, increase level of understanding, fill gap in the findings and ensure that the evaluation is as per the spirit of ToR.

## Evaluation Approach

As per ToR, special attention was paid for analysing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication.

Participatory approach was used to ensure the participation of a broad range of stakeholders including government, community, civil society and gender balances in participation and influence. This not only captured the diverse voices, but also enriched evaluation findings and it is expected that it has increased ownership of evaluation that would lead to promoting use of evaluation lessons in planning and implementation.

Special attention was also paid to gender mainstreaming. It is not adequate to include women and men in implementation, there should be sizable representation of both sexes in design, plan, implement and review the progress. Whether the project has taken adequate measures to ensure gender concerns are mainstreamed in the project cycle management was assessed.

The information collected from various sources was triangulated to increase reliability and validity of the evaluation.

## Evaluation Instruments

Questionnaire and checklists were the major instruments of this evaluation. There were four types of questionnaires and checklists customised against UNDP, MoFA, community people and private business. These instruments are attached in Annex-3.

## Schedule of Tasks and Activities

The evaluation was of 28 days spread from October 20 to December 10, 2013. The evaluation is planned home-based and field-based. The initial period for document review and inception report preparation phase and report writing phase is scheduled home-based phase, whereas the field-based phase is further broken down into Male’-based and island-based. This is given in Table below.

Table 3: Schedule of Major Tasks and Activities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Activity** | **Date** | **Remarks** |
| **Inception report preparation** | Desk review | Oct 20-26, 2013 | Home based |
| **Field Mission** | Internal Consultation | Oct 27-28 | Male’ |
| Inception report presentation | Oct 29 |
| Project site visit and interaction | Oct 30 – Nov 6 | Islands |
| Interim discussion | Nov 7 | Male’ |
| **Drafting report** | First draft report | Nov 17 | Home based |
| Review/comments | Nov 18-Dec 3 |
| **Finalization of report** | Final report | Dec 15 |

## Evaluation Matrix

An evaluation matrix is prepared by considering the main evaluation questions under each criteria, sub-questions, indicator, source of data, and data collection method. The evaluation matrix is provided in Annex-4.

## Institutional Arrangement

The evaluation was facilitated by the Policy and Inclusive Growth (PIG) Unit of UNDP Maldives in close collaboration with the Project Management Team led by Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture and Marine Research Centre.
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# SECTION-FOUR

# Evaluation Findings

The findings of this evaluation are presented below by grouping them into four evaluation criteria that include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. In addition, replication and exit strategies are also provided.

## Relevance

Relevance is defined as the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies. In this evaluation, the relevance is looked from the prospective of consistency of the project with community requirement, priorities of GOM and priority area of UNDP and UNDAF.

### Requirement of the community

Community needs in agriculture are to have increased access to agricultural production and processing technologies and market infrastructure to overcome the household poverty and reduce vulnerability. Unemployment is a major problem, especially among rural women and youth. Cultural barriers to accept job in some lucrative markets such as resort and hotel discourages them to take employment outside the home. In such a situation creating job for women within the premises of their access is necessary and important. The current project has provided opportunity for women employment within their own community through agriculture development. Relevancy of this project “Support to Integrated Farming” is high from the point of view of community requirement.

### Addressing National Need

Improving national food security and reducing dependence on agriculture imports as well as reducing environmental and climate change risks are the major challenges of the country in agriculture. These challenges have to be addressed by increasing agriculture production and by diversifying agriculture through strengthening organised farming while applying appropriate climate resilient technologies and developing market infrastructure. Economic diversification plan has placed agriculture and fisheries two of the 10 priority sectors of national economy. In agriculture, the plan has eight strategies which focus on scaling up of the production of organic vegetables and tropical fruits; expanding access to tourist markets; invest in commercial scale egg production; and provide training, demonstration and support for farmers among others. These strategies are congruent with the Agriculture Development Master Plan (MoFA, 2006) which focuses on improving productivity of the agriculture sector for enhancing food security, improving the nutritional status of households, increasing rural employment focusing particularly on unemployed youth and women in outer atolls, and partially substituting imports of agricultural products. In fisheries, GOM intends to sustain this sector through export and trade. Also that mariculture is recognised as an important economic industry for investment. The plan encourages cultivation of specific high value marine species such as groupers and sea cucumbers utilising ecologically sustainable practices and technology (MED, 2013).

The project is also relevant from the national need perspective. National need is to address transient poverty and reduce vulnerability by widening the base of economic growth, increasing government revenues, promoting employment, particularly for women and youth. Though the size is small, there are mostly the vulnerable women that have been employed in the project. In the beginning, more number of women were partially employed in auto-pot and poultry. But the number of the days for each worker was low. Later, the number was reduced to provide full time employment for most vulnerable among the women workers, in many of the cases. In addition to employment created for vulnerable group, the project has also provided model for increasing agriculture production, investing on commercial egg, vegetable and fruit production that would contribute to substitute import, widen economic base and reduce transient poverty. This project, therefore, has contributed to some extent to address the national need.

### Consistency with UNDAF Priorities in Maldives

Creating opportunities for economic diversification is the broader priority area of UNDP in Maldives as per UNDAF outcome 6. Within this broad priority area, strengthening food and income security through diversification of agriculture and fisheries sector and market integration are the priority areas in agriculture sector as per UNDAF output 6.2 (United nations System in the Maldives, 2010).

The project is congruent to the economic diversification strategy of the GOM and the priorities outlined in the agriculture and fisheries sector plans of the Strategic Action Plan 2009-2013. It is also compatible with UNDAF outcome 6 which is about diversification of the economy in selected regions and UNDAF Action Plan Output 6.2 that seeks to attain food and income security through agriculture and fishery sector diversification and market integration. This is also supportive to UNDP corporate strategy of fitting the support within strategic-plan priorities of recipient country needs (UNDP, 2012). At the same time, the project has produced fairly good evidence that commercialisation in agriculture is feasible for some selected commodities which can not only contribute diversifying Maldivian economy by substituting the import of these commodities but also that it provides income to island households by creating employment to rural women who are among the most vulnerable. The evidence produced by the project can be used by UNDP and others to advocate and lobby the government to create enabling environment in favour of agriculture commercialisation. Inviting other agencies to use project findings is also very much along the line of the recent UNDP corporate strategy (UNDP, 2013).

The above discussion supports that the project objective of strengthening economic resilience of island communities and vulnerable groups including women and youth is consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, and UNDP priority area, to a large extent.

## Effectiveness

The effectiveness is generally considered as the extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. In this evaluation the effectiveness is assessed by examining: project effect on diversification of agriculture sector, partnership strategies, progress of the project and their contribution to outputs and outcome, contributing factors, matching of outcome and objective, contribution of project to gender equality, and project reach to target group and meeting their needs.

### Diversification of Agriculture Sector

The Support to Integrated Farming second phase project (2011-2013) intended to support diversification of Maldivian agriculture sector through the commercialisation of already introduced and successfully demonstrated innovative technologies including auto-pot, poultry, and chilli sauce making through the first phase of the SIF project (2008-2010). In the commercialisation process, the project conducted feasibility studies and looked at other institutional capacity building including linking the products to the market by creating partnership with private sector, mainly the resort. Auto-pot technology has somewhat contributed to agriculture diversification. Farmers are organised into groups either as members in NGOs or in cooperative societies and have planted sweet melon, rock melon and honey melon as well as other products including cucumber, cabbage and other crops using auto-pot and modified auto-pot technologies. Similarly, poultry production supported by the project has shown that given the supportive environment, poultry can be commercially produced. Likewise, chilli sauce making is another commodity that project supported for. The verification of these already introduced and demonstrated innovative technologies has further confirmed the potential for diversifying agricultural sector but cannot be yet said that diversification has actually taken place as the technologies are used in a small scale which are supposed to be taken up by other projects of the government. Studies, however, have shown that these enterprises can be expanded in many islands with supportive policy environment backed by resource investment and private sector partnership. Rather than actual diversification, the project has provided direction for diversification as the project is implemented in small size. The scaling up of the project to the desired extent could not be observed as other agencies supporting to agriculture sector of the government could not match with the originally planned schedule of the government. However, they have now started working on these technologies. IFAD’s engagement with MoFA to support commercialisation process of these technologies through cooperative development and FAO’s commitment to support agriculture sector including commercialisation of poultry could be taken as some examples for other agencies entering for commercialisation of these technologies and contributing to potential diversification of agriculture.

### Partnership Strategies, Plans and Mechanisms

The Economic Diversification Plan recognises that meeting the economic diversification goals require coordination and collaboration amongst key stakeholders, both public and private. It also specifies that building an enabling environment through legislation, institutional development plans and improved value chain linkages is important for trade, tourism and food security-related livelihood interventions. The project, has supported public private partnership (PPP) through Partnering for Development Forum where government, private sector including resort, civil society organisations including NGOs and Cooperatives as well as community people were invited and opportunities provided to explore the areas of partnership. These forums have facilitated the formation of partnerships.

Partnership among private sectors, partnership among UN agencies, partnership between UN agencies and government, and partnership between private sector and the government are different types of partnership the project has exercised. There is also partnership among UN agencies to establish and promote partnership between other agencies. In SIFP, partnership between farmers’ organisations and business are found in the area of poultry, auto-pot and chilli sauce making. Partnerships between Baarah Cooperative Society (BCS) and Seagull for egg marketing worked well till the poultry was running. The time of the evaluation coincided with the end of the poultry egg production cycle and the birds had been sold as meat. When to replace the new birds depends on how quickly IFAD funding secured by BCS reaches there. With termination of egg production, the partnership is also at stand still stage. Similarly, there were good relations between buyer Seagull and Filladhoo A-11 Cooperative Society (AECS) as well as Seagull and Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun (BZG) NGO for the sale of auto-pot products as far as the goods were produced. There is no more partnership now between the auto-pot producers’ organisations (BZG, AECS) and resorts/hotel as there is no production. There has been consistent supply of auto-pot products in Meedhoo. The producers there are organised into an NGO Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu (MEC) and the NGO supplies auto-pot products to Shangri-La resort through Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society (AMCS) which has concentrated activities in marketing. In Kondey, auto-pot was operated under KISSARU NGO management, the auto-pot products melons were supplied to Park Hyatt resort through a middle-person. What has been found is that there are direct links between producers’ organisations and resorts in the northern islands, whereas an intermediary is present between the producers’ organisations and resorts in the southern islands. The intermediary is a marketing cooperative in Meedhoo and an individual in Kondey. Despite different types of partnerships, the determining factor of the successful partnership is the production of goods for the consistent supply to market.

### Progresses of the Project

The project has four outputs. Progress to these outputs are measured against the related indicators comparing the current situation with baseline, where available. Assessment is made on the basis of target achievements of particular indicator. These are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Progress on the outputs of the project

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Progress** | **Remarks** |
| **1: Production capacity strengthened and market integration facilitated through private sector partnerships** | % of women trained and engaged in agriculture and value addition activities who feel their income has increased as a result | Nil | At least 50% of trained women feel that their income has increased as a result of agriculture and value addition activities | Could not be assessed as there was no study done till the terminal evaluation was held | Not achieved |
| Progress made on private sector engagement in community-led projects | 1 community project linked with private sector | 8 community projects linked with private sector and at least 3 linkages maintained | 8 partnerships established and 3 linkages maintained | Achieved |
| **2: Quality control and standardisation of agriculture value-addition activities supported** | Progress made on strengthening the quality control and standardisation of agriculture value-added products | No quality control and standardisation mechanism in place | A standardised quality control procedure and certification system developed | Lack of proper regulations to implementing a certification mechanism in Maldives | Not achieved |
| **3. Mariculture commercialisation and knowledge exchange supported** | Number of knowledge products developed on mari-culture activities | Pearl farming handbook, Half round pearl culture course document, Pearl culture feasibility study and business plan developed | At least 3 additional knowledge products developed and utilised by MRC in promoting mariculture initiatives | Three knowledge materials developed and printed in 2012 | Achieved |
| **4. Strengthen institutional capacity of MoFA** | % of MoFA agri-division staff trained who feel that their institutional efficiency has improved | Nil | At least 50% of trained MoFA agri-division staff feel their institutional efficiency has improved | Study not conducted to assess staff feeling on the improved efficiency | Not achieved |
| Progress made on improving the efficiency of the plant and animal quarantine system of MoFA | UNV support to strengthen plant quarantine system (2010). No standardised local M&E system or database for plant and animal quarantine | Local M&E system and database for plant and animal quarantine developed and implemented | Both Plant quarantine database system and animal quarantine database system not developed | Not achieved |

Table shows that progress on output 3: Mariculture commercialisation and knowledge exchange supported is achieved; whereas in other three outputs progress is partially achieved.

**Output 1**: Production capacity strengthened and market integration facilitated through private sector partnerships has two indicators. Though some of the working women on the innovative technologies revealed during the evaluation that they have earned some income by getting employment in the technology promotion centres (poultry farm and auto-pot), actual assessment of the first indicator could not be made as there was no study done on the feeling of women regarding their increased income as a result of agriculture and value addition activities till the terminal evaluation was held.

Progress on 2nd indicator of output 1 was achieved as per the target. There were 8 partnerships established between private sector, especially resorts and NGOs/Cooperatives involved in 5 auto-pot, 2 poultry and 1 chilli sauce production; 4 Feasibility studies on commercialisation of auto-pot, poultry and chili sauce production and feed mill activities were developed; and linkages with private sector including Park Hyatt, Seagull, Shangri-La were maintained.

Production capacity of trained women was somewhat maintained and it was transferred to other women and men, especially in southern islands. The capacity of the producers’ organisations such as cooperatives/NGOs was not found well developed as the communities were not very familiar with the concept of cooperative and the business mind-set was limited in some communities. It is especially in the north that some islands (Baarah and Filladhoo) discontinued production after the UNDP assisted year was over due to mainly management issues and financial discrepancies.

Though there have been some expansion or scale up of the results of the projects beyond the direct support of the project that individual farmers have started farming under greenhouse using modified auto-pot technologies, large scale expansion did not take place because of lack of managerial capacity of the producers’ organisations. Market linkages were dismantled due to inconsistent supply as a result of discontinued production in some islands in the north. Partnering by private sector for developing local business which the project expected was not practiced in many islands.

**Output 2:** Quality control and standardisation of agriculture value-addition activities supported was not achieved though some frameworks, guidelines and proposals were developed for the establishment of a registration mechanism, standards and a certification system. Training was provided to inspectors on Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) and laboratory staff on testing of local produce. This was participated by staff from MFDA, MoFA, MoH, HPA, sea and air ports as well as the private sector food inspectors. A detailed gap analysis was developed which highlighted the lack of proper regulations as the main limitation to implementing such a certification mechanism in Maldives.

**Output 3**: Mariculture commercialisation and knowledge exchange supported was achieved. The target of 3 additional knowledge products developed and utilised by MRC in promoting mariculture initiatives was achieved with the production and printing of (1) Aquarist's Guide to Clownfish Culture, (2) Pearl Jewellery Handbook, and (3) Basic Mariculture Techniques. MRC would accredit these materials plus the pearl culture handbook previously developed and incorporate them into the formal vocational education system for usage in vocational training. Concerned respondents informed that these materials would be used by IFAD and the Training and Extension unit of MoFA, as well as in MRC’s own trainings on mari-culture initiatives. There were 17 participants who took part actively in the training programme conducted using the above materials.

**Output 4:** “Strengthen institutional capacity of MoFA” has two indicators and targets. Indicator target “at least 50% of trained MoFA agri-division staff feel their institutional efficiency has improved” can be known only after a focused study is conducted. As no study is conducted in this regards, assessment cannot be made on this indicator. Second indicator target is “Local M&E system and database for plant and animal quarantine developed and implemented”. Developing plant quarantine database system was dropped out from the target in 2013 because UNV-supported consultancy was carried out in 2010 to strengthen the plant quarantine system. The animal quarantine database system is yet to be developed and is planned for 2013 on the light with the import of various livestock to Maldives, and a proper M&E mechanism being absent to monitor the entry of plant and animal species to the country. It was expected to be developed by 2011 with joint funding of UNDP and FAO, but due to delayed response from FAO, it could not take place. Currently, FAO has proposed to take over the whole activity instead of going for co-financing. Another important activity that has not been completed yet is the establishment of Agriculture Information Dissemination Centre (AIDC) though concept note on its establishment has been developed and development of web portal is underway.

### Progresses Contributive to Outputs and Outcomes

**Output 1: Production capacity strengthened and market integration facilitated through private sector partnerships**

The progress made on establishing and maintaining linkage with private sector has facilitated the market integration of agricultural products including but not limited to rock melon, sweet melons, and cucumber produced through application of auto-pot technology demonstrated through the project to the target group, especially in southern part of the country. In the northern part, linkage was with private sector till they produced these items. But currently, they stopped producing these items due to the internal management issues, especially by AECS and BZG. Therefore, the established relations with private sector has not been continuing there. However, efforts to revitalize the linkages are going on between AECS and Seagull that production management of the auto-pot technology be given by the cooperative to Seagull under a contract out agreement. MoFA is facilitating this process. Regarding linkage with private sector about poultry products, Seagull bought and promoted eggs with a distinct brand name as “Baarah Eggs” till the eggs were produced by BCS. Egg production has recently been stopped with the end of the production cycle. Seagull would buy the eggs when produced which is expected to be achieved through the funding support of IFAD. Though there is temporary breakup of the linkage, potential for re-establishing it is high between the Seagull Company and BCS. Relationship between Veymandoo Women's Cooperative Society (VWCS) and Live and Learn for chilli sauce production and marketing is continuing and seems to continue longer as the latter has recently introduced bigger bottle packaging against the narrow-necked small bottle and that the both partners have expressed to continue this relations.

Regarding the production capacity, there has been some improvement. Producers in the south know the technology well as they are continuing it even after the runaway of some of the early trained technicians. Even in the north where re-establishment of auto-pot technology after the field officer left the project (BZG) has not taken place, the workers indicated that they can kick start production once they have the materials. There are individual farmers who have learnt the auto-pot technology from the auto-pot plants and now producing vegetables and fruits using modified auto-pot technologies. The evaluation noted this in Filladhoo among the members of AECS and in Meedhoo among the members of MEC. Therefore, production capacity of producers has developed to some extent.

The managerial capacity of producer organisations has mixed results that the south knows knots and bolts and has practiced transparent management keeping the record well, sharing income and expenses, working in group, discussing the issues and practicing participatory approach. This was specially noticed with MEC**.** The northern organisations, are relatively low in good governance that expenses are not properly shared with the members by executive committee (BZG), issues in transfer of resources from outgoing board/management to the new board in NGOs (BZG) and transfer of resources from NGO to cooperative (AECS) has also not been smooth. This entails the low level of capacity of the organisations.

One of the project indicators of this output is the “% of women trained and engaged in agriculture and value addition activities who feel their income has increased as a result” and target for this indicator is “At least 50% of trained women feel that their income has increased as a result of agriculture and value addition activities”. To assess this indicator, a study was proposed. As already indicated, the study has not been conducted so far. Therefore, this could not be assessed. Not conducting study in time as per schedule could be regarded as low level of management capacity of project implementing agencies. This suggests that the progress made on various activities have partly contributed to the attainment of the output 1.

**Output 2:** **Quality control and standardisation of agriculture value-addition activities supported.**

The indicator for this output is “Progress made on strengthening the quality control and standardisation of agriculture value-added products”. Target is “A standardised quality control procedure and certification system developed”. The target is not yet achieved as certification system is not developed. However, standardized quality control procedure has been developed. Regarding the certification system development, there is a lack of proper regulations to implementing certification mechanism in Maldives. In the absence of which certification system cannot be developed. The project developed frameworks on how such a quality control and standardisation system can be established once the lacking regulations are in place. The development of certification system, therefore, could not be done due to the reasons which was not under the control of the project management. The pre-conditions required for developing quality control and standardisation and the certification system not being in place has contributed to not achieving this output.

**Output 3: Mariculture commercialisation and knowledge exchange supported**. The indicator “Number of knowledge products developed on mari-culture activities” was to be achieved through the given target, “At least 3 additional knowledge products developed and utilised by MRC in promoting mariculture initiatives”. The project has developed three knowledge products. These products have been utilised and potential of further utilization of these technical materials is high which can contribute to knowledge exchange. However, only knowledge part is not adequate for commercialisation of mari-culture. Financial part becomes always a prime factor, which has not been addressed by this project, except the expectation that private sector would takeover. Here again, the progress made in the activities has contributed to achieve the stated output 3, to some extent.

**Output 4:** **“Strengthen institutional capacity of MoFA”** is an added output to the original three outputs of the project. This output is expected to be achieved through the development of data management system of plant and animal quarantine and establishment of AIDC. The data management system of the quarantine, however, has not been developed due to the unavailability of technician despite that it was expected to be undertaken by UNV supported consultancy and that this activity later taken over by FAO. Therefore, the activities done so far have not contributed to the strengthening of institutional capacity of MoFA in this regard.

As there is not much progress on the outputs, the extent of contribution of these progresses to the project outcome for creating employment opportunities to women and youth through agriculture value-addition and commercialisation of mariculture is low as there are only a few women employed in project supported interventions and only a small number of people who took training on mariculture have participated in its commercialisation.

### Contributing Factors of Achieving the Outcome

The followings are the contributing factors identified for achieving and not achieving the outcome of the project.

* **Enabling environment**: It refers to the laws, rules, regulations, policies and plan. Enabling environment has a great bearing in success of any enterprise. Current enabling environment is not strong for poultry production, quality control and financial support. Poultry production will go on loss in the absence of enabling environment as indicated by the feed-mill establishment feasibility study conducted by this project. The establishment of poultry feed mill would serve as an enabling environment for commercial poultry production in Maldives. Though government has strategy to invest in commercial scale egg production, the strategy should be backed by the action in creating enabling environment, the actual establishment of the poultry feed mill, in this case. Another area where enabling environment requiring strengthening is agriculture input supply. Timely availability of quality seeds and poultry chicks on time would be supportive for producers. It was reported by the producers that they are not getting the quality seed of melons and poultry chicks on time, in some places. Also that the current regulations are not adequate to establish quality control mechanism for local agriculture products and needs to be passed through parliament. Similarly, there is no well-developed banking system to support investment in agriculture sector. In the absence of bank, PPP for establishing feed-mill and provision of feed to farmers may not be sustainable. These all are the issues requiring government attention for creating enabling environment for commercialisation of agriculture in Maldives.
* **Financial support for initial investment**: The innovative production and processing technologies such as auto-pot, chilli sauce making and poultry raising require higher initial investment for installing the plant. These cannot be borne by marginal vulnerable farmers and their groups and therefore, require both technical and financial support. The initial investment support has been a strong factor that the poultry plant in Baarah and auto-pot plants in all five islands were successful. Even with the termination of the support, the farmers’ organisations are still continuing the production of melons and other items using auto-pot technology in the south though internal management issues have affected the success in the north.
* **Linkage with market:** For any commercial enterprise to be success, market linkage is a crucial factor. This was supported strongly in the project area that the linkage of producers’ organisations with resort has been helpful to sell the products to them in a regular and systematic way. Seagull’s linkage to BCS on egg, auto-pot producers’ organisation KISSARU in Kondey and Park Hyatt resort through an intermediary, MEC’s linkage with ADMC and their linkage with Shangri-La are some of the examples that these linkages have made the enterprises to continue.
* **Timely availability of quality inputs** (chicks, seed, and nutrients): When the inputs were timely available during the first year, farmers planted in time. In the 3rd quarter of 2013, planting materials including sweet melon seeds were not available in time and they might still take months to come to farmers from Malaysia as some of the NGOs/Cooperatives order seed from there as seeds supplied by local suppliers have germination problem because of low quality seeds. Farmers have kept some greenhouses unoccupied due to unavailability of seed on time, especially in Kondey. Partly because of this, about 500 melon fruits weighing about 650 kg equal to MVR 32500 will be lost by farmers in Kondey, organized under KISSARU. This does not mean that it was only the factor for keeping greenhouses fully unoccupied as NGOs/Cooperatives in some places practiced this to match production with weekly demand of resorts. However, availability of inputs on time is one of the contributing factors to the outputs and outcome of the project.
* **Engagement of members**: Member engagement in affiliated organisation is one of the critical factors contributing to the success of any enterprise. This was reflected in this project as well. There was higher level of engagement of members in the activities of affiliated group/NGO/Cooperative in some of the organisation (AMCS, KISSARU) which are successful compared to the members’ engagement in other organisation which have discontinued production (BZG, AMCS).
* **Transparent management**: The successful NGOs and Cooperative practiced transparent management including keeping of records, sharing income and expense information among members, involving members in planning, implementation and review. Such practices were found to have present less among the unsuccessful organisations which has created distrust between workers and management leading to closure of the auto-pot plant (BZG), for example.
* **Business mindedness**: People in the south where more number of success cases are found were with more business mind set compared to the north, where less number of the success stories were found.
* **Complementarity**: Partnership requires complementary activities to be successful rather than competing in an activity by partners. NGO involved in mobilizing producers in production and cooperative performing marketing function was seen in the south and both entities (MEC and AMCS) fared well there. In the north, NGOs and Cooperative did not play complementary role (BZG) rather enmity between them was observed. Existence of one was challenged by another. They were not faring well.
* **Sense of ownership**: There was a stronger ownership feeling among members of the successful organisations (MEC, AMCS, BCS) regarding their business, in general, than among the members of the unsuccessful organisations (BZG, AECS, VWCS).
* **Communication between partners**: Internal communication played important in the success of enterprise development as informed by the successful organisation such as MEC and AMCS. Low level of communication was found among members/partners with less successful organisations (BZG, VWCS). A dissatisfaction was expressed by chairperson of VWCS with Live and Learn for not communicating and not consulting the Cooperative while changing the bottle size of the chilli sauce. Similarly, the previous management of NGO did not communicate with members and workers about the financial details in BZG. This created mistrust between them. Low level of communication was also reported between members and outgoing management in BZG leading to misunderstanding between them.
* **Clarity in roles and responsibilities**: Roles and responsibility should be made clear between and among partners right in the beginning of partnership. This was not done clearly between the VWCS and Live and Learn. This was one of the reasons that the chairperson of the chilli cooperative was expecting electricity repair from the Live and Learn even though the cooperative had money to repair it.
* **Capacity (technical and managerial).** The organizations involved in agriculture production require technical capacity in package of products as well as managerial capacity to timely access inputs and sell produce. This was weakly present with producers and their organisations. It was further weaker in the north (BZG and AECS) than in the south (MEC, AMCS, KISSARU). It was not also strongly present with MoFA and UNDP as the some activities were not timely implemented.

### Contribution of Project to Gender Equality

The project intention is to create employment opportunity for vulnerable group including women and youth. Accordingly, the project tried to involve this group right from the beginning. In the beginning both men and women were employed as some hard work such as cleaning jungle, constructing green house and poultry house was to be performed. Later, light work such as feeding birds, collecting eggs and putting in tray in case of poultry; and keeping seed in nursery, feeding nutrients to plant though auto-pot, transplanting plants from nursery to auto-pot, cleaning, supplying nutrition to the plants, trimming, transferring pollens to stigma of the plant for pollination, maintaining size of fruit, harvesting, and gathering harvested products from the greenhouse are the major activities that women do in the auto-pot. Thus the project was found to have practiced gender sensitivity by involving women in women friendly activities and men in activities that are not women friendly.



Figure 3: MEC worker cross-pollinating in melon in Meedhoo

In the beginning more number of women was employed but the number days of per woman employment was small—so small that wage earned out of it was not significant to their household income. Later, they decided to provide fulltime employment to women looking at the intensity of vulnerability. This reduced the number of women employed but provide full time employment for most needy vulnerable women.

Another good practice of gender equity was found in the cooperative management. The concept of having at least three women in cooperative management committee has been practiced, especially with encouragement of IFAD. MoFA has now recognized this approach useful for engaging women in development discourse. Every cooperative society supported by the project has three women in the management of the cooperative society. Some organisations are women managed including Chilli Sauce Producers’ Cooperative and Meedhoo NGO. In these organisations chilli sauce production and processing as well as auto-pot production and sale are done by women. This way, it is found that the project interventions are mainstreamed gender and that have contributed to gender equality.

### Reaching the Target Groups and Meeting Their Needs

The main need of the community was identified as employment of people specially women and youth. The need for employment of women was also pointed out by community people in the course of this evaluation. The project was designed to increase income of vulnerable groups including women and youth through employment creation. This intention of project which was based on the need of the community was successfully implemented with especial attention paying to vulnerable women by involving women in the project intervention in auto-pot, chilli sauce making and poultry raring. Though actual number of men and women employment was not available during the evaluation mission, it was known that many were vulnerable women among those employed in project interventions.

## Efficiency

Efficiency is generally defined as a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. Within this broad definition, efficiency in this evaluation is assessed from the perspective of cost-effectiveness; institutional capacity; coordination, complementarity and synergy; project monitoring; and cost-sharing arrangements.

### Cost Effectiveness

Cost effectiveness in this evaluation is looked by comparing original budget plan and actual expenses, annual income of selected enterprises against the annual expenses and progress made in intangible benefits. The total cost of the project was originally agreed to be US$ 623,000. It is now reduced to US$ 471,744. This was done with detail analysis of the potential costs of all the activities planned to achieve stipulated outputs. When the project phase II was extended, it was with the purpose of commercialising the demonstrated pilot projects with core fund available with UNDP for scaling up the innovations. However with the reorientation of the project from community level direct interventions to policy level, it was revised as per UNDP Strategic plan 2011. The expenditure is 359342.42 up to the 3rd quarter of this year which is 42.32% below the original plan and 23.83 below the revised budget. The reduction (US$ 151,256) in almost one-quarter of budget from the originally planned budget indicates itself that the project is cost-effective when compared to the original budget. Financial records including income and expenditure available with three partner organisations (1 poultry, 1 chilli sauce and 1 auto-pot) shows that they have generated a total of an annual income of $ 33113. This amount is almost 21% of the total annual average budget of $157248 (471744/3). This is higher than simple annual interest the amount of money invested would otherwise generate if deposited to a bank. If the production of other five units are added, the percentage of income would go higher than this. This means that the project is cost-effective while looking from the income generation perspective.

In addition to the direct income generated from the project, there have been other benefits that are generated from the project. These include, development of mari-culture course materials, training provided to beneficiaries including 17 mariculture trainees, skill development of farmers on the production of poultry, auto-pot and chilli sauce making; partnerships establishment between the producers and resort management. These further indicate that the project was cost-effective.

The evaluation looked also the effect of delayed implementation on the efficiency of the project. It found that there were some political conflicts created between the island authorities and participating NGOs had delayed the project pace due to lack of cooperation and not meeting up with the set deadlines. Evidence in increased costs due to this delay, however, has not been found.

### Institutional Capacity of the Project Management Team to Deliver Results

As indicated before, project management team (PMT) which is now commonly known as Project Board (PB) is established with representatives from MoFA, and UNDP. Maldives Food and Drug Authority (MFDA), and Live and Learn Environmental Education are other critical members that are often invited in the meeting of the PMT/PB. The project board meetings were held to decide upon any major change that the project needed to make including change in annual plan, allocation of resources, and review of project progress and constraints. The PB members have participated in joint monitoring of field activities in several occasions.

Most crucial among these agencies, as far as this project is concerned, is MoFA. The MoFA is technically capable to deliver the results to some extent as seen in the Agriculture Research Centre at Hanimaadhoo. The Centre has auto-pot and poultry demonstrations and has provided training to producers. Similarly, Marine Research Centre (MRC) has capacity to provide technical advice. Despite the technological availability, MoFA, however, do not have adequate human resources to deliver the technologies to producers. It is also, at the same time, constrained with financial resources to monitor field activities. No strong linkage is found between farmers and the MoFA centres. Despite these constraints, the MoFA has capacity to bring agriculture and farming issues for the discussion at policy level. With establishment of Agriculture Information Dissemination Centre (AIDC) which is one of the major activities in progress that this project supports, these technologies will hopefully be delivered more efficiently by reaching larger audience at low cost.

### Coordination, Complementarities and Synergies

Coordination, complementarities and synergies are looked amongst UNDP projects, units, between line ministries and other partners to enhance efficiency and effectiveness. There is a high level of coordination, complementarities and synergy between two UNDP projects: Support to Integrated Farming (SIF) project and Employment and Enterprise Development for Women and Youth (EEDWY). One of the good examples of synergies created between these two projects can be found in organising partnering for development (P4D) which is popularly known as Resort Forum. Though Resort Forums were carried out under the EEDWY project, the Forums were participated by stakeholders of both projects. The issues of both projects were discussed and need for organising other forums by SIF project was not there. These forums were equally effective in terms of participation of stakeholders but implemented at lower costs as the cost of SIF was saved for UNDP. As both projects were carried out under UNDP core fund, UNDP could save fund from not duplicating similar activity. The stronger coordination, complementarities and synergies between these projects might have been also because both projects were under Policy and Inclusive Growth (PIG) unit.

Complementary arrangements were noted between this project and BDSC/UNDP project implemented through MED, especially in providing training to Baarah Poultry cooperative. This level of coordination, however, was not observed between and among UNDP units as far as this project is concerned except that that some field visits were conducted jointly with other UNDP units, but this project’s outputs did not have a strong correlation with other units’ projects. What has been observed is the compartmental thinking of units rather than systemic/holistic one. There has been better coordination and complementarities between UNDP and IFAD regarding the follow up actions on the results of this project than between UNDP and FAO. A complementary arrangement made between UNDP and FAO regarding developing standards and a local certification system for agriculture value-added products could not be implemented due to much delayed response of FAO and it was done with full fund of UNDP. With line ministries, the relations was found smooth which was also due to that the project assistant was stationed in MoFA.

### Effectiveness and Efficiency of Project Monitoring

The responsibility of monitoring of project activities was given to MoFA as the project was implemented under NIM (national implementation) model. The monitoring of MoFA was also strongly supported by UNDP. There have been joint monitoring made by UNDP and MoFA in several occasions. The recommendations of these missions have helped make decision fast and re-enforce implementation. Such joint monitoring, however, were not adequately made due to shortage of fund for M&E under the project. An arrangement was made to utilise funds available in the M&E budget of MoFA under IFAD supported project with a view to maximise effectiveness and efficiency. Despite these, the results were not encouraging in the later part of the project that even with small difficulties, the project activities in several places were stopped. Had there been effective monitoring, these problems could be resolved locally and operations would go smooth. The issues of not paying workers and field officers on time, transparency in record keeping and sharing with members, role clarity between two partners were the issues that have led to closure of the plant in Baarah auto-pot (BZG) and Chilli Sauce making (VWCS) in Veymandoo. With frequent monitoring and follow up actions, such issues would have been corrected. If follow up actions by UNDP and MoFA were not working as informed by the project personnel, some low cost workable alternate mechanisms to update with information could have been developed taking into consideration the financial aspect associated with frequent field monitoring for a small scale project with activities spread to islands connected by long distance travel.

### Cost-Sharing Arrangements

A cost-sharing arrangement was made between the project and beneficiaries. The beneficiary contribution could be either cash or kind or both. Generally, the costs for land clearing, proposal development, accommodation, design were borne by beneficiaries and costs for materials to be imported were borne by the project. Cost sharing arrangement was also between MED and cooperative societies as well as with IFAD initiatives. This kind of arrangements of cost-sharing made the project cost-effective to some extent and also that it increased the level of ownership of beneficiaries to the project.

### quality and relevance of project reporting

Project reporting was found done in each quarter and annually. Both programme and financial progresses are reported in both cases. The annual report is presented to the Board/PMT meeting and decisions are taken for improvement. Based on the progress, the annual plan of action is prepared. The project reporting was found highly relevant, especially in adjusting the activities based on the progress made. Similarly, project report were found of good quality as they used the standard format for reporting that include project purpose, project progress, resources, work plan, results, financial status, challenges and strategy for implementation. These reports are used in making decisions indicating their good quality.

### mechanisms for information dissemination

The information related to the project progress is shared among the members of Board/PMT through the board meeting. The general information of the project is shared to larger audience through UNDP website. In addition, validation workshops, training, joint monitoring, e-mail discussion, presenting findings in the workshops organised by other organisations are the major dissemination mechanisms used by the project. The four feasibility studies were presented to validation workshop participated by the key stakeholders including the policy makers and regulators and were given final shape after consolidating the comments of the participants. Another example of dissemination is the training conducted by MRC using the materials developed under this project. Such activities have created awareness of the project to the concerned stakeholders.

In general, beneficiaries and other stakeholders including some council members, resort people were found aware of the project activities though they were not quite sure of the donor agency supporting the particular project. They referred to UNDP for all donor funded projects as it has longer history of its continuous presence in Maldives than other donors. The confusion was not only about the agencies (which agency/donor supported which project) but also between this project and the EEDWY project, as both projects have some similar activities and objective.

Despite some level of awareness, the project requires intensive advocacy and lobbying for creating enabling environment in the area of poultry feed mill establishment, approval of regulation for establishing certification system for local agricultural value-added products and establishment of financial institutions to support micro, small and medium enterprises including those based on agriculture and fisheries. This requires partnering not only with private sector but also with civil society organisations. Evidences to support this level of efforts made were not available. This indicates the need for strengthening information dissemination system which the project is intending to do through establishment of AIDC.

## Sustainability

Sustainability refers to the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed including the probability of continued long-term benefits. In this evaluation, sustainability is assessed by looking at how achievements are carried out by stakeholders after the project support is terminated, how project was designed, level of capacity of stakeholders and replication of results.

### Sustainability of Achievement

The evaluation assesses the extent of contributions of outputs to outcome being sustainable within the existing capacity and structures of the country.

The four outputs of the project which have contributed to strengthening food and income security through diversification of agriculture and fisheries sector and market integration have some challenges to continue the achievement within the existing capacity and structure of Maldives. The enabling environment, at the moment, is not strong to continue poultry enterprise as the business has shown negative return over the cost. The feed cost is higher than total return of poultry production. With current feed price of Maldivian Rufiyaa (MRf) 20 per Kilogramme, the poultry business of 300 birds is at loss of MRf 8,000 per month as informed by the manager of the BCS in Baarah. Unless an enabling environment is created either establishing local feed mill or providing imported feed on subsidised price, the poultry business can no longer continue. However, with the establishment of a local feed-mill, the commercial venture of poultry can be expected to go in profit as shown by feasibility study conducted under this project and verified by relevant respondents in this evaluation. But at the moment, since there is no local feed-mill, poultry business cannot make profit unless supported financially from external sources. It is good to note that IFAD has come forward to provide financial support for promoting poultry in islands including the BCS. Nevertheless, supporting a business financially for the recurrent costs is not always the best choice. One should not forget also that establishment of feed-mill requires enlargement of poultry industry so that there is sufficient demand to optimally operate a feed-mill.

The partnership between auto-pot producers’ organisation and private sector seems to continue in southern part of the country as the producers’ organisations have technical as well as managerial capacity as evidenced by their continuity of the activities even after the project support was complete. Not only that they have more number of members demonstrated technical skills in the production of auto-pot, they have also expanded linkage with other organisations. They have funds to continue activities. They have devised a system supportive to continue the activities while putting certain percentage of amount aside for continuation, as per project design requirements. They have also a plan to expand the green house area for more production. Also that market does not seem to be a problem as there is a well-functioning marketing cooperative which has linkage with different resorts. Therefore, the partnership between the private sector and Auto-pot activities seems to continue in the south. In the north, however, managerial capacity on auto-pot is weak at present. The evaluation interacted with two auto-pot production organisations (BZG, AECS). In both cases, the technological know-how is limited to a few technical officers and workers (BZG). Though they have funds to restart discontinued auto-pot, there is an issue of transparency in the fund management in the north with production organisations of auto-pot. Handover from old management to the newly elected management has not been proper. Dissatisfaction among members and workers was well noticed by this evaluation. A culture of blaming to each other, rather than appreciation, was found. AECS does not have funds to restart the program again due to funds not handed over properly by NGO to the cooperative. They have expressed their inability to continue it. They are rather inclined to lease out the facilities to Seagull. The auto-pot in the north by producers’ organisations, hence, seems to discontinue because of financial mismanagement and loss of trust among members of the NGO/cooperative.

The willingness of Seagull private company to take the auto-pot production plant in lease from AECS indicates that commercialisation of agriculture through auto-pot technology is profitable. The current problem of discontinuity of this technology with producers’ organisations was associated with their management.

In case of Chilli Sauce making, a study though has shown it a highly profitable enterprise, the producers’ cooperative has not fully owned it. It considers this project as the project of Live and Learn which has taken the marketing responsibility of the produce. There is a lack of role clarity as well as there are a lot of partnership management issues. Partnership demands a high level of transparency in addition to clear roles and responsibility to achieve the common goal. This was not well practiced in this partnership. Possibility of continuing this partnership is there if Live and Learn comes up with more open transparent management practices so that the trust between the partners is strengthened with a greater facilitating role of MoFA.

### Project Design and Sustainability

The evaluation particularly looks at whether UNDP deliberately designed interventions and engaged partners to build in sustainability in the project. Establishment of private sector partnership, capacity building of both supply side and demand side stakeholders were thought up from the beginning of the project and the project was designed accordingly. Emphasis on partnership was laid that the output indicators (output 1) were aligned along the line of partnership. Capacity strengthening activities such as training, facilitation, and networking were designed to ensure sustainability. The high priority given to sustainability in the design can also be viewed from its objective. The stated main objective of this project is to assist in strengthening sustainability of livelihood activities through expansion, commercialization, market integration through private sector partnerships and knowledge exchange. The UNDP, thus, has deliberately designed the project keeping in view of its sustainability. There were consultations between UNDP and MoFA during design phase. However, evidence of consultation among UNDP, MoFA and private sector partners during the design phase was not found by this evaluation though consultations among these agencies were there during implementation. It would have been better if the private sector was also consulted and inputs from this sector was integrated into the project as stakeholder participation in the project cycle increases ownership, makes implementation easier and leads for sustainability.

### Sustainability of Project Results

The sustainability of the results is assessed in terms of the extent to which the outputs and outcome lead to benefit beyond the lifespan of the existing project. The first output, “production capacity strengthened and market integration facilitated through private sector partnerships” needs to be assessed from the current level of production capacity and partnership. The sustainability is governed by continuity of partnership and level of capacity that individual organisations have. There is continuity of partnership in the south and is likely to continue there while looking at their commitment, capacity, and governance style and fund availability. Similarly, engagement of private sector, replication of technology to the vicinity, and continuous supply of products to the market are the indications that project results are sustaining and are likely to sustain in the south. The results in the north among the auto-pot producers have shown already symptoms of discontinuity and therefore, may not be sustainable there unless the low level of managerial capacity is improved, ownership to the business is realized, and organisational governance is improved. The poultry business of BCS is likely to get restarted and continued with financial support of IFAD for recurrent costs, mainly for the feed. For sustaining the poultry business thereafter, policy level interventions are required mainly in the production of feed domestically.

The second output, “Quality control and standardization of Agriculture value-addition activities supported”, when measured against the indicator “progress made on strengthening the quality control and standardisation of agriculture value-added products” there is a partial attainment of the progress with the development of framework which serves as the foundation for quality control mechanism of agriculture value-added products, though it is not fully established to introduce into industry. As the results have not been fully achieved, discussing this from the perspective of sustainability of results carries little value.

The third output, “Mari-culture commercialization and knowledge exchange supported” seems to continue as the three training materials have been developed into local language and a training program has already taken place. The document shows that Mari-culture research centre, MoFA’s Training and Extension unit and IFAD have shown interest of continuing the use of these training materials on mari-culture technologies. This output results therefore, seem to continue also because of the existing capacity with Mari-culture centre.

Output four is “Strengthen institutional capacity of MoFA”. The results in stated indicators such as “% of MoFA agri-division staff trained who feel that their institutional efficiency has improved”; and “progress made on improving the efficiency of the plant and animal quarantine system of MoFA” are not achieved due to that survey is not conducted to assess feeling of trained staff and that animal quarantine systems are not established though plant quarantine systems are working. What is known is that the animal quarantine system development task was taken in by FAO and that FAO is working on it. Though these activities are not completed and at this stage, MOFA capacity has not been strengthened, with the completion of these activities, it more likely that institutional capacity MoFA will be strengthened.

### Capacity Development

The project has given high priority to the capacity development of implementing ministry MoFA so that the useful results of the project are integrated into the overall government programme and that these are continued after the project phases out. The project document explicitly places great priority on national capacity development of both institution and human through training, knowledge sharing and through the establishment of strategic partnerships. The project remained flexible enough in terms of revising project activities so as to achieve the stated project outputs. To assess the capacity of MoFA to continue the achieved results of this projects, the evaluation interacted with MoFA staff at MoFA, MRC and Hanimaadhoo Agriculture Research Centre. The evaluation assessed MoFA capacity in terms of its willingness and present capacity to facilitate for quality control mechanism of local agriculture products, ensure quality and timely supply of agriculture inputs, establish plant and animal quarantine database and ensure that healthy animal and plants and seeds are entered in Maldives, work for feed-mill establishment and expanding poultry industries, mainstream different funding sources and coordinate their activities, prepare plan by pooling internal and external resources for integration of useful results, and provide technical services to producers. It found that MoFA has capacity in all areas given above except that they have limitation to provide technical services to large number of producers scattered thinly to different islands. This was mainly because of shortage of human resources with MoFA to conventionally provide technical services. With the establishment AIDC, which embodies the use of modern technology, MoFA is likely to provide technical services to large number of users more efficiently. Involving MoFA staff right from the beginning of the project implementation was a good strategy that has contributed to increased project ownership and improved transfer of project knowledge and memory.

### Replication and Scale up of Project Outputs and Outcome

Here the extent of project outcomes and outputs replicated into other projects and government integrating this into the overall national development priorities of the country and self-scaled innovations is assessed. Some of the project outputs are replicated into other projects of MoFA supported by IFAD and FAO. These include involvement of IFAD in the expanding poultry industry and auto-pot as well as developing cooperative societies with a view to sustain results by building institutional capacity of local organisations. IFAD interest is to promote the business model found successful at community level including the partnership model that has linkage with producers’ group, cooperative and private sector, mainly the resort market. The technologies channelled through NGOs by UNDP/MoFA are now being operated by cooperatives under the value chain project of IFAD/MoFA. Similarly, IFAD is supporting poultry enterprise by providing funds for expansion of poultry size in BCS Baarah by supporting construction of two poultry houses of capacity of 500 birds each and providing recurrent cost support. Both IFAD and FAO are using information of feasibility studies conducted by the SIFP including feed mill, auto-pot, poultry and chilli sauce making. FAO is interested taking up the feed-mill feasibility study recommendations as a component of the forthcoming poultry project. Likewise, the feasibility studies were also used by the private sector while applying for commercial lease islands. It is also known that the Mariculture Enterprise Development Project in the pipeline is taking the knowledge products of mariculture and basic training component undertaken by this project and linking for continuation. Thus the project outputs, to some extent, are replicated by government, related UN agencies and also by private sector, to some extent.

The evaluation also noted the scaled up of the auto-pot technology in the vicinity of project supported intervention area. It was found in two cases. In Filladhoo, though the auto-pot plant managed by AECS was not functioning due to internal management of the cooperative, individual farmers were using modified auto-pot technology. This was also found with individual farmers in the vicinity of auto-pot plant managed by MEC NGO in Meedhoo in the South. The modified technology uses the local materials and is a bit labour intensive as the nutrient has to be given manually against the fully auto-pot technology wherein nutrient is pot controlled. The production cost difference is almost one-half. Under full auto-pot system, production cost per kg of fruit is MVR 20, whereas it is 10 under the modified technology. The total production in both cases is the same as reported by farmers and also by workers in the MEC managed auto-pot plant. Hanimaadhoo Agriculture Research Centre is also conducting trials and demonstration on different technology models including the auto-pot and its modification. Likewise, green house technology which was demonstrated by the SIF project in Meedhoo as a part of the auto-pot technology is being used by farmers in vicinity and planted fruit and vegetables under it.

 

Full-fledged auto-pot technology managed by MEC Modified auto-pot technology used by a Meedhoo farmer

Thus the project has clearly demonstrated that likelihood of further replication and scaled up of these technologies is high given that enabling environment is created for expansion of these technologies.

## **EXIT STRATEGY**

For the safe exit, UNDP should make arrangement to complete the incomplete activities. There are five activities yet to be completed including study on trained women’s feeling about their increased income, study on feeling of MoFA staff about their improved efficiency, establishment of certification system for the quality control of local agricultural products, establishment of AIDC and establishment of animal quarantine database system. Of these activities, the last one, establishment of animal quarantine database system, is already taken up by FAO. The first two activities (trained women’s feeling about their increased income, and study on feeling of MoFA staff about their improved efficiency can be done within the project period as these do not take long time. What is needed is to start these studies immediately. Regarding the establishment of AIDC, process on hiring consultant to develop web-portal is underway. Though it may take relatively longer time, it seems that this activities would be completed with little involvement of UNDP after the project termination. The certification system development may take relatively longer time as it requires regulations to be passed by cabinet. This activity should be taken up by MoFA, but of course with UNDP’s influential role. With these arrangements the incomplete activities can be completed.

Safe exit strategy should also consider how the good results of the projects are sustained, scaled up and replicated. There are some initiatives already in place that are supportive to safe exit of UNDP from the project. One of the supportive strategies is the continuous involvement of a focal Ministry staff at implementation stages that has greatly improved the transfer of project knowledge and memory. Some of the initiatives are the interest areas of other development partners including IFAD and FAO that are now coming in Maldives with relatively larger amount of funds. MoFA has already owned the poultry and auto-pot technologies and conducted demonstration and training on these in the research centres. Likewise, mari-culture training materials are already owned by the MRC and MoFA and IFAD and FAO have interest to use them in their mari-culture support programme. MoFA has demonstrated the innovations successfully with technical and funding support of UNDP. It has technical capacity to guide producers. More importantly, MoFA’s shift in working pattern toward programme effectiveness by harmonising support of different development partners along the line of the government policy would encourage other agencies to work for agriculture commercialisation building on the results that have been achieved by MoFA through this project. These are the opportunities for UNDP which can be capitalised to develop the exit strategy.

Since little time is left for the phase out of the project, it is useful and necessary that project is terminated with a sound exit strategy. Against this backdrop, UNDP within the remaining period of the project should facilitate MoFA to develop a plan taking into consideration resources from different sources including IFAD, FAO, private sector, public sector and civil society to integrate the useful project results into the overall agriculture development programme of MoFA. In this respect, UNDP should use the aid harmonization strategy that it should have consultations with other related UN agencies including IFAD and FAO and develop a practical work plan to complete the incomplete activities with clear responsibility among them. For scaling up and replication, it would be better if these agencies update the UNDAF framework with project results that each UN agency will integrate into the respective annual work plan. This arrangement among the related UN agencies will be an effective instrument for UNDP to facilitate MoFA to integrate good results of the project into the government’s regular agriculture development plan. Option for no cost extension of the project not more than three months should also be kept open, in case the above mention agencies are pre-occupied to actively participate in the two level of meetings (among UN agencies and with MoFA) within the project period.

# SECTION-FIVE

# BEST PRACTICES, LESSONS LEARNED, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

# Best Practices

Best practices identified by this evaluation include shift from ad hoc to systematic approach, joining hands by prominent support agencies, ownership of project by the government, partnership for development forum, tripartite partnership, remodelling of innovation, good governance and use of existing information. These are briefly described below.

* **Shift from ad hoc to systematic approach.** A system of building from what has been achieved has been in practice this time, which was not before the project. Before the project, there was a tendency of starting new project, without considering the lessons learned from the previous projects and learning derived from the previous projects were rarely incorporated into the new one. There were many things done systematically in this project including island selection, participation of support agencies including UNDP, FAO, IFAD and MoFA in the selection of islands for project that followed, activity planned based on market demand and project prepared while linking to the economic diversification policy and agricultural strategy of the government.
* **Joining hands by prominent support agencies**. In agriculture, FAO and IFAD are the prominent support agencies of the UN. The magnitude of their role in the Maldives has not been uniform. IFAD was established in Maldives recently three years ago. FAO operated from Sri Lanka Office with a liaison person in the island country. Recently, their presence is relatively larger and are operating from Male’. These agencies have now working in the same areas based on the lessons gained from this project. They have already started working on auto-pot and poultry which were demonstrated and proven commodities to be feasible for commercialization by the SIF project. This has, to a large extent, lessened the UNDP concern for safe exit of this project, in addition to getting continued support by farmers involved in these innovative technologies.
* **Ownership of the project by MoFA**. There has been constant involvement of MoFA from the beginning of implementation to the end of the project. The MoFA has fully taken the ownership of this project as expressed by the related persons in the process of this evaluation. MoFA has played important role also linking this project with other support agencies. It has also been playing crucial role in re-establishing partnership between Seagull and Filladhoo AECS. Though level of ownership need still to be strengthened, owning the project by MoFA would be helpful in several ways which may also be useful for UNDP to exit safely from the project.
* **Partnering for Development (P4D)[[6]](#footnote-6).** P4D is a forum that brings together supply side and demand side actors as well as those involved in creating enabling environment for private-community partnership. Three forums were conducted each in north, south and centre and national as well as regional agenda to enhance community-resort partnerships were discussed. Recommendations of these forums have been good inputs for shaping the partnership policies. Though in a limited scale, respondents reported of improved understanding and strengthened relations between the partners. Continuity of the forums would, however, be necessary to boost up this good start.
* **Tripartite partnership.** In the southern islands, this partnership was working well including the one among MEC, AMCS and Shangri-La resort in Addu atoll. The NGO MEC has mobilized its members to produce auto-pot, the auto-pot products are bought by AMCS and supplied regularly to Shangri-La which is guided by an agreement among these three partners.
* **Re-modelling of innovative technologies** and adapting by locals. The auto-pot technologies were costlier and also that the instruments have to be imported from other countries (generally from Malaysia) which take longer time. Hanimaadhoo Agriculture research Centre has been conducting trials on auto-pot and poultry to make the innovations less costly using locally available options. Farmers in Meedhoo remodelled the technologies with local materials. They tried it in the local area and found that there was almost the same level of production but at much lower cost. Farmers are now using the modified auto-pot technologies. This innovativeness of the farmers is a good practice which could be tried in other areas also.
* **Good governance**. MEC NGO, for example, has practiced good governance including participation of members, capacity building, transparent management and rule of law. They have set rules for operating business, made democratic decisions, created environment for learning including establishing a library, kept records well of auto-pot including date of sale, amount of money, distribution of money and expenditure details. Applying good governance principle is definitely a good practice which has helped bind members together and build trust among them.
* **Use of existing information.** The four feasibility studies (poultry, auto-pot, chilli sauce and poultry feed mill) conducted by the project are being used as references by MoFA and other agencies including IFAD and FAO and some private agencies. Rather than duplicating similar studies, using the already existing information was a good practice which has saved both money and time of the support agencies.

# Lessons Learned

Lessons that can be derived from this project are related to context specific strategy, transparent management, internal strength necessary for successful partnership, piesence of enabling environment, role clarity between and among partners, financial support for initial investment, engagement, and business mindedness. Their brief discussion is provided hereunder.

* **Need for context specific approach/strategy**. The project used similar approach and strategy in all project sites. This global/standard model worked in some places but not in all places. It worked in the southern islands but not in the north. It was not only the inter-regional but also the intra-island variations in terms of contexts governed by the institutional and human capacity, governance style practiced by the institutions, and exposure to the similar initiative that mattered. Where these contextual factors are taken into consideration, interventions get success; otherwise not. In the southern islands, these contextual factors were present more in the partner organisations than in the north. Though project made some differences in the intensity of monitoring and supervision with more frequency in the needed north than south, required level of attention was not paid. In the same island Baarah, BCS and BZG fared differently. Since the status of success factors differ by institution to institution, development interventions should develop and use the context specific approach and strategies.
* **Transparent management.** Transparency is a necessary element that plays crucial role in enhancing the organisational strengths and fostering partnership management. Transparency is a binding force that builds trust among members in the organisation. In the southern islands, especially in MEC, management was kept transparent and it was mentioned by participants in the focus group discussion that it was one of the strong factors enhancing trust and binding the members together. In the northern islands, especially with BZG, there was mistrust among the members mainly because they were not made aware of the income and expenditure details and that workers were not paid with wages. It was one of the reasons that skilful workers did not go for work and auto-pot plant had to shut down.
* **Internally strong organisations can make better partnership.** Organisations that are internally strong technically and managerially can exchange goods and services in a better way with partner organisations. In partnership, internally strong partners trust each other so that they can fulfil the agreement agenda. Weak organisations cannot implement the agreement agenda timely and regularly. In the northern islands, production organisations were not internally strong enough in operating the organisations which had implication for both in producing goods and also in managing supply. Their partnership with private sector was not continuous. In the southern islands, the producers’ organisations were relatively stronger than in the north. The partnership between the producers’ organisations and private sector was continuing. The trust worthiness of partner is important to continue partnership which has implication for internal strength of the partners.
* **Presence of enabling environment**. Favourable laws, rules, regulations, policies and plans of the government are necessary elements for enterprise development including their production and marketing and also for developing endurance partnership between the organisations of producers and of buyers. In the absence of enabling environment, enterprise development schemes cannot go long. This was observed in two output areas of this project. Due to absence of appropriate standard and certification system, the project could not meet its one of the outputs which was about quality control and standardization of agriculture value-addition activities. Another result area that was affected by not having appropriate enabling environment was poultry production with BCS. The poultry production scheme which was found excellently working in production and marketing as well as maintaining good partnership with buyer till the project support was there, had to be discontinued because of the high price of imported feed due to unavailability of the feed in country. With the feed mill established in the country, the feed price would come down and poultry production would not have to stop as depicted by the feasibility study conducted with support of this project. If government monitored quality seed supply agency was made available, producers would not have to lose their profit which happened with many auto-pot producers’ organisations. They got low quality seed having low germination rate that kept their greenhouses half empty, in many cases, though some other factors were also responsible for this in some cases[[7]](#footnote-7).
* **Role clarity is necessary for successful partnership.** In partnership, there are two fundamental elements that every partnership should respect. One, there must be division of work (roles and responsibility) clearly defined and two, there must be common goal of all partners involved. In the absence of these two elements, partnership cannot go long. Importance of these two elements is even more in development partnership. The project was not found to have strongly considered these two elements seriously. For example, the chairperson of VWCS was expecting money from the partner Live and Learn organisation for electricity repair of the production unit, which could be the responsibility of VWCS. The production unit was kept idle for long time which would have restarted with the money earned from the sale of some bottles of the sauce. The role unclarity affected the business. Role clarity between and among partners was observed in MEC-AMCS-Shangri-La resort partnership. This partnership was found successful.
* **Financial support needed for initial investment**. Things are costlier in Maldives than in neighbouring countries as most of the things have to be imported. This makes the investment cost high. Without financial support, production facilities cannot be installed by marginal and vulnerable group of people. Installation of auto-pot facilities, poultry production facilities, chilli sauce production facilities, and poultry feed mill require high amount of initial investment which requires both technical as well as financial support. After the initial investment support was provided by the project, these facilities were satisfactorily operated in some areas, although they were closed down in some areas which were mainly of their internal management issues linked to low level of capacity. Though the feasibility studies were carried out to provide entrepreneurs with opportunities to approach banks/other investors to get the financial support, the evaluation could not observe any progress along this line.
* **Engagement.** The more in-depth engagement of a large number of members, the more the organisation will be success to harness benefits out of the enterprise development. The lesser the engagement, lower will be benefit. The example of former case was auto-pot producers’ organisation in Meedhoo; and for latter, it was the organisation of auto-pot producers in Baarah. In Meedhoo, more number of members were found engaged in planning, implementing, monitoring, and reviewing; whereas it was left for a few members in Baarah. Meedhoo was harnessing good profit, whereas Baarah was keeping the plant idle.
* **Business mindedness**. Agricultural enterprises are, after all, produced for selling/ business. Business skills in addition to good attitude towards business is necessary for successful business. It was found in the south that people had more entrepreneurial skills and they were more business minded than in the north. Several respondents indicated this as a major factor for successful intervention in the south. IFAD/FAO/BDSC and others that are trying to build capacity in the north should also concentrate that their efforts are concentrating on the north to address such capacity issues –as it takes long time to change the attitude.

# Conclusion

The overarching finding of this evaluation is that the Support to Integrated Farming project has created opportunities for economic diversification in some islands of the Maldives by providing evidence that poultry, auto-pot and chilli sauce can be commercially produced and marketed given the enabling environment. The project has contributed to food and income security of some households through additional employment of rural women in agriculture sector. It has demonstrated that alternate livelihoods activities can be replicated to other islands through expansion, commercialisation and market integration through private sector partnership. More importantly, the project has produced evidence based on which the government and other agencies can make the field level as well as policy level decisions. For UNDP, the information generated by this project can be an instrument for evidenced-based policy level advocacy with respect to commercialisation of agriculture.

The project supported technically and financially in the installation and operation of five auto-pot, two poultry and one chilli sauce plants in different islands in the north, central and south Maldives with a view to verify the technologies and the partnership model for their commercialisation in diverse context of the country. It also provided managerial support to the producers’ organisations. As a result, production capacity of farmers and their organisations in terms of production knowledge and skills in the use of new technology on poultry, auto-pot and chilli sauce is strengthened, to some extent. With the strengthened capacity, they produced products with successful application of the technology. The capacity of producers’ organisations in terms of managing production and marketing was also, to some level, strengthened but with much variation by organisations and locations.

Technology-wise, poultry was successfully produced and marketed by forging partnership with established business centre for two years. The first year was technically and financially supported fully by the project. The second year was operated with income from the first year production. The production was excellent in terms of both quantity and quality but income was lower than the expenditure mainly due to high cost of feed which had to be imported as feed mill is not available in country. At the time of evaluation there was no operational poultry industry as it was the time for replacement of old birds. The new birds were not brought in due to the expected loss to run it without external support. According to the feasibility study and verified with the relevant respondent of this evaluation, feed can locally be produced at almost 50% lower cost than the price of imported feed and can be made available to producers at an affordable price. Therefore, an enabling environment for poultry production by establishing a local feed mill is necessary precondition for the sustainable operation of poultry industry. Together with the establishment of the feed-mill, the size of the poultry industry should also be enlarged for the operation of feed-mill in its optimal capacity for its own sustainability.

In regards of auto-pot technology, it can be profitably grown and marketed. However, strategy for supporting this enterprise should be context specific with more emphasis on capacity development of producers and their organisations in the northern islands compared to the south. Further trials and evaluations are necessary on the locally modified technology and efforts to further size down production cost need to be made.

Chilli sauce production and marketing has also a good scope but requires enabling environment for certification of its quality to sell in resort for consumption by tourists. The project effort to establish a registration mechanism, standards and a certification system has not been materialised due to lack of proper regulations to implementing such a certification mechanism in Maldives, as highlighted in the gap analysis done by the consultant hired under the project support.

With respect to mari-culture, the produced training materials were successfully piloted with 17 training participants and these are in the process of accreditation. These are good for use by MoFA and MRC as well as other support agencies. The challenge for use of technology by marginal and vulnerable producers is again limited by high cost associated with the technology. Here again, enabling environment for promoting financial institutions is necessary for a sustainable business. Mariculture enterprise project may put some efforts to motivate policy people to promote financial institutions to provide loans to parties involved in agriculture business.

In terms of capacity development of MoFA, plant and animal quarantine as well as establishing AIDC is a good strategy to strengthen MoFA capacity to reach wider audience at low cost. MoFA capacity in these result areas, however, have not been strengthened as these activities, except the plant quarantine which was developed under UNV in 2010, are yet to be completed. It is expected that animal quarantine support would be completed soon with FAO and AIDC with UNDP support as procurement of technical services are underway.

In addition to the intended capacity, project contribution has been remarkable to the shift in the working pattern of MoFA. The project worked as a catalytic agent in shifting the MoFA’s operational pattern required to address the issues associated with commercialisation of agriculture. With this project, MoFA started working with farmers' groups such as NGOs and Cooperatives against the individual farmers it worked before. MoFA made a system to align agriculture related projects supported by donors with the overall government’s agriculture programmes. It also established a norm for the donor supported projects that they should liaise while basing at MoFA that helps strengthen communication. In addition, it also opened door for other support agencies to build on the results of this project.

Despite these good changes, as enabling environment is still a constraint in promoting innovative technologies that lead to diversification of economy as well as agriculture and fisheries section, the Maldivian government needs to pay special attention to creating the enabling environment. Future support of UNDP requires, therefore, to focus on this direction.

# Recommendations

The recommendations are divided into three major groups: Policy, strategy and partnership. There are a total of nine recommendations comprising of three recommendations to each major group mentioned above. Of the nine recommendations four are related to UNDP, whereas the remaining five recommendations are specific to MoFA. The group-wise and agency-wise recommendations are presented below in Table 5.

Table 5: Recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **MoFA** | **UNDP** |
| Recommendations regarding Enabling Environment | **MoFA should come up with strong agenda for supporting the establishment of poultry feed-mill and expansion of poultry industry.**  Poultry is an integral part of the overall diversification of the agricultural sector. This demands for the commercialisation of poultry industry to meet the growing demand of eggs and meat in Maldives. Establishment of feed-mill is essential for the commercialisation of poultry industry as its private undertaking is not profitable with imported feed. Though MoFA is paying attention to this, it should make special efforts to mobilise needed resources for the actual establishment of poultry feed mill. It is also important that MoFA comes up with poultry expansion programme with a view to run the feed-mill at optimal capacity for its sustainability.  **MoFA should monitor input supply agencies for their timely supply of quality inputs of successfully demonstrated innovations.**  Poor quality seed and low production of melons for auto-pot technology was reported in several places. Low germination of the seed was one of the critical factors that maximum benefit was not harnessed from this innovation. To promote the auto-pot technology, government should monitor seed supply agencies for timely supply of the quality seed and related inputs and UNDP and other donor support should go to encourage government in this direction. | **UNDP should continue paying greater attention to policy issues by decreasing its field level engagement.**  UNDP engagement in community project in the past was justifiable as other UN agencies’ presence in Maldives was low. Now more number of UN agencies are on board whose strength is in implementing the field projects. Under such a situation, UNDP should focus its attention even greater to creating enabling environment by lobbying policy-makers and encouraging civil society and private sector for creating pressure to them. The greater level of UNDP push is also important because of the emergence of more number of policy level issues which are also associated with the escalation of Maldives from low income country to middle income country. |
| Recommendations regarding Strategies and Approaches | **MoFA should coordinate with other agencies to support for institutional and individual capacity development of agriculture research centre as well as other island level organisations including cooperative societies.**  Capacity level of different organisations was found low in general with all organisations with some variations. Therefore, especial attention should be paid to capacity development at institutional and individual level of local organisations such as cooperatives, NGOs as well as central level organisations such as MRC, MoFA, and Agriculture Research Centre. Here again, capacity development should be based on the capacity need of the organisation and individual. MoFA should encourage development partners to put sizable amount of funds for capacity development. | **UNDP should allocate adequate amount of budget for monitoring and evaluation as per the evaluation policy of the UNDP.**  Project success depends, to a large extent, on the effective monitoring and evaluation. Because of the high cost associated with travel, field monitoring is understood to have taken place not to the desired extent. Though strategy to use funds from different sources were in place, budget for monitoring should be increased at least to the level identified by UNDP evaluation policy.  **UNDP should develop a project exit strategy.**  Develop an exit strategy with leadership of MoFA by involving critical stakeholders so that incomplete activities and good practices are put into the programme of MoFA and other supporting stakeholders. If this requires additional time, UNDP should be flexible to extend the project period for three months on no-additional-cost basis. |
| Recommendations regarding Partnership | **MoFA should develop a workable framework for ensuring coordination among related stakeholders.**  Strengthened coordination among stakeholders related to agriculture commercialisation is essential for activities to be efficient and programme to be effective and responsive. In the first place the coordination mechanism should be inclusive consisting of representatives of the sector ministries, development partners, the private sector and NGOs. The inclusive committee should revisit the existing coordination mechanisms and develop a more practical mechanism using participatory process. It should also develop a coordinated plan of work with clear roles of each partner and monitor its implementation. Establishing and strengthening such mechanisms at atoll and island level will be required with the expansion of commercialisation of agriculture there.  A UNDP supported project “Developing capacities for effective aid management and coordination” developed a framework which improved coordination between the ministries and the national planning commission in Nepal**.**  **MoFA should strengthen linkages between agriculture research centres and organisations of farmers for technology utilization and feedback.**  Linkage between agriculture research and producers was not found strong. Efforts should be made to strengthen their relationships so that research finds practical agenda for demonstration/trials and farmers get verified technology. In this regard, certain percentage of time of the researchers and technicians should be allocated for farmers’ field visit. | **UNDP should continue working for strengthening relations between and among private sector, cooperative society and producers’ organisation**.  Though there has been some relations established among resort, cooperative and community partnership, it needs to be strengthened. Give continuity for P4D forums and encourage resorts and other businesses to use their corporate social responsibility funds to community for increased quality agriculture products. |
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# **ANNEXESAnnex 1: Terms of Reference**



**Terms of Reference**

**Job Title:** Terminal Evaluation of Support to Integrated Farming Project

**Duty Station:** Male’’ with travel to Islands

**Project Reference:** Support to Integrated Farming Project

**Type of Contract:** Individual contract (International)

**Duration of Assignment:** October 20 – December 15, 2013

**Background**

The Maldives faces major socio-economic challenges in widening the base of economic growth, promoting employment particularly for women and youth, and delivering a diversified and affordable service industry within and across its geographically dispersed islands. For the agriculture industry in particular, challenges persist in reducing the over dependence on imports, improving national food security, strengthening organised farming and subsistence farming systems, applying appropriate technologies and developing the required market infrastructure for sustainability.

With the aim to address the need to strengthen economic resilience of island communities and vulnerable groups including women and youth, Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture (MoFA) in collaboration with UNDP Maldives initiated the Support to Integrated Farming project (2008-2010) to provide long-term support for economic development of communities through agriculture extension and integrated farming. The interventions focused on expansion, diversification and business orientation to agriculture and farming in the Maldives. Technical and grants assistance were provided to eight community level NGOs to conduct pilot projects in innovative farming technologies (auto-pot), poultry farming as well as chilli sauce production (value addition). To ensure sustainability and increase market linkages for the agricultural products, efforts were made to establish private sector partnerships and strengthened capacity through training in business skills and facilitating access to business development services. Efforts were also made to enhance organisational and networking capacity within the Ministry.

Lessons learnt from these experiences showed that sustainability of the activities, in particular the auto-pot, poultry, chilli sauce processing and mariculture initiatives depended essentially on expansion of production capacities and establishing formal market linkages for the products through private sector partnerships. To this end and also to support government's agenda for diversification of agriculture, the Support to Integrated Farming project was extended into the new UNDAF cycle for a further three year period (2011-2013). The new focus was mainly at a policy level, to facilitate the expansion of the existing community level activities from the initial demonstration level to a commercial level, encourage market integration through sustainable private sector partnerships, support the standardization and quality control of agriculture value addition activities as well as the commercialization and knowledge exchange of existing mariculture activities.

In 2012, UNDP Maldives conducted a broader UNDAF outcome level evaluation to assess relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of UNDP engagement strategy with civil society actors, non-profit organizations, including at the national and community levels, and private sector actors - including cooperative societies, and mechanisms (including small grants) in achieving its development goals as outlined in the UNDAF and the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD 2008-2011 and 2011-2015). The outcome evaluation assessed the activities that were implemented with NGOs, CBOs through various grant schemes and also looked into the various interventions from this project.

UNDP will also be recruiting a National Consultant to document the Success Stories and lessons learnt from the projects for knowledge creation, collection and sharing as relevant for different networks of government, private institutions and individuals working on projects that share common characteristics. As a result of this assignment, portraying the success models from the outcome Interventions levels, its impact to a common person and the policy level discussions would be developed that will help in further sustaining the efforts as knowledge materials and for future replications.

**EVALUATION PURPOSE/OBJECTIVE**

The main purpose of the terminal evaluation is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements in relation to project objectives endorsed by the project Board including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results. As such, the evaluation aims to review progress towards the project’s objectives and outcomes, assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes, identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success, and on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature.

The main objectives of this assignment are to:

* Promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
* Synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future interventions; and
* Provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.

**EVALUATION SCOPE**

The assignment will broadly cover the following areas:

1. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the overall project design remained valid in the context of national priorities and UNDAF. The evaluator will review the project’s concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development and sustainability.
2. The evaluation will assess the extent to which project management and implementation has been effective, efficient and responsive.
   * Asses and evaluate the results and impacts of the project;
   * Measurement of results based on set indicators and targets;
   * Assess the quality and relevance of project reporting;
   * Assess the mechanisms for information dissemination (advocacy and awareness raising)
   * Assess the extent to which project design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration: Gender, Equity, Institutional strengthening and Economic Diversification or added value to national development
3. Provision of recommendations based on findings, including suggestions on exit strategies and integration into other government led programmes
4. The evaluation should also assess how and to what extent the project has built management, planning and operational capacity among the project’s stakeholders, particularly at the national and island level.
5. The evaluation will also highlight lessons learned and best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance & success and support the National Consultant in identifying and capturing success stories from the project

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS/ CRITERIA**

**Relevance**

* Are the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities and UNDP priority areas?
* Are intended outcome and outputs of the project relevant to national and community needs and priorities and did it help in diversifying the agriculture sector?
* Are the partnership strategies, plans, demonstration projects and mechanisms developed under the project relevant to national conditions and priorities?

**Effectiveness**

* Is the progress made to date on achieving the stated outcome or outputs of the project on track? And what factors are contributing to achieving or not achieving intended outcome?
* Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?
* In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluator should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether there are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects?
* To what extent have the project’s interventions mainstreamed to gender and contributed to gender equity?
* To what extent have the project’s interventions successfully reached the target groups and met their needs through design and implementation?

**Efficiency**

* Was the project cost effective? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness?
* To what extent is institutional capacity strengthened for the PMT to deliver results efficiently?
* Coordination, complementarities and synergies amongst UNDP projects, units, between line ministries and other partners to enhance efficiency and effectiveness?
* To what extent the project’s monitoring (and evaluation) activities have been efficient and effective?

**Sustainability**

* To what extent are contributions to outcome and achievement of outputs sustainable within the existing capacity and structures of the country?
* Has UNDP deliberately designed interventions and engaged partners to build in sustainability in the project?
* Are the results sustainable? (Will the outputs and outcome(s) lead to benefit beyond the lifespan of the existing programme(s) and project (s)?
* How the project outcomes and outputs replicated into other projects and government integrating this into the overall national development priorities of the country
* How might we do things better in the future? (Which finding may have relevance for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?)
* As part of the recommendations, the evaluator is expected to suggest proper exit strategies with a focus on integration of project initiatives into other government led programmes.

**METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation methodology will be finalized by the consultant, guided by the requirements of MED and UNDP as articulated in various criteria and guidelines provided, as well as key documents such as the approved project document, mid-term evaluation report, annual budgets and work plans, project Board meeting minutes as available, and other technical reports and documents as relevant. The evaluation methodology should be clearly documented in the final evaluation including comprehensive details of the following:

* Documents reviewed
* Interviews conducted
* Stakeholders consulted
* Project sites visited
* Techniques and approaches used for data gathering, verification and analysis

**APPROACH**

* The evaluator will be expected to give special attention to analysing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication.
* Stakeholder participation, including government, community, civil society and gender balances in participation and influence;
* Mainstreaming gender- whether the project has taken adequate measures to ensure gender concerns are mainstreamed in the implementation of the project activities;
* Data should be triangulated and crosschecked with difference sources of data
* The evaluator is recommended to use success stories and human interest stories which the national consultant would be collecting, as evidence to support the evaluation.

**EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)**

The terminal evaluation will produce the following deliverables:

1. Evaluation inception report: an inception report should be prepared by the evaluator before going into the full fledged evaluation exercise. It should detail the evaluators understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be addressed by way of proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks and activities. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. This should be completed during first week of the assignment home based.
2. A Comprehensive terminal evaluation report, including lessons learned and recommendations – the recommendations should include suggested exit strategies with a focus on integration of project initiatives into other government led programmes;
3. A record of key outputs from the evaluation process, including workshop outputs, and minutes of meetings with stakeholders;
4. A summary presentation of terminal evaluation report findings to be presented at the project terminal workshop

* The above deliverables will be reviewed and approved by the project management team and UNDP Maldives.
* The final report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented as a hard copy as well as in electronic form (CD) in MS Word format.

**ROLES AND RESPONSIBLITIES**

The following are the roles and responsibilities of the Evaluator in undertaking this assignment:

* To conduct & evaluate the project and carry overall responsibility for organizing and completing the terminal evaluation and delivering the final report including technical analysis and recommendations.
* To consult and coordinate with other institutions/agencies/ communities that are involved in similar initiatives that could be linked with the initiatives of this project.
* To provide an evaluation schedule outlining a timeline, work plan and methodology that would be followed in conducting the evaluation, which would be finalised in discussion with Policy and Inclusive Growth Unit and PMT.
* The consultant would be supporting the National Consultant hired for developing the success stories of the project and provide support in identifying the stories.
* To conduct an interim discussion with key stakeholders upon completion of the field visits, after which the consultant would consider the feedback received in preparation of the interim draft evaluation report.
* To work closely with the other two consultants in conducting a final validation workshop to disseminate the findings/recommendations from the evaluation and showcasing the success stories.
* Final evaluation report to be submitted to UNDP via email for onward distribution in addition to forwarding an electronic copy saved on disk. The consultant will be responsible for the contents, quality and veracity of the report.

**INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT**

The consultant will be monitored, overseen and supervised by the Policy and Inclusive Growth (PIG) Unit of UNDP Maldives in close collaboration with the Project Management Team (led by Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture and Marine Research Centre). The consultant shall report regularly to PIG and provide updates on progress as agreed.

**OTHER ARRANGEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED**

* The assignment will be concurrently carried out with Terminal Evaluation Consultant hired for the project “Employment and Enterprise Development for Women and Youth” which is also under the Policy and Inclusive Growth Unit of the UNDP Maldives. Both the projects are interlinked and have a number of synergies; as such the relevant field missions for both evaluations will be jointly conducted to the same regions across Maldives.
* The consultant will visit the project site to ensure adequate consultation with all key stakeholders and the field visits would be a joint mission with the terminal evaluator of “Employment and Enterprise Development for Women and Youth” project and the National Consultant who will be documenting the success stories from these two projects.

**DURATION OF THE WORK**

The expected duration of the terminal evaluation is 28 working days, out of which the International Consultant shall be in Male’’ for 12 days and shall report from his/her country of residence for the remainder of the assignment.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TIME FRAME OF MISSION TO MALDIVES [28 working days]** | | |  |
| Inception Stage | * Desk Review | Oct 20 – Oct 26 | Home Based |
|  | * Internal Consultations * Inception Reports | Oct 27 – Oct 28 Oct 29 | Male’ |
| Field Mission | * **North Trip** (Hanimaadhoo, Baarah, Filladhoo, 2 Resort visit) * **Central Trip** (Kadhdhoo, Veymandhoo and Fonadhoo) * **South Trip** (Kaadedhoo, Hoadedhoo, Vaadhoo, Kondey, Gan, Meedhoo and 2 resort visits) | Oct 30 – Oct 31– Oct 31 – Nov 1 Nov 3 – Nov 6 |  |
|  | * Interim discussion | Nov 7 | Male' |
| Drafting Report | * First draft Report * Review/comments | Nov 17 Nov 17 – Dec 1 | Home Based |
| Finalization | * Final Report | Dec 8 |
| * **Validation** | Dec 15 |  |

**QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS / SELECTION CRITERIA**

* Minimum of a master’s degree or equivalent in sustainable development, livelihoods development, economics , labour economics or related field demonstrably relevant to the position
* An evaluator, with proven experience of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.
* Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP or other UN agencies, development agencies or donors;
* Academic and/or professional background in development related fields with in-depth understanding of issues in community based sustainable development/management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required.
* Experience in leading multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations;
* Familiarity with community development approaches in developing countries, preferably related to agriculture industry will be an advantage either through management/implementation or through evaluation of similar livelihoods development projects.
* Excellent English writing and communication skills
* Excellent analytical and report writing skills

**PROPOSAL REQUIRMENTS**

Proposals should contain the following information:

1. **Technical proposal** including a P11 form, an updated current CV, contact details of at least three referees and a cover letter setting out:
   * + How the applicant meets the selection criteria
     + Evaluation approach and methodology
2. **Financial Proposal:** The consultant is requested to provide a proposal or quotation of the fees/cost (including field missions) for the services which will be rendered using the following format and should be separate from the technical proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Daily consultancy rates | A daily consultancy rate proposed by the consultant |
| * Air Ticket | To and from home country ( 2 visits) |
| * Travel expenses to three field visits (North, Central and South) | Site visits are compulsory |
| * Living allowances |  |
| * Other miscellaneous expenses | (please state) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Annex-2: List of Persons Met | | | |
|  | **Name** | **Designation** | **Office/Organisation** |
| 1 | Abdulla Sameeh | Board member | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society -Auto-pot |
| 2 | Ahmed Najeeb | Vice Chairperson | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society -Auto-pot |
| 3 | Ahmed Shathir | Chairperson | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society -Auto-pot |
| 4 | Mohamed Shareef |  | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society -Auto-pot |
| 5 | Mohamed Thinaan | Manager | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society -Auto-pot |
| 6 | Mohamed Waheed | Member | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society -Auto-pot |
| 7 | Samaana Naseem | Board member | Addu Meedhoo Cooperative Society -Auto-pot |
| 8 | Anees Hilmee | Manager and beneficiary | Baarah Cooperative Society - poultry |
| 9 | Fathimath Abdulla | Beneficiary and beneficiary | Baarah Cooperative Society - poultry |
| 10 | Nathasha Mohamed | Supervisor and beneficiary | Baarah Cooperative Society - poultry |
| 11 | Sajid Mohamed | Secretary and beneficiary | Baarah Cooperative Society - poultry |
| 12 | Sofiyya Ali | Beneficiary and beneficiary | Baarah Cooperative Society - poultry |
| 13 | Ali Sameem | Vice President and beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 14 | Ali Shakir | Secretary and beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 15 | Hassan Rameez | Secretary - Sports and beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 16 | Khadeeja Ibrahim | Beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 17 | Khaleela Abdu Razzaq | Beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 18 | Mohamed Rasheed | Exco member and beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 19 | Moosa Niyaz | President and beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 20 | Shameem Abdu Nasir | Exco member and beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 21 | Yoosuf Ali | Secretary - Organising and beneficiary | Baarah Zuvaanunge Dhirun - auto-pot |
| 22 | Dr Aminath Shafia | FAO Coordinator, Maldives | FAO |
| 23 | Mohamed Moosa | (Former) Field Officer | Filladhoo A-11 Cooperative Society) - auto-pot |
| 24 | Mohamed Rasheed | Chairperson | Filladhoo A-11 Cooperative Society) - auto-pot |
| 25 | Ghassan Adam | Marketing | Hoadhedhoo Kotella Cooperative Society |
| 26 | Rifath Mohamed | Information | Hoadhedhoo Kotella Cooperative Society |
| 27 | Ahmed Mumthaz | Agriculture Marketing Business Expert - FADiP | IFAD |
| 28 | Fathimath Shafeeqa | Country Manager | Live & Learn |
| 29 | Aminath Abdulla | Chairperson | MACCS |
| 30 | Hassan Shakeel | Senior Biologist | Marine Research Centre |
| 31 | Shafiya Naeem | Senior Research Officer | Marine Research Centre |
| 32 | Ahmed Ifthikhar | Director | MED |
| 33 | Fathimath Thasneem | Economic Development Associate | MED |
| 34 | Nuha Mohamed Riza | Business Development Consultant | MED |
| 35 | Anisa | Secretary | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 36 | Mariyam Didi | Beneficiary | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 37 | Mariyam Nizama | Exco Member | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 38 | Mohamed Waheed | In-charge (auto-pot) | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 39 | Naima | Vice President | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 40 | Rasheedha | Organising Secretary | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 41 | Samaana Naseem | Treasurer | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 42 | Shaffaf Rilwan | President | Meedhoo Ekuveringe Cheynu - auto-pot |
| 43 | Abbas Ali | Beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 44 | Ali Rifaath Gasim | In-charge and beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 45 | Jamshad Ramiz | Assistant and beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 46 | Mariyam Ibrahim Didi | Beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 47 | Ramiz Hassan Didi | Beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 48 | Rishfa Ahmed | Beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 49 | Shifaza Anwar | Beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 50 | Zuhudha Abdul Ghafoor | Beneficiary | Kondey KISSARU - auto-pot |
| 51 | Mahid Shareef | Permanent Secretary | MHRYS |
| 52 | Mariyam Zoona | Deputy Director | MHRYS |
| 53 | Ali Amir | Assistant Director | MoFA |
| 54 | Hussain Faisal | Assistant Director – Agriculture Business Development | MoFA |
| 55 | Ibrahim Shabau | Deputy Director General | MoFA |
| 56 | Aishath Ali | Director General | MoTAC |
| 57 | Ali Shinan | Senior Planning Officer | MoTAC |
| 58 | Ali Shinan | Senior Planning Officer | MoTAC |
| 59 | Ciara McCarten | CSR Manager | Park Hyatt Maldives Hadahaa resort |
| 60 | Mohamed Rasheed | Purchasing Manager | Park Hyatt Maldives Hadahaa resort |
| 61 | Abdul Muhsin Hussain |  | Participants of Business skills training |
| 62 | Hussain Yoosuf |  | Participants of Business skills training |
| 63 | Ibrahim Anees |  | Participants of Business skills training |
| 64 | Ibrahim Rasheed |  | Participants of Business skills training |
| 65 | Ibrahim Shakir |  | Participants of Business skills training |
| 66 | Ismail Ibrahim |  | Participants of Business skills training |
| 67 | Mohamed Jameel |  | Participants of Business skills training |
| 68 | Salah Shihab | Managing Director | Seagull |
| 69 | Hawwa Nafeela | Manager, Administrative Services | Seagull |
| 70 | Mohamed Naseem – Maafahi | Project Coordinator | Seagull |
| 71 | Meenakshi Sundaram | General Manager | The Residence Maldives resort |
| 72 | Visham | HR manager | The Residence Maldives resort |
| 73 | Athifa Ibrahim | Program Analyst | UNDP |
| 74 | Azusa Kubota | Deputy Res. Rep. | UNDP |
| 75 | Safa Musthafa | Project Assistant | UNDP |
| 76 | Mohamed Inaz | Assistant Resident Representative | UNDP Environment and Energy Unit |
| 77 | Zindu Salih | Assistant Resident Representative | UNDP Governance Unit |
| 78 | Ali Shiyaz | Vice-President | Vaadhoo Council and Southern Farmers' Cooperative Society |
| 79 | Mohamed Ibrahim | Chairperson - Co-op | Vaadhoo Council and Southern Farmers' Cooperative Society |
| 80 | Mohamed Waheed | President | Vaadhoo Council and Southern Farmers' Cooperative Society |
| 81 | Fathimath Ghaneema | Chairperson and beneficiary | Veymandoo Women's Cooperative Society -Chilli Sauce |
| 82 | Mohamed Manik | Member and beneficiary | Veymandoo Women's Cooperative Society -Chilli Sauce |
| 83 | Shahula Hassan | beneficiaries - chili sauce | Veymandoo Women's Cooperative Society -Chilli Sauce |
| 84 | Zuhudha Mohamed | beneficiaries - chili sauce | Veymandoo Women's Cooperative Society -Chilli Sauce |

# Annex-3: Checklist and Questionnaires

**UNDP**

**Checklist**

1. Major achievements of this project
2. Major contributing factors of these achievements
3. How could these achievements be even greater?
4. How could it have covered more number of primary stakeholders?
5. How could it have been less costly?
6. How could have it produced even better quality?
7. What lessons have you learnt from this project that that you will adapt it to the forthcoming project?
8. What lessons you have learnt from this project that you will not use it in the next project?

**Questions**

1. To what extent are the progresses contributive to stated outputs and outcomes of the project?
2. What are the contributing factors of achieving or not achieving the outcome?
3. To what extent have gender issues mainstreamed into the project? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality?
4. What were the approaches designed to reach the target group?
5. To what extent were the designed approaches appropriate in implementation? To what extent have the project interventions reached the target group?
6. What is the per output cost of the project? What was the effect of project delay on cost effectiveness?
7. To what extent do the member/staff of PMT know the concept of efficiency? To what extent do they know the process of attaining efficiency?
8. Are the project progresses updated periodically? Are report of the missions and minutes of the meetings recorded? How is information collected by the project shared with other partners and vice-versa?
9. How are project outcomes and outputs and process replicated into other projects of UN bodies? What are the project outcomes and outputs and process integrated into government programmes?
10. What are the lessons learned, both positive and negative?
11. What is the current exit strategy? What activities have been implemented to converge towards an exit strategy? What improvements are needed into the existing exit strategy?

**Beneficiaries**

**Checklist**

1. What change do you have in your house during the last 3 years since 2010?
2. What contributed to these changes?
3. When did you start your business
4. What specific support did you get from this project? (training, material, money, others)
   1. From other project and agency?
5. How would the support be more relevant and useful to you, if it was given differently? What are these approaches?
6. At what level would you be able to continue your business? (Same, lower, higher)
   1. Your reason for the above response
7. Has someone done similar business by seeing/learning from your business? Who are they?
8. What is your future plan about this business? (Expand, keep at the same level, decrease or stop), Why?
9. Where would you go to get technical, financial and materials services?
10. What support would you require to continue or expand your business?

**Questions**

1. What were the community and national needs and priorities in agriculture sector?
2. To what extent did the project outputs and outcomes help in diversifying the agriculture sector?
3. What are the contributing factors of achieving or not achieving the outcome?
4. To what extent have gender issues mainstreamed into the project? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality?
5. Does MoFA have required capacity and structure to continue project results?
6. To what extent would the outputs and outcomes benefit the target group beyond project life?

**Private sector/Cooperative/NGO**

**Checklist**

1. How was this partnership evolved?
2. What are the main reasons that this partnership happened?
3. This partnership would not have happened, if (1, 2, 3)
4. What was project contribution to this partnership?
5. Who were others involved in supporting the partnership?
6. What are the best of this partnership?
7. How would it have been even better?
8. What are the major results that you would continue this partnership even after the project is terminated?
   1. On what ground are you telling these things? (Human, financial, technical, physical resources)
9. From December this year, the project is terminating. Where would you go for support in the area of
   1. Technical service
   2. Financial services
   3. Material services
10. What are your suggestions for future projects

**Questions**

1. To what extent have gender issues mainstreamed into the project? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality?
2. To what extent would the outputs and outcomes benefit the target group beyond project life?

**Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture**

**Checklist**

1. What are the major achievements of this project?
2. What would not have happened if the project were not there?
3. What are the contributing factors of this achievement?
4. How could it have achieved even better results?
5. What results of the project would you integrate into the regular program? Why?
6. What are good results that you will not be able to integrate into the regular program? Why?
7. What support would you require from others to integrate the good results of this project? (Advocacy, financial, capacity building, others)
8. What are the uniqueness of this project that you like in terms of
   1. Planning
   2. Implementation
   3. Capacity development
   4. Partnership development
   5. Monitoring

**Questions**

1. What were the community and national needs and priorities in agriculture sector?
2. To what extent did the project outputs and outcomes help in diversifying the agriculture sector?
3. What are the partnership strategies, plans and mechanisms developed under the project?
4. To what extent are the progresses contributive to stated project outputs and outcomes?
5. To what extent have gender issues mainstreamed into the project? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality?
6. What were the approaches designed to reach the target group? To what extent were the designed approaches appropriate in implementation? To what extent have the project interventions reached the target group?
7. What is the per output cost of the project?
8. Are the project progresses updated periodically? Are report of the missions and minutes of the meetings recorded? How is information collected by the project shared with other partners and vice-versa?
9. Does MoFA have required capacity and structure to continue project results?
10. To what extent would outputs and outcomes benefit the target group beyond project life?
11. What are the project outcomes and outputs and process integrated into government programmes?
12. What are the lessons learned, both positive and negative?
13. What is the current exit strategy? What activities have been implemented to converge towards an exit strategy? What improvements are needed into the existing exit strategy?

# Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Main Question** | **Sub-question** | **Indicator** | **Data source** | **Method** |
| **Relevance** |  |  |  |  |
| **         Are the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities and UNDP priority areas?** | What are the focal areas and priorities of agriculture extension and integrated farming in Maldives? | Focal areas of Maldives, priority areas of agriculture extension, priority area of integrated farming in Maldives | Project documents | Document review |
| What are the priority areas of UNDP in Maldives? | Priority areas of UNDP in Maldives | CSP | Document review |
| **         Are intended outcome and outputs of the project relevant to national and community needs and priorities and did it help in diversifying the agriculture sector?** | What were the community and national needs and priorities in agriculture sector? | Identified needs of the target community and Maldives |  | Document review, interview (MOFA), Focus Group Discussion (FGD)(Beneficiaries) |
| To what extent did the project outputs and outcomes help in diversifying the agriculture sector? | Outputs and outcomes of project, perception of people about the contribution of project to diversify agriculture sector | Project reports, FGD | Document review, interview (MOFA), Focus Group Discussion (FGD)(Beneficiaries) |
| **         Are the partnership strategies, plans, demonstration projects and mechanisms developed under the project relevant to national conditions and priorities?** | What are the partnership strategies, plans and mechanisms developed under the project? | Partnership strategies, plans and mechanisms developed under the project | Project reports, FGD | Document review, interview (MOFA, PMT) |
| **Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |
| **         Is the progress made to date on achieving the stated outcome or outputs of the project on track? And what factors are contributing to achieving or not achieving intended outcome?** | What are the progresses of the project (as of 2013 September)? | Progress of the project by 2013 Sept? | Project reports | Document review |
| To what extent are the progresses contributive to stated outputs and outcomes of the project? | Outputs and outcomes of project | Project reports, interview report | Document review, interview (UNDP, MOFA) |
| What are the contributing factors of achieving or not achieving the outcome? | Contributing factors | Project reports, FGD, consultation and interview reports | Document review, interview/ consultation (UNDP, MOFA, Partners) Discussion (Community) |
| **         Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?** | What are the actual project outcomes? To what extent have they corresponded to project objectives? | Project outcomes, project objectives | Project document and project report, logframe | Document review |
| **         In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluator should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether there are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects?** | What is the level of the expected results (inputs, outputs or outcomes)? Has project generated any real outcome? | Logframe indicators at various level | Project document, project reports | Document review |
| **         To what extent have the project’s interventions mainstreamed to gender and contributed to gender equity?** | To what extent have gender issues mainstreamed into the project? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality? | Participation of women and men in the project; participation ratio of women and men decision-making body; perceived decisions made by women and men in the project | Project report, FGD report | Document review, FGD |
| **         To what extent have the project’s interventions successfully reached the target groups and met their needs through design and implementation?** | What were the approaches designed to reach the target group? To what extent were the designed approaches appropriate in implementation? To what extent have the project interventions reached the target group? | Project strategies used to reach farmers; number of households reached by the project | Project document, project reports | Document review, FGD |
| **Efficiency** |  |  |  |  |
| **         Was the project cost effective? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness?** | What is the per output cost of the project? What was the effect of project delay on cost effectiveness? | Cost per output | Project reports | Document review and consultation (MOFA, UNDP) |
| **         To what extent is institutional capacity strengthened for the PMT to deliver results efficiently?** | To what extent do the staff of PMT know the concept of efficiency? To what extent do they know the process of attaining efficiency? | Number of trained staff in respective field; experience of the staff; |  | Interview (MOFA, UNDP) |
| **         Coordination, complementarities and synergies amongst UNDP projects, units, between line ministries and other partners to enhance efficiency and effectiveness?** | To what extent are these agencies planning activities together? To what extent are these agencies reviewing activities together? | Number of participation meetings; number of organisations represented in the meetings; Number of activities complemented and coordinated | Project reports | Document review |
| **         To what extent the project’s monitoring (and evaluation) activities have been efficient and effective?** | Are the project progresses updated periodically? Are report of the missions and minutes of the meetings recorded? How is information collected by the project shared with other partners and vice-versa? | MIS in place; Quarterly updating of project progress; number of information shared | MIS | Observation of MIS (UNDP, MOFA) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** |  |  |  |  |
| **         To what extent are contributions to outcome and achievement of outputs sustainable within the existing capacity and structures of the country?** | Does MoFA have required capacity and structure to continue project results? | Knowledge, attitude and skills available within MoFA | Project reports and interview | Interview (MOFA, Community, Private sector) document review |
| **         Has UNDP deliberately designed interventions and engaged partners to build in sustainability in the project?** | To what extent has UNDP engaged partners in the design of the projects? | Number of partners who participated in project design | Project reports | Document review (MIS) |
| **         Are the results sustainable? (Will the outputs and outcome(s) lead to benefit beyond the lifespan of the existing programme(s) and project (s)?** | To what extent would the outputs and outcomes benefit the target group beyond project life? | Perception of target group and other stakeholders | interview | Interview (MOFA, Community, Private sector) |
| **         How the project outcomes and outputs replicated into other projects and government integrating this into the overall national development priorities of the country** | How are project outcomes and outputs and process replicated into other projects of UN bodies? What are the project outcomes and outputs and process integrated into government programmes? | List of project outputs and outcomes replicated into UN projects and interrelated into government programmes | Project report and interviewees | Document review and interview (UNDP, MOFA) |
| **         How might we do things better in the future? (Which finding may have relevance for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?)** | What are the lessons learned, both positive and negative? | List of lessons learned | Progress reports, meeting minutes, interviewees | Document review and interview (UNDP, MOFA) |
| **         As part of the recommendations, the evaluator is expected to suggest proper exit strategies with a focus on integration of project initiatives into other government led programmes.** | What is the current exit strategy? What activities have been implemented to converge towards an exit strategy? What improvements are needed into the existing exit strategy? | List of existing strategy and suggested strategies | Progress reports, and interviewee | Document review and interview (UNDP, MOFA) |

1. Though there are variations in these achievements by regions of the country and also that the achieved results have some issues related to sustainability, the scope of this paragraph is not to go into details. Therefore, only the national average achievements are given here. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In the original project document, Ministry of Finance and Treasury, the Ministry of Economic Development (MED) were also part of the PMT and project board. Now Ministry of Finance has signed as per the procedure back then, and MED has been listed as a partner for the market linkages and private sector engagement components. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. MFDA Responsible for quality and standards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. MED is a partner for the market linkages and private sector engagement components [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Live and Learn has an agreement with MoFA on marketing of chilli sauce products [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Though P4D was led by the Employment project of UNDP with MED, and MoFA wa a supporting partner agency as the MSMEs linked with market during the initial forums were from the Farming project [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Though keeping greenhouse half empty was also intentional to match with the weekly demand in some cases. But, in other cases, it was due to low germination of the seed. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)