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Tourism is the mainstay of the Maldives economy. The tourism sector accounts for over 60% of foreign currency earnings and provides direct employment for over 22,000 people working in 87 resorts. The sector also provides substantive indirect employment and a range of opportunities in the fields of transport, communications, agriculture, fisheries, construction and manufacturing, and maintains critical economic linkages with remote and highly dispersed inhabited islands. The tourism sector is expected to grow significantly over the next five years with the opening of 53 new resorts and an additional 10,000 beds.

Climate change-related risks to the Maldives tourism sector and associated island communities are projected to materialize both directly (through physical damages and losses from climate- related hazards, stresses and events) and indirectly (through reduced revenues across all levels of tourism-related value chains). Initial impacts are already being felt on coastal infrastructure, fisheries, water resources, agriculture and human health. IPCC climate projections for the Maldives, including those related to variability and extreme events, indicate increasing likelihood of conditions detrimental to the tourism sector. It is worth emphasizing that these consequences will be felt not only by the tourism sector, but also by the individuals, communities, enterprises and entire sectors that are catering to the tourism sector and hence dependent on its resilience.

The goal of the project is to support Maldives to become climate resilient by integrating adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions. The objective of the project is to increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures. In order to achieve this objective, the project will deliver on the following three Outcomes: Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses; Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism- associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change; and Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions.

MTE assessesthe progress achieved, particularly with regards to the evaluation criteria such as efficiency and effectiveness of delivery; relevance of the initiative and its consistency with the national and local policies and priorities; measure of the sustainability achieved with regards to project's benefits and outputs; and the impact of changes TAP has made in the Maldives.MTE also identifies strengths and weaknesses of the project's design and implementation, and comes up with recommendations for changes in the overall design and orientation of the project and on the work plan for the remaining period of the TAP's implementation. MTE becomes cognizant of the barriers hindering the project's implementation and lays out a feasible strategy to prop the project's execution towards reaching its objectives. MTE's scope revolves around three major aspects of the project, namely: (1) progress towards results (project design and progress); (2) adaptive management (planning, finances, monitoring, risk management, and reporting); and (3) management arrangements.

The evaluation concluded that TAP is still relevant with respect to its national importance, consistency with national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change, but also because of its global importance and innovations that are integrated in the project design. Its overall structure should remain unchanged. The speed of its implementation is far from being satisfactory, and it will have to be improved in order to keep the perception of the project's relevance and appropriateness active.

The project has been moderately effective in achieving its objectives. The results, i.e. the outputs, produced so far are only the basic studies and preparatory reports for the most important outputs of the project, the MTAP and demo projects. The implementation of the demo projects is still pending. Reports produced have been of mixed quality and were delivered with considerable delay. The stakeholders' mobilisation process is taking place with moderate speed, while the tourism operators, as one of the most important stakeholder groups in the project, are not yet fully brought into the process.

The project's efficiency is moderately satisfactory. The project's management and decision-making structure has faced problems, particularlyat the time when, practically, the entire PMU has been changed, while the newly established bodies (TC and MTAP Committee) have not yet been fully efficient. The role played by UNDP, has been effective, even if the implementation of the project has been taking place in politically very sensitive time for Maldives, which is affecting negatively the delivery of project outputs. TAP's administrative arrangements are cost-effective and rational. The PMU is rather small (three staff members) and the support of MT is significant. The use of financial resources is way below planned expenditure rate, and it reflects the problems project is facing in delivering outputs. While the co-financing has been delivered, it has not been recorded and/or reported consistently.

The TAP's progress towards results is moderately unsatisfactory. While a number of outputs, mainly specific technical studies, have been delivered, serious work is still expected to be carried out to produce major project's outputs (particularly in Component/Outcome 2. This carries relatively high degree of risk, because of large portion of grant funds allocated to this component. The project's major lines of intervention (increasing the knowledge base, testing the measures to increase resilience of tourism sector on the ground, and introduction of innovative financial instruments) are still relevant, but the effective delivery of respective outputs is faced with problems, because, of inadequate quality of some consultants' reports.

The sustainabilityof the project has not yet been secured. The absence of well-designed post-project mechanisms in the PD increases the risk to the project's sustainability. Although started, the intensity of the capacity building activities should be increased. The sustainability strategy doesn't exist, while the replication strategy, although not envisaged in the PD, should be prepared. The communications strategy of the project practically doesn't exist, while the web site and MTAP are still in early stages of development and implementation.

The evaluation has found that certain progress has been made towards achievement of the TAP objectives. However, having in mind that in some important aspects the project has achieved marginal results, in particular in the Component/Output 2 (implementation of concrete measures towards increasing resilience of the tourism sector to impacts to climate change), which are critical for the attainment of major objective of the project, the overall rate of the project is set at **moderately satisfactory**. Keeping in mind that the TAP is,practically, only mid way through its implementation course, and that UNDP CO and PMU are very much committed to the successful implementation of the project, there is a possibility that the project's performance will be improved, leading to a better terminal mark, particularly if the MTE'srecommendations will be fully taken intoaccount.

Evaluation rating table is given below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspect of the project** | **Summary assessment** | **Rating** |
| Project design | The project is still relevant in view of its national importance and consistency with the national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change. Conceptual approach fundamentally correct, but the approach to the implementation of the MTAP and demo projects has not been developed enough.  | **MS** |
| Progress towards results | Certain progress has been made towards attainment of the TAP objectives. Project is exhibiting serious delay in the in implementation of all three components, and in particular the Outcome 2. | **MU** |
| Adaptive Management | No major shortcomings perceived, but there are areas that need improvement, such as work planning and financial planning, and reporting, which should be made more transparent and accessible | **MS** |
| Management Arrangement | Additions to the management arrangement made during the Inception phase were beneficial to the project, while the PMU has been recently consolidated | **MS** |

The report proposes 22 recommendations divided in 3 groups. The most important recommendations are: improve the functioning of thecoordination mechanism, in particular the Technical Committee; secure more active participation of major “non-institutional” stakeholders, in particular the private sector of the tourist industry including MATI, other segments of private sector, and representatives of island tourism dependent communities; facilitate more active role of the most important “institutional” partners and stakeholders such as MEE with EPA and MHI; to start of the implementation of demo projects very soon, by linking the short-term priorities with the longer-term perspective emanating from the overall project goal; MTAP has to be finalized and become operational very soon, while extending MTAP “life” after the project closure should be considered; take measures to improve the quality of outputs and avoid lengthy delays in their delivery; in order to achieve long term sustainability during the remaining period of its implementation TAP management needs to focus on two critical areas: on turning the knowledge base into an element of the enabling environment that will facilitate implementation of the adaptation measures, and on practical demonstration of ways to solve concrete problems on the ground to stimulate long term interest of major stakeholder groups; prepare the Replication Strategy; prepare the communications strategy of TAP as a matter of priority; request a no-cost extension of 12 to 18 months duration; and finalise consultations and reporting on the Outcome 3 outputs, notably the risk transfer instruments and open discussion with a view of developing other innovative instruments.

The major lessons learned from the TAP’s implementation are the following: project document produced for situations similar to this one should not omit defining in a greater detail some critical outputs; commitment of the project staff is of critical importance for the success of the project; start some activities as early as possible, and especially those that might require ample time to mobilise, such as demo projects, capacity building, and communication and replication activities; quality control procedure has to be integrated into the project’s workplan; and bringing in stakeholders early in the process is of critical importance.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

**1.1. Brief description of the project**

Tourism is the mainstay of the Maldives economy. The tourism sector accounts for over 60% of foreign currency earnings and provides direct employment for over 22,000 people working in 87 resorts. The sector also provides substantive indirect employment and a range of opportunities in the fields of transport, communications, agriculture, fisheries, construction and manufacturing, and maintains critical economic linkages with remote and highly dispersed inhabited islands. The tourism sector is expected to grow significantly over the next five years with the opening of 53 new resorts and an additional 10,000 beds.

Climate change-related risks to the tourism sector and associated island communities are projected to materialize both directly (through physical damages and losses from climate- related hazards, stresses and events) and indirectly (through reduced revenues across all levels of tourism-related value chains). Initial impacts are already being felt on coastal infrastructure, fisheries, water resources, agriculture and human health. IPCC climate projections for the Maldives, including those related to variability and extreme events, indicate increasing likelihood of conditions detrimental to the tourism sector. It is worth emphasizing that these consequences will be felt not only by the tourism sector, but also by the individuals, communities, enterprises and entire sectors that are catering to the tourism sector and hence dependent on its resilience.

As climatic conditions will impact on the tourist experience and, in extreme situations, on tourists’ health and safety, the effects of global warming substantively challenge the reputation of the country as a tourist destination.The major climate hazards to which tourism resorts in the Maldives are exposed regularly include windstorms, heavy rainfall, extreme temperatures and draught, sea swells and storm surges. Of these, the intensive risks associated with swell waves, heavy rainfall and windstorms can be especially problematic, due to their high frequency and great potential for physical destruction and erosion. The combined effect of storm surges and tides, or storm tides, are perceived as especially destructive by tourism resorts. However, there is considerable variation in hazard patterns across the archipelago and even between islands in the same atoll, due to local variation in geophysical and climatic factors.

The underlying causes for reduced resilience of the Maldives tourism sector to climate change are considered to be the following: tourism-related human activity undermining natural resilience of coral reefs; climate change not addressed by dedicated policy instruments for the tourism sector; technical knowledge gaps especially with decision-makers in the tourism industry; and financial constraints because of limited government resources available for climate change adaptation. The GoM recognizes that in order to effectively manage climate change risks on the tourism sector in the long-term, it is necessary to integrate climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into the country’s policy instruments across all sectors and levels of government.

In order to remove the above barriers, the project combines two approaches: i) it addresses evident policy and regulatory gaps in the tourism sector, defining targeted guidelines for the resilient management of climate-sensitive natural resources and the construction of climate-resilient over- as well as underwater infrastructure; and ii) it removes capacity barriers in government departments as well as tourism-related institutions (tourism association, resorts and private operators) to ensure that climate change-related trends and hazards are recognized, addressed by means of appropriate adaptation actions at island-level, and financed through public-private partnerships and/or market-based instruments.

The goal of the project is to support Maldives to become climate resilient by integrating adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions. The objective of the project is to increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures. In order to achieve this objective, the project will deliver on the following three Outcomes:

* Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses;
* Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism- associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change; and
* Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions.

**1.2. Purpose of the evaluation**

The evaluation of the project"Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector"(in further text: Tourism Adaptation Project, or TAP) is performed at the midpoint of its implementation and it should be considered as a performance type of evaluation. Mid Term Evaluation (in further text: MTE) generally has a formativenature, as its purpose is to improve performance of the project's implementation. Therefore, the main purpose of MTE is: i) to assess the progress made towards the attainment of objectives and planned results to date; and ii) to examine processes affecting attainment of results as a basis for lessons learned and recommendations proposed for the future implementation of the project.Therefore, the MTEshould be considered asa moment in the project's implementation when an external evaluator comes in and gives comments on how to "redress" it for the remaining period of its implementation.

MTE assessesthe progress achieved, particularly with regards to the evaluation criteria such as efficiency and effectiveness of delivery; relevance of the initiative and its consistency with the national and local policies and priorities; measure of the sustainability achieved with regards to project's benefits and outputs; and the impact of changes TAP has made in the Maldives.

MTE also identifies strengths and weaknesses of the project's design and implementation, and comes up with recommendations for changes in the overall design and orientation of the project and on the work plan for the remaining period of the TAP's implementation. Finally, MTE becomes cognizant of the barriers hindering the project's implementation and lays out a feasible strategy to prop the project's execution towards reaching its objective(s).

**1.3. Scope and methodology**

The evaluation covers the entire scope of the project with all its components, but within the limits of the activities implemented so far. The activities implemented are then compared to the initial work plan and the workplan amended during the Inception Phase of the project. Therefore, the MTE covers the period from the beginning of its implementation (formally, July 2011) up to the present (December 2013). Sjm mxfb}fslag tlbb}ym ysfgcfuc CFImxfb}fslag iulsmulf fgc em fy|ysmnfsli fgc aeomislxm fyymyynmgs a sjm DBSGPuaomis" lsy cmyldg" lnpbmnmgsfslag fgc umy}bsy'Ls tlbb fln sa cmsmunlgm sjm umbmxfgim fgc}bbbnmgs a aeomislxmy" cmxmbapnmgs milmgi|"mmislxmgmyy" lnpfis fgc y}ysflgfelbls|'The MTE analyses the funds spent at the time of evaluation against the total amount allocated. It is not, however, an audit report, but an assessment of the rate of expenditure of funds. Finally, the target groups consulted during MTE are: representatives of the beneficiary country (project focal points, ministries involved, selected group of national experts, and project management). Other stakeholders, such as NGOs, professional (mainly tourism) groups, concerned individuals and other were included as much as that was possible during the evaluator's mission to Maldives in December 2013.

As indicated in the TOR, the MTE's scope revolves around three major aspects of the project, namely: (1) progress towards results (project design and progress); (2) adaptive management (planning, finances, monitoring, risk management, and reporting); and (3) management arrangements.

The first aspect, progress towards results, was assessed through analysis of the documents, in particular the TAP Project Document and the Inception Report, as well as interviews with major stakeholders when they were specifically asked to comment on the validity of the project design with regards to the national priorities. Specific weightwas given to the analysis of progress of project's implementation. All the outputs produced so far were examined, opinions of the project's staff as well as stakeholders were sought on the progress during the interviews, and the results were evaluated against planned outputs. The second aspect, the adaptive management, wasanalysed through project progress reports and financial reports, as well as through interviews with respective technical staff and government's counterparts. Finally, the third aspect, management arrangements, wasanalysed through interviews with the project staff and important stakeholders, whentheir views were sought on the efficiency and effectiveness of the management arrangements, including the support of UNDP. The results of the above analyses formed the backbone of the evaluation’s recommendations.

MTE methodology is the approach for conducting the evaluation, as well as a description of data collection methods and data sources to be utilized. The evaluation methodology follows the division of the evaluation in three major groups of categories/aspects (described above). However, in addition to that, the evaluation is based on the five standard evaluation criteria that are usually applied in MTE, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Therefore, in addition to the evaluation questions, the answer to which will form the basis for evaluating each of the above three aspects/categories of evaluation, and which are mentioned in the MTE TOR, this evaluation will also be complemented by taking in consideration the following issues:

* Project relevance, which includes examination whether the project's strategy designed during its formulation phase and hitherto implementation is still relevant, i.e. consistent with national and local as well as global policies and priorities;
* Project preparation and readiness, which includes examining the clarity and feasibility of its objective and components, and whether the planned implementation arrangements were based on properly conducted preliminary assessment of partners' resources;
* Project ownership at the national and local levels;
* Stakeholder participation, both in the project preparation and implementation stages;
* Assessment of underlying factors and assumptions affecting the project's implementation, primarily of those originating outside the project's context, and measures to counteract them;
* Project organization and management arrangements, both in the planning and implementation stages of the project, and an assessment whether these arrangements could still be considered as optimal in the current implementation context;
* Assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the project budget and duration, and implementation of the financial aspect of the project including parallel funding;
* Soundness of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation system;
* Sustainability and replicability of the project’s achievements and impacts based on current project’s results;
* Effectiveness of the application of adaptive management through monitoring and evaluation, risk management, work planning including regular updates and reporting;
* Assessment of the UNDP contribution;
* Complementarity with other relevant ongoing or past activities, establishment of partnerships in the future, and catalytic role the TAP could play.

The MTE wasorganised into overlapping phases focusing on:

* Document review and analysis (desktop study),
* Interviews with key stakeholders, both through face-to-face-interviews at their location and by telephone/skype/email, and
* Preparation of the MTE Report.

Methods of data collection and data analysiswere the following:

* Data collection in the field (interviews, direct observation),
* Review of project preparation and approval documents (PIF, project document, logframe, GEF CEO endorsement),
* Analysis of project reports (annual reports, PIR),
* Analysis of meeting, workshops, conferences reports (Project Board, workshops and conferences, training courses, mission reports etc.),
* Review of financial records (annual financial reports),
* Analysis of outputs (consultants' reports, thematic reports, guidelines),
* Review of other relevant documents (newsletters, website, etc).

**1.4. Structure of the evaluation report**

The structure of the MTEreport follows the outline as provided to the evaluator in the TOR. After the introduction, the TAP is reviewed in its development context and in its design, as presented in the Project Document (Chapter 2), then the findings of the actual implementation and results achieved on the basis of produced reports and stakeholder interviews are assessed (Chapter 3), and, finally, the lessons learned and recommendations are presented in Chapter 4.Several important annexes are added at the end of the report.

**2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

**2.1. Project start and duration**

Dr. MariyamZulfa, Minister of Tourism, Arts and Culture, and Mr. Andrew Cox, UNDP Maldives Resident Representativesignedthe Project Document on 17 October 2011.However, the Project Document, as well as the Project Inception Report, states that the official starting dates of the project are July 2011.Finally, the Inception Report mentions 1 January 2012 as the starting date of the project. With a planned duration of three years, TAP should be completed in June 2014. However, if the PD signature date is considered as the starting date, then the closure date of the project should be end September 2014. And if Inception Report mentioned date of the start of the project (1 January 2012) should be considered as the starting date, then the project should end in December 2014. Finally, the Project Manager started working on the project in March 2012, and that could also be considered as the effective start of the project. However, whatever date would be taken as the closure date, it is obvious that very little time is being left for the closure of all activities (a maximum of one year from now without extension). It has to be added that, until now, no extension of the project's duration has been requested.

The Inception Workshop took place on 21 March 2012, i.e. 8 months after the official start of the project (July 2011), or 5 months after signature of the PD. In both cases, and in normal circumstances, this delay would be unjustified. However, it has to be stated that in the beginning of 2012 the political crisis struck Maldives, and it has affected all spheres of life in the country. This may be considered as one of the reasons why the Project Manager was hired only in early 2012, and started to work in March 2012, just prior to the Inception Workshop.

The Inception Report (IR), marking the end of the Inception Phase, was completed in June 2012. Therefore, the Inception Phase took more than one year to complete, if the starting date of the project is taken as July 2011. This may be considered as rather long for a project of this size (MSP) and duration, but the delay, as stated above, may be justified by the political events in Maldives that took place in early 2012, and political instability since then.

The project has entered the third year of its implementation. The activities implemented so far are largely behind the planned course of implementation. The project is still in the course of completion of basic studies; the decision on the criteria for selection, and the location and contents of demonstration projects to be implemented is yet to be taken; the MTAP is practically in its infancy phase; and the communications strategy is only now being developed.

**2.2. Problems that the project sought to address**

The TAP operates in the context of tourism industry, the mainstay of the Maldives economy. The second element that prompted initialization of the project is the real danger of negative impacts of climate change, in particular if timely adaptation measures aimed at strengthening the resilience of its tourism industry to climate change impacts will not be taken. Impacts on tourism industry will be particularly strongly felt if we keep in mind the 30% direct, and more than 40% (some say even 75%) sector's indirect contribution to the country's GDP. The PD adequately reflects on the abovementioned issues.

The PD is also very elaborate on the underlying causes of the problem that the project seeks to address, i.e. the relationship between overreliance of the Maldives economy on tourism, and impacts of climate change on that very sector. The PD elaborates on a number of barriers to achieving the solution to abovementioned problems. At a policy level the description of barriers are addressed in a very general sense. The wording is not Maldives specific but more tourism sector specific. It could be applied to a similar situation in another country, therefore it is lacking a certain level of analytical depth and respect for the specific situation in the Maldives. Also, based on the interviews that the evaluator has had during his mission to Maldives, the problems such as perception that resort islands show certain lax attitude towards the issue of climate change; the need to showcase the importance of climate change adaptationto the small islands' communities; differences of opinion on the issue between tourists and general public, particularly with regards to building hard protection structures, which locals want to see and tourists do not; etc. However, in spite of the above, it could be considered that the PD gives fairly appropriate horizontal (crosscutting) review of the current problems.

**2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project**

The immediate and development objectives of TAP are not specifically distinguished in the PD. The overall project's goal is to "increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regret adaptation measures." While this objective is quite a general declaration on the thematic focus of the project, it is"unpacked" in the Project Results Framework through a set of outcomes, outputs, activities and indicators. The Project Document, in the section "Project rationale and policy conformity", also mentions a score of other strategic policy documents that deal with the issue of climate change in Maldives (NAPA, NSDS, Strategic Action Plan 2009-2013). All these documents are rich in objectives and, in a more or less detailed manner, present sets of policies and objectives that TAP is leaning on. Some of these objectives are quite relevant for the adaptation of tourism sector to climate change.

While the PD has not developed tourism sector specific objectives, the Project Inception Report is more precise on the project goals and specific objectives. First, it states that the project's overall goal is to "support Maldives to become climate resilient by integrating adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions." Second, it sets specific goals: adapt to climate change, protect coral reefs, and achieve carbon neutrality in energy. The Inception Report also mentions the project overall objective (goal). Finally, the Inception Reportstates, almost*verbatim,*sevenout of nine objectives contained in the Strategic Action Plan, as TAP Specific Objectives. Although the Strategic Action Plan was sidelined somehow when the new government came in power in 2012, one could not fully ignore the validity of its objectives for the TAP.

The project's strategy emphasises two avenues of activity: filling the policy and regulatory gaps aimed at increasing the tourism sector's resilience to climate change; and developing capacity of decision makers in respective ministries as well as strengthening the enabling environment of tourism sector to make well-informed decisions to reduce vulnerability and improve response to impacts of climate change. To do that, the project aims at creating a solid knowledge base on the climate change issues. The major outputs fit into the proposed strategy of the project, namely: the MTAP (Maldives Tourism Adaptation Platform); the improved regulatory and economic instruments; and practical applications through demo projects.

**2.4. Baseline Indicators established**

The PD contains the Situation Analysis, which gives a fairly comprehensive overview of the issue of climate change in Maldives and its importance for tourism, which is the main economic activity of the country. It also gives an overview of the country and of the tourism sector's capacity to cope with the expected impacts of climate change. While it provides an overview of the major barriers to achieve improved resilience to climate change, it doesn't provide an assessment of the adaptation capacity of the country and the tourism sector. However, this issue was analysed in much more depth in the study "Baseline Analysis of Adaptation Capacity and Climate Change Vulnerability Impacts in the Tourism Sector".

This study focuses on the assessment of the vulnerability of tourism operators (resorts, safari operators and tour operators) tourism-associated communities to the adverse effectsof climate change adaptive capacity of tourism operators, and tourism-associatedcommunities to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses; knowledge and use, withinthe tourism sector, of climate risk financing instruments and solutions; perceptions oftourism operators and tourism-associated communities of the key barriers to adaptation andknowledge within the GoM of tourism policies and planning frameworksand national policies and laws regulating/relating to the tourism operations.

The main objective of the baseline analysis is to assess, quantify and document the currentadaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climatechange and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures. The three specificobjectives of the study are;i) to determine the existing vulnerabilities, existing adaptationresponses and gaps in response to climate change, ii) to determine the awareness andvulnerability of the tourism operators, and dependent communities and iii) to determine thereadiness of the government institutions to tackle the issues to address the climate changevulnerabilities.

The study gives a very good overview and assessment of the adaptation capacity of all major stakeholders, including the tourism dependent island communities. As such it could be considered as a solid base upon which the project's activities should be based. The preparation of the study was somewhat delayed, as it was undertaken in the first half of2012.The PMU stated that the main reasons for the delay were late recruiting of the project staff, late formalization of the Project Board arrangements, which caused some delay in approving the 2012 Work Plan, as well as logistical difficulties in arranging survey visits to tourist resorts and safari vessels.

**2.5. Main stakeholders**

The Project Document presents the stakeholder baseline analysis. It states that MTAC is mandated to oversee the development of tourism at a national level, and carry out long-term planning, development, monitoring, and regulatory functions. Key stakeholders were consulted during the preparation of the project, and two stakeholder workshops were held along with a number of smaller consultation meetings with specific stakeholders. The PD states that stakeholders have provided numerous contributions to the project document. It also states that a final Stakeholder Participation Plan will be endorsed and one of the first activities at project inception. The PD contains a table with the description of major stakeholders, which was expanded during the Inception Phase and contained in the Project Inception Report. It contains the rudimentary form of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan, but a number of its elements are missing. There is no critical analysis of stakeholders, their willingness to participate in the project has not been assessed, more detailed plan of stakeholder activities does not exist, and there is no timeline and description of expected benefits of stakeholder involvement. The Baseline Analysis also deals with the stakeholder involvement, but it does not present the plan. The Baseline Analysis results came only in 2013, when the first fruits of stakeholder involvement were supposed to be shown already. The main stakeholders are supposed to be the following:

* Ministry of Tourism Arts and Culture
* Ministry of Environment and Energy
* Environment Protection Agency
* Maldives Energy Authority
* Maldives Association of Travel Agents and Tour Operators (MATATO)
* Live-a-board Association of Maldives (LAM)
* Maldives Association of Tourism Industry (MATI)
* Maldives Tourism Promotion Board (MTPB)

It is important to mention that the issue of climate change is part of the mandate of the environment ministry (now Ministry of Environment and Energy). While MEE was pivotal during the project preparation phase, the project's implementation is the responsibility of MTAC (now MT). This is not necessarily a wrong decision even if MT's climate change adaptation related capacity does not match that of the MEE.Awarding the implementation to MT certainly improves the climate change adaptation mainstreaming efforts.

Major decision-making body of the project is the TAP Project Board, where major representatives of the government are sitting. It is important to note that representatives of all government bodies, met during the evaluator's mission to Maldives, expressed their full support to the project even if they were not always fully informed about its characteristics and implementation.

The PD does not mention the need to establish the project's coordination body, which is usually an important implementing partners' involvement tool in every GEF project. However, during the Inception Phase this was corrected by establishingthe Technical Committee. It fulfills the coordinating role, albeit not in a fully satisfactory manner. Its most important weakness is an obvious lack of dull engagement of all major tourism sector stakeholders, in particular MATI. Thus, for example, the planned meeting of the evaluator with MATI representatives during his mission to Maldives did not materialise. Another weakness of the TC is frequent change of its members, i.e. the representatives of various organisations.

**2.6. Expected Results**

It is expected that TAP will result in better understanding of the processes influencing the climate change in Maldives, and their expected impacts. Furthermore, the project is expected to contribute to the enhanced capacity to improve resilience of the coastal natural and manmade resources to expected climate change. The project is expected to show how cost-effective concrete actions, implemented through demo projects in tourist resorts and dependent island communities could enhance resilience of tourist sector and protect it from the impacts of expected change and, in particular, the SLR. However, the most important result expected is the removal of barriers to better institutional coordination and cooperation.

The project has been seriously delayed. The activities implemented so far have been carried out according to the work programme, albeit grossly delayed. It is important to note that if all remaining activities of the project will not be initiated during the first quarter of 2014, the full achievement of expected project results will be endangered,even if an extension will be granted.

**3. FINDINGS**

**3.1. Progress toward Results**

3.1.1. Project Design

The TAP was formulated in accordance with standard GEF procedure and it was approved at all appropriate levels. The following paragraphs are evaluating the approach to the project design, in particular the initial assumptions adopted during the TAP preparation phase.

The Inception Report gives a good account of the activities that preceded the development and approval of TAP. The first consultation started in 2008, between the then Ministry of Environment, Energy and Water (now MEE), Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation (now MT), UNDP CO and GEF. During the project developmentphase, MTAC, the Ministry of Environment and Housing (today split in two ministries),the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and, to a certain extent, the Department of National Planning of the Ministry of Financeplayeda critical role. The Project Document was signed in October 2011. Once the project was approved, the MTAC was assigned as the Implementing Partner of TAP, while the MEE, EPA and DNP participate in the Project Board and the Technical Committee. Considering the current implementation capacity of MTAC, in particular its technical capacity, and if the Project Management Unit will not be strengthenedwith adequate technical capacity, the larger role of MEE and EPA in the TAP's implementation may be considered. This may be particularly valid for MHI, being in charge of implementation of the building code, which is considered as important output that will help improving the resilience of the tourism sector to climate change.

3.1.1.1. Underlying assumptions

The implementation of this project is not an easy task, because the issue of adaptation to climate change, particularly in the context of coastal areas in such a sensitive situation as in Maldives, is very complex. It also happened that the implementation of the project has beentaking place in very difficult political times forMaldives.

The presentation of the climate change problem confronted by the Maldives, as elaborated in the Project Document, is accurate and none of the initial assumptions has changed to the better. Furthermore, the causes that are reducing the resilience of tourism sector, either through tourism related human activities that are aiming at maximizing profits at the expense of resilience of natural systems, or through lack of adequate policy intervention, intersectoral coordination, financial support and/or knowledge, are still there.

The basic assumptions and associated risks presented in the PD have been confirmed during the Inception Phase, at least judging by the risk assessment as presented in the Project Inception Report.The risk log in the 2013 PIR presents actions that have been taken to minimize the initial risks as presented in the PD, but no new assessment of risk has been made. However, at least the following three assumptions need to bechangedto reflect the current situation, namely:

* Political: In the period since the approval of the Project Document until the finalisation of the Project Inception Report, Maldives have gone through a very turbulent political period, which has affected the implementation of the project. In that respect, the Political assumption, and associated risk, should have been redefined, from Low to Medium at least.
* Organizational: Critical assumption is the coordination between MT, MHI and MATI. The hitherto implementation has shown that this coordination hasn't work as expected, in particular with regards to the coordination with MATI. The associated risk should also have been raised from Low to Medium at least, because in the absence of cooperation of MATI there is a danger that project's results will not be fully implemented.
* Operational: In addition to the risk associated to the project management and presented in the Project Document, the danger resulting from the slow operationalisation of the demo projects component of the project should have been added. The project is conceived as a soft type of technical assistance, but demo operations are important as they may add a sense of reality to the theoretical proposals, contained in most of the outputs of the project. The level of risk, however, should remain as Medium.

3.1.1.2. Relevance of the project strategy

The theory of change defines all steps required to bring about a given long-term goal. In other words, it should be the basis for the project's implementation strategy. This set of connected outcomes, activities and outputs/results is depicted in the Project Results Framework. The strategy is based on an articulation of the assumptions that underlie the implementation of the activities.Assumptions explain both the connections between early, intermediate and long term outcomes and the expectations about how and why proposed interventions will bring them about.

The project's strategy and outcomes, and its design are, ingeneral,still relevant as there has been no major change in the circumstances existing at the time of its preparation.As a matter of fact, the relevance of the project and its expected outcomes and outputs may have even increased because of new scenarios developed by IPCC, which have raised the level of expected sea level rise in most of the regions of the world.

The strategy revolving around three outcomes that are developed from the basic objective of the TAP (increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives) is realistic considering the financial resources engaged in the project, and one should not expect extremely high tangible results in terms of concrete interventions on the ground. In respect to that, the three avenues of work: filling the knowledge gap and strengthened regulatory framework; concrete interventions on the ground linked to the results of two other components of the project; and planting the seeds for innovative financing of climate change interventions, also seem logical and realistic in terms of time and human resources allocation. However, in both cases, intensive participation of stakeholders in the project’s implementation is critical.

The project is rather insufficiently designed and developed in the following three important strategic areas: MTAP;demonstration projects;and communications and replication strategy.

While the Outcome 2 of the project is almost exclusively devoted to implementation of MTAP and demo projects, in the Project Document some important elements are missing. There is no description of the “platform” (MTAP). This is important because the concept of “platform” has beenused in many projects, almost as a panacea for solving criticalproblems, as well as the stakeholders'participation tool. While this matter in TAP may have been left to a subsequent consultancy to describe in more detail, the Project Document should have provided a more profound definition of the “platform”. If that has been doneat such an early stage of the project’s implementation, some misunderstandings and false expectations, as well as delays, would have been avoided. It is interesting, also, that five different names for a “platform” in the Project Document were used(tourism adaptation stakeholder platform for Maldives; National tourism adaptation platform; tourism adaptation platform; platform for joint action between the MTAC, the MHE, and the tourism industry; and Adaptation Learning Mechanism platform). Furthermore, a proposal for more concrete steps on how to develop the platform is also missing in the Project Document. There is no mention in the PD of the MTAP Committee, which was created after the TAP’s implementation has started. Finally, there is no indication if and how the long-term sustainability of the MTAP will be achieved.

Similarly, the demo projects, to which more than one third of the grant money is allocated, have been only briefly described in the Project Document. The implementation of TAP would benefit from a description of criteria to be used and steps to be taken in the selection of demo projects, as well as expected benefits including an indication of what might be expected in the “post project” phase, as well as how the demo project results will be fed into the MTAP.

Communications component was not mentioned in the PD at all, while it was only briefly mentioned in the Project Inception Report.However,what was presented in the Inception Report is far from satisfactory. The fact that the communications officer was hired recently, although that position was not envisaged either in the PD or in the Inception Report, is a sign that this component is considered as important.

Replication is presented in the PD in very general terms, while in the Inception Report it is not mentioned at all. The term “replication” is generally used to indicate the process through which “practices” that have been proven cost‐effective and sustainable in achieving a desired beneficial impact, are adopted, implemented or up‐scaled in contexts similar to the one where the demonstration of effectiveness has occurred. It is, hence, evident that success in catalyzing replication is critical, particularly when addressing adaptation to climate change. The fact that 20 demo projects were planned to be implemented in TAP certainly called for giving replication amore strategic importance. The replication component couldhave been, for example, integrated into the MTAP, where it could be one of its pivotal elements.

3.1.1.3. Country priorities

The project adequately addresses the country priorities, in particular those with regards to the adaptation to climate change.The DNP reconfirmed that climate change adaptation is among the highest country priorities when it comes to resource allocation, even if some say that overall country’s climate change adaptation policy is, generally, lacking.However, the Project Document states that TAP is aligned to “key national policies” and, in its section on strategy while explaining the project’s rationale, mentions several documents to which the TAP will be aligned. It is, however, beyond the scope of MTE to analyse these documents and establish in what measure they are the policy documents and/or simple action plans (which are aimed at implementation of policies). But, according to the title, there is only one of those documents that is substantially close to the issue of climate change adaptation, and that is the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA). As stated earlier, the NAPA'sobjectives are practically taken as the TAP operational objectives and,based on that, the project adequately addresses the country priorities. Other documents mentioned in the Project Document are only serving the purpose of showing how the climate change is being mainstreamed in country’s political agenda and are not of strategic importance when it comes to country's priorities.

However, the fact that MT is the Implementation Partner of the project shows, to a large extent, that country’s development objectives and priorities have adequately been taken in consideration. Contrary to many countries, in Maldives the MT is one of the most important ministries because it is overseeingits most important economic sector. Equally so, during the preparation of the project the representatives of the tourism sector have been adequately involved.

From the above, it could be concluded that the design of the project, generally, adequately reflects the Maldives’ priorities with regards to climate change adaptation. What is missing, however, is a more precise indication of, and linkage of planned projects outcomes, outputs and deliverables to the specific country’s priorities mentioned in the respective documents.

3.1.1.4. Baseline data included in the project results framework

The evaluation of the underlying causes affecting the resilience of Maldives natural systems and the tourism sector, as presented in the relevant section of the Project Document, has provided enough evidence to conclude that the Projects Results Framework/Strategic Results Framework, which presents the logic and strategy of the project, has been built on solid ground, and that no serious weaknesses in the internal logic of the project have been found. In general, outcomes indicate change, since each one of the three outcomes has as the target an altered future state. Results are measurable, as there is a whole set of clearly defined outputs and indicators to verify them. Outcomes are relevant, as Maldives still seem to be highly committed to the stated objectives of the project.

With regards to the baseline data included in the Project Results Framework, most of them are linked to the analysis of the underlying causes. However, some baseline indicators thatare fairly general would be better defined if a higher level of precisionwere applied. Thus, for example, the baseline indicator for Outcome 1 ("Most tourism operators are concerned about their increased vulnerability to climate change, but do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for effective no-regrets adaptation measures to increase resilience") could define more precisely which are the "no-regret" measures that they are not complying with. It would also be beneficial if "no-regret" (or "low-regret") measures could be spelled out more clearly and linked to "soft", "green" or "grey" actions. For example, reducing pollution of the island aquifers is a measure that would reduce vulnerability of the islands to impacts of climate change, but even if these impacts would not that severelyaffect waterresources, investments made in reducing pollution will still have beneficial effects for achieving other development objectives.

3.1.2. Progress

Although the PD was signed in October 2011, the implementation of TAP fully started only afterMarch 2012 when the National Project Manager came fully on board. Major reasons for a rather long project mobilization period were the political events that took place in Maldives in early 2012.

The Project Document does not contain the project's timetable, which makes evaluation of timeliness of delivery of project outputs difficult. Chapter 4 of the PD (Total Budget and Workplan) is presenting the budget only. There is an annual breakdown of major budget items, but that should not be considered as a substitute for the fully-fledgedworkplan and timetable. The Inception Report contains the annual workplan for the year 2012. Having in mind the long mobilization period of the project, it can be concluded, even within the limits stated above, that the project's implementation is facing serious delays.

The following sections look at achievement of outcomes through realisation of outputs and activities during the less than 2 years of actual implementation of this 3-year project. The PD lists 3 outcomes, and 11 outputs. Each output is systematically broken down into a certain number of activities. It is relatively easy to follow the logic of implementation of each output, and establish how the activities lead to delivery of each output of the project.

During the Inception Phase, and as presented in the Inception Report, there were no changes in the list of outcomes and outputs. The titles of outcomes and outputs remained unchanged, except for Output 1.1, where the text "and technologies (infrastructure and environment)" was added. However, in the Inception Report, the additional Indicators, and Targets End of Project were added for outputs 1.1. to2.2. (6 in total), and Capacity Needs for all 11 outputs. While the Indicators and End of Project Targets may be a welcome addition to the Revised Project Results Framework, it is not clear why that exercise was not carried out for the remaining 5 outputs.

3.1.2.1. Outputs and progress toward outcomes

*Outcome 1: Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses*

According to the Project Document and the Inception Report, the Outcome 1 has fouroutputs (1.1. Inventory of adaptive and maladaptive practices and technologies (infrastructure and environment) on island resorts and safari boat operations in Maldives; 1.2.Policy recommendations developed to enable and incentivize private sector investment for climate change adaptation in the tourism industry; 1.3.Addendum to national building codes on the physical planning and construction of infrastructure in tourist resorts is developed and disseminated to all tourism operators; and 1.4. Technical guidance provided to all tourism operators on how to climate-proof sensitive resource management systems and infrastructure (freshwater management; solid waste and wastewater management; physical and energy infrastructure), which are implemented through a total of 25 activities. The indicators and targets for the Outcome 1 have not been changed during the Inception Phase but, as noted earlier, in the Inception Report the indicators and targets were added for each output of the Outcome 1, which has not been done in the Project Results Framework contained in the PD.

Under theOutput 1.1.,two studies were commissioned: "Baseline Analysis ofAdaptation Capacity andClimate ChangeVulnerability Impacts in theTourism Sector" and "Report onVulnerability of Tourism Products and Associated Management Practices" (not mentioned in the PD, but added during the Inception Phase). The first study (Baseline Analysis)mentions examples of adaptive techniques used by resorts and communitiesand the lack of adaptive techniques, but there is no mention of maladaptive practices, which is the main target of this output. However, aside of that,the study is of good technical quality as it covers wide scope of issues. Its analysis of awareness in resorts and communities of climate change and its impacts is very useful.

The second study (colloquially called"Economic Valuation of Climate Risk Report")isjust a little more than the compilation of web researched documents and is not of good technical quality. It failed to give more concrete information on the valuation of climate risk in Maldives, and developed only a fairly general base for the Benefits and Cost Analysis. The contract was cancelled and new consultant was found. The work on the new report will start in January 2014.The scope and output of this study are potentially of great value and should be considered as a very important analytical contribution to the products that the project aims to deliver.However, having in mind the challenges this study is confronted with, it has been relatively difficult to find an adequate expert to prepare it. The outcomes of the study are also very important, as they may allow the project to engage with the tourism industry and put on the table a solid understanding of anticipated impacts of climate change on the tourism sector and the proposal for urgent actions. The study could also be used as an important advocacy tool by indicating the financial benefits of actions taken by the tourist sector to adapt to climate change. Good quality study of this scope is equally important for the government to act with greater confidence upon certain necessary control and regulatory measures.

Activities in preparation of Output 1.2.mainly revolved around the study "Gaps and Disincentives that Exist in the Policies, Laws and Regulations which Act as Barriers to Investing in Climate Change Adaptation in the Tourism Sector of the Maldives". The study has been finalised, and the Validation Workshop was held on 11 December 2013 in Male. The study provides an extensive analysis of policies, laws and regulations and barriers to their effective implementation. The study also proposes recommendations on adaptation to beach erosion and inundation, impacts on coral reefs and marine life, and extreme weather events. It is expected that in 2014 these recommendations will be implemented within the Maldives Tourism Policy, which is now being reviewed. Once the recommendations will be reviewed the consultant will prioritizethe areas for action (in final report of the study) and the recommendations will be validated again and then placed forward to policy-making bodies. It can be concluded that this output has been prepared in a satisfactory manner and, roughly, within the planned timeframe.

Activities to prepare the Output 1.3.aim at developing an Addendum to National Building Code (NBC)on the climate resilient physical planning and construction of infrastructure in tourist resorts. The following documents were produced: Green Code (Green Building Code), Guideline to Compliance Document, Tourism Planning Code, Infrastructure/Construction Code, and finally the Addendum to national Building Code. The preparation of these documents is largely completed. However, there is an issue with the Tourism Planning Code, as it has to be revised to fit in the standard format. The Addendum to National Building Code will also have to be made more concrete with regards to engineering details. It can be concluded that the progress of this output, at least the preparation of the documentation, has followed a steady course. The code will be discussed within government and tourism operators in 2014.

The activities related to Output 1.4.have been revised during the Inception Phase, and changes integrated in the Inception Report. While the name of the output has remained the same (focus on preparation of "technical guidance"), the final output - the "technical guidance", has been replaced with the "handbook". However, in the 2014 Annual Work Plan, the "technical guidance" is again the output to be produced, and the "handbook" has been dropped. This is a wise decision, as the preparation of a handbook is a complex task, and the time and resources available to produce and disseminate it are scarce. Two reports on climate-proof practices have been prepared: on solid waste management and on freshwater and wastewater management. Reports greatly vary in terms of overall structure, level of detail and width of scope. The Solid Waste Report seems to be more profound, but both reports are lacking more concrete recommendations. The remaining four activities under this output(participatory review, site visits, and dissemination of the guidelines physically and online via MT website and MTAP) should be tackled very soon by the PMU, so that they could be completed in 2014.

The overall objective of Outcome 1 is to strengthen the adaptive capacity of tourism sector to reduce climate change induced risks through analyzing critical issues such as respective codes, laws and regulations, practices and assessment of the economic impacts of climate change and related actions to adapt to it. The planned outputs and activities are forming a coherent whole, since the scope of all the activities is relevant for the achievement of the project's goal. The rate of progress of the activities undertaken so far has been mixed. The technical quality of the reports has not always been at the same level, even within the same output (for example, the solid waste and water reports under output 1.4.), while the activity on economic valuation is still to produce expected results. However, what is still missing is implementation of the coordinated activity to review, summarize and disseminate the results. Until this is being done, it wouldn't be known whether the expanded knowledge base has contributed to the creation of an enabling environment for increasing resilience of the tourism sector.

*Outcome 2: Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change*

According to the Project Document and the Inception Report, the Outcome 2 has four outputs (2.1. National tourism adaptation platform created to establish and support effective public-private partnerships for climate change adaptation in the tourism sector; 2.2.Development and implementation of at least 10 new investment projects on climate-proofing water supply/storage/distribution, solid waste management, wastewater management, energy management, and/or new physical infrastructure in island resort and/or safari boat operations; 2.3. Development of at least 10 new investment partnerships between island resorts and tourism-associated communities, which result in joint climate risk management activities; and 2.4.South-South transfer of tourism adaptation case studies between Maldives and other SIDS), which are implemented through a total of 16 activities. The indicators and targets of Outcome 2 have not been changed during the Inception Phase. Judging by the grant allocation, this outcome seems to be the most important one because more than 57% of the total grant has been allocated for its implementation. Essentially, two major outputs are envisaged within this component of the project: Maldives Tourism Adaptation Platform (MTAP), and 20 (10 plus 10) demonstration projects in tourism resorts and associated island communities. Unfortunately, not an adequate progress has been made towards finalisation of both outputs.

Activities leading to realization of Output 2.1.aim at developing MTAP. The implementation of this activity has been largely delayed. Until now, the study “Consultancy to design and establish a National Tourism Adaptation Platform (MTAP) to support effective public-private partnerships for climate change adaptation in the Maldives tourism sector” has been prepared. The main finding of the study is that the support for MTAP has been enthusiastic. That has also been impression of the evaluator. MTAP is supposed to be one of the central elements of the project andthe critical driver for project’s deliverance. The study has been commissioned well into 2013 and the final report was delivered in December 2013, more than year and a half after the implementation of the project has started. The study doesn’t provide clear definition of the platform, and gives only an indication what it should be (virtual community network, communities of practice and knowledge sharing), but no further refinement of the idea of platform in the Maldivian context is given. Therefore, at the end of the day, the study leaves many open ends, and it remains unclear whether MTAP is a community of stakeholders, a web platform with a certain structure, a communications platform, or something else. The only tangible result of this output until now, besides the study, is the Facebook profile, which is managed in a relatively haphazard and an ad-hoc manner. However, the MTAP has been taken seriously by the PMU, and the special MTAP Committee has been established (one meeting has been held until now), and the communications officer has been hired.

Most of the known examples of the “platforms” are international in scope. Only a few of themare specifically related to the climate change adaptation, or are national in scope. Related to the former, one could be advised to visit the European Climate Adaptation Platform (CLIMATE-ADAPT Project), while for the former National Resources Canada: Adaptation Platform could be a good example to visit. However, none of those two is fully comparable to the Maldivian situation but some guidelines on how to run the MTAP in the future could be drawn. One good example, albeit still in the making and not specifically related to climate change adaptation, is the ICZM Governance platform of the EU Pegaso Project ([www.pegasoproject.eu](http://www.pegasoproject.eu)). The ICZM Platform consists of three parts: Pilot projects, comparable to demo projects In TAP; the Knowledge part, composed of tools and other products similar to those produced within Outcomes 1 and 3 in TAP; and the Governance part. The “heart” of the Pegaso Platform, though, is the linkages between these three parts. The description of the platform in the MTAP study, referred to in the previous paragraph,generically does not differ too much from the aboveICZM “platform”, but the MTAP study has remained somewhat short in presenting the MTAP structure in a succinct and clear manner. For successful management of the MTAP, it must be understood that the platform is a tool anda network. The former gives it substance, while the latter secures its long-term sustainability. While the prime function of MTAP is to serve the purpose of the project during its “lifetime”, it is advised to examine the possibility ofits continuationafter TAP will be closed. In the case of its continuation an appropriate institutional arrangement will need to be found. The institutional arrangement may include embedding the MTAP within a government institution, a tourism sector association, another civil society association, specialized expert or tourism industry network, or a special inter-agency body. The cost of running the MTAP does not have to be necessarily prohibitive, as we are talking about hosting the web site/portal and an administrator who will manage the platform only (probably on a part-time basis). It is important to stress that the possibility of MTAP's continuation could attract the content providers such as tourism industry, communities, professionals, government and other who will create the platform’s network to embrace the idea. To conclude, the decision on the future of MTAP should be taken by, and will have to be a commitment of the beneficiary country subjects only, and not the UNDP CO.

While the PD doesn’t mention the issue of communications at all (one of its major shortcomings), the MTAP study has developed an elementary communications strategy. It is dealing with this issue as part of MTAP, which it certainly should be the case, because the platform is supposed to be an important communications tool. However, the communications strategy of the project as a whole, and which should be reaching beyond MTAP, still has to be developed. One good initiative with respect to communications is the June 2013 workshop, which, as was indicated several times during the consultant’s interviews, made a major pushtowards raising public awareness of the project. In addition to the above, and not as part of the workprogramme, several other communications initiatives have taken place. First, the communications officer has been hired, although this position was not envisaged either in the PD or in the Inception Report. Second, the TAP documentary video on water and wastewater was produced, while another one on TAP findings will be produced soon. And finally, the design of the logo for the project has been commissioned after a public call for applications. The logo selected and the accompanying design is of a very good quality and will certainly help increase the visibility of the project.

Large section of the abovementioned MTAP study is related to the Small Grants Programme (SGP), but it doesn’t clearly link it to the Outputs 2.2. and 2.3., i.e. the demo projects. However, assuming that SGP is related to the demo projects, it has to be concluded that the ideas expressed in that section of the study could be well utilized for the implementation of the Outputs 2.2. and 2.3.

Verymodest progress has been made towards the implementation of the Outputs 2.2. and 2.3., i.e. 20 projects in tourism resorts and island communities (10 in each).These are the demonstration projects that are aimed at showing in a practical and tangible way in which the vulnerability to effects of climate change of tourism resorts and tourism dependent communities could be reduced and their resilience increased. The time needed for their implementation is at least 12 months, and in case no extension would be granted there is no possibility that these projects could be fully implemented. Taking in consideration the fact that no methodology of their implementation has yet been developed, except in the SGP section of the MTAP study (which may be considered as a good starting point only), the further delay could jeopardize the entire project. The Inception Report mentions some suggestions given during the stakeholder consultation workshop held in May 2008 (before the project started!), which may be considered as a good start as well. However, given the importanceof this activity for the entire project, and the current serious delay in its implementation, the PMU should take the implementation of the demo projects as an absolute priority.

The first task would be the definition of criteria for selection of the projects. The MTAP study gives enough breadth to define these criteria. However, while the MTAP study's proposals are mostly led by urgent priorities, it is important that a longer-term view is constantly being kept in perspective. Thus, one of the criteria for the project selection could be the contribution to better solid waste management. While the selected project will not directly contribute to adaptation to climate change, better collection and disposal of solid waste will certainly improve the availability of good quality groundwater. That, in turn,will certainly producean added beneficial effect if these water resources will be endangered in the future by the saltwater intrusion. In another example, if a certain project will propose improved water use practice in tourist resorts and island communities, that will certainly result in more rational use of water and, consequently, in a lesser need to build desalination plants, whose negative environmental consequences and use of energy are not negligible.

After the project selection criteria will be defined, the call for proposals will have to be issued. Two options may be possible here. First, of course, is the direct call when those proposing the projects are expected to submit relatively well-developed project proposals. In this case, there is a risk that not enough good proposals will be submitted, as for 20 projects at least 40 to 60 proposals will be needed. It is questionable whether there is a capacity in Maldives to prepare such a large number of good quality proposals. The second option may be a two-step process. First, the call should indicate the subject areas which proposals are expected to cover, and the proposals will have to come up with the idea what they intend to do and which is the subject area they intend to cover (eventually, it could be done by filling a simple form based on one given in the MTAP study). Slightly more than 20 proposals are selected and thendeveloped in more detail. This could, eventually, be done with the support of the ministries that are participating in the project (depending on the subject area a certain proposal is covering). Once the proposals are submitted, the final selection is being made. The second option may take a bit longer to implement and may require an extra effort from the implementing partners, but will certainly result in much less uncertainty regarding the final outcome of the activity. Also, working closely with the resorts and communities will certainly increase their appreciation of the project. MTAP should be considered as the main tool to assist the projects’ developmentand implementation. Finally, during the implementation of the demo projects, the respective ministries/project partners should be more actively involved in assisting and monitoring their implementation. Their participation should go beyond reviewing projects as members of the TC.

The preparation of the Output 2.4.is closely linked to the finalisation of the Outputs 2.2. and 2.3., but also of the Output 2.1. It is envisaged that demo projects, once they will be completed, will form the body of experience from which the case studies will be selected and lessons learned summarized for dissemination to other SIDS facing similar problems as Maldives. MTAP is considered to be the major communications tool. Its Facebook page has already being used to disseminate good practices developed elsewhere.

*Outcome 3: Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism operators*

According to the Project Document and the Inception Report, the Outcome 3 has three outputs (3.1. Training of tourism operators and government representatives on climate risk financing options and their potential application in the Maldivian context; 3.2.Feasibility study on micro-insurance for tourism-associated communities to buffer climate-related shocks from extreme events; and 3.3. Feasibility study on index-based insurance and risk pooling options to address risk transfer priorities of the Maldivian government), which are implemented through 15 activities. This component of the project is considered as the most innovative one. During the Inception Phase the indicators and targets for this outcome have not changed.

Preparation of the study"Introduction of Financial Instruments to Cover and Transfer the Risks of Climate Hazards in the Sector of Tourism for the Maldives"is an activity of Output 3.2. It was commissioned in March 2013 and submitted in August 2013. The objective of the study was to shed more light on the financial instrumentsto deal with the climate risk exposure that could be applied in Maldives. The interest of the project's benefactor in pursuing this initiative is clear. Tourism is predominant sector of the Maldives economy (between 60 and 75% of GDP, depending on the source). If income expectations fail, either from short-term weather event/climate variability or a long-term climate change, the whole economy of the country may run into trouble. Creating, thus, an appropriate insurance scheme,could be beneficial. However, the results and recommendations of the study are not that straightforward. It stresses that insurance and financial instruments cannot address the entireclimate andnatural hazard risks of the Maldives, and insurance are not appropriate or generallyfeasible for slowly developing and foreseeable events, or events that happen with a highlikelihood under the different climate change scenarios. The study proposes a combination ofmore than one financial instrument, as different instruments are most appropriate for differentlevels of risk faced. More concretely, the most appropriate tools to address the tourism sector needs in the case of the Maldives are indexbasedinsurance tools in the short term and, in the long term, a catastrophe pool involving institutionsor governments outside of the Maldives is likely to be more efficient. The study proposed the procedure to select demo areas to develop these instruments in more detail. To conclude, the study seems to be judged as rather short of expectations, as it couldn't identify a scheme acceptable to all. However, in spite of that, the study could be considered as a good starting point for subsequent activities leading to the preparation of theOutput 3.3. , the implementation of which has not started yet.

The above activity still has to be completed (this is planned in the 2014 Workplan, delivered to the evaluator after his mission to Maldives). In order to achieve the acceptable quality of the output, the consultations with relevant stakeholders have to be carried out in a more proactive manner. The way the study is being prepared now seems to be not too attractive for the stakeholders, either because its proposals are too sophisticated for the Maldives context or because it lacks adequate numerical/monetary indicators. Further activities should be focused on developing proposals that are more appropriate for local situation and tested in local projects. Specific issue is how to attract the tourism resorts and tourism dependent communitiesto participate in the risk insurance schemes. In this respect, it would certainly help if concrete monetary indicators and valuation of benefits will be developed. The scope of the activity could also be expanded by exploring the feasibility of implementation of other instruments, such as voluntary and/or involuntary fees. Experience elsewhere shows that, even when amounts proposed are small (1 dollar or 1 euro), there is always a certain resistance against, both voluntary and involuntary, fees. However, if such an analysis will be made, in addition to an estimate of the monetary value/benefit gained when such measure is implemented, the utilization of resources thus collected should also be shown.

3.1.2.2. Attainment of the overall objective of the project

The overall TAP objective, "to increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regret adaptation measures", is not easy to evaluate at this stage of the project's implementation. Even if the project is now clocking the second year of implementation, it was largely delayed and none of the three indicators (number of policies, strategies and plans; number of operators investing in concrete initiatives; and number of tourism associated communities reducing their vulnerability to climate change) could be utilised to show if there was a significant advance.

The attainment of the Outcome 1's objective (strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses) has made a relatively good progress, in spite of the difficulties and barriers to the project's implementation, particularly the political instability in the Maldives. Basic studies have been made, albeit with varying level of quality, but the real legal, regulatory and institutional changes within the tourism sector are still waiting to happen, in particular the adoption of the Addendum to the National Building Code.

Objective of the Outcome 2 (reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change) focuses on the implementation of MTAP and demo projects. While MTAP is in early stage of its development (only the Facebook profile created, and a MTAP Committee established), the implementation of the demo projects has practically not started yet. The progress is significantly lagging behind the schedule.

The attainment of the Outcome 3's objective (Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions), while being the most innovative, is still uncertain, as the documents prepared so far do not show yet the clear path to follow.

As the TAP's objectives have not yet been fully attained, and the project is experiencing serious delays, it is very difficult to establish at this stage whether it has produced beneficial development effects. In economic terms, it is certainly impossible to state that it has. But, in terms of stakeholder's engagement, it has produced some beneficial results, as the project is very well known among many stakeholder groups, and all of them fully support the project. However, in spite of that, it would be necessary to improve the outreach of the project. In that respect, implementation of the communications component of the project, in order to mobilise as many stakeholders as possible, would greatly help.

3.1.2.3. Potential adverse environmental and social impacts

No adverse environmental and social impacts have yet been observed. However, the potential adverse effects of the planned demo projects should be avoided. One of the criteria for the projects’ selection should certainly be the minimisation of such impacts. Thus, for example, projects aimed at adapting to sea level rise should avoid, or plan to a minimum, the coastal defence engineering works that might cause undesired effects such as coastal erosion. Similarly, any proposal related to the solid waste managementproblems should be planned in order to prevent pollution of groundwater resources. The same caution should be applied to any “no-regret” measure eventually to be implemented. In this respect, the MTAPshould play an important role by continuous dissemination of good environmental practices elsewhere that could be used as a source of inspiration for the proponents of demo projects.

3.1.2.4. Stakeholders' involvement

The PD states that "…in the initial stages of project formulation, two well attended stakeholder workshops were held along with individual or small group consultations before and after both workshops", and that stakeholders have made many contributions to the preparation of the PD.It contains the section "Stakeholders Baseline Analysis", but it is essentially only the list of major stakeholders (ministries and associations) with a description of their scope of work. No proper stakeholders analysis has been made during the PD preparation phase. The PD also doesn't contain the stakeholders' involvement plan, but states that it shall be prepared during the Inception Phase of the project. As stated above, Inception Report contains the satisfactory version of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan. During the preparation of the Baseline Analysis report an extensive survey among representatives of tourism resorts and tourism dependent island communities was carried out. Its scope is wide and findings quite relevant, in particular with regards to the analysis of their awareness on the climate change issues. Even if it could not be considered as a substitute for the stakeholders’ analysis, the survey created a solid bases for the subsequent stakeholders engagement as well as their awareness of the project’s objectives and expected benefits.

During the hitherto implementation of the projectthree workshops have been organised: Inception workshop (March 2012); Stakeholder Workshop (June 2013); and Validation Workshop (December 2013). There has been a gap of 15 months between the first two workshops. The involvement of stakeholders is critical for the success of a project of this size and duration. While workshops should not be considered as the sole instance of stakeholder involvement, they are important because they offer a unique opportunity for the PMU to present the progress of its work, and for the stakeholders to exchange their views and to get them identified with the project.The workshops have been usually held over half a day or one day maximum. It is clear that the logistical situation in Maldives is specific and that it has been reflected in the way the workshops were organised, but one should think that on important occasions workshops may last more than one day. Workshops and similar gatherings may, ultimately, be an opportunity to create a longer lasting network that can carry on the TAP after its closure.

The MT is the TAP ImplementingPartner but other ministries are very important as well, because they were either involved in the preparation of the project,are involved in its implementation or will be involved in the post-project phase. It is true that relevant ministries are members of the PB and TC, but their members do not always attend the meetings. In addition, these bodies' membershave been changed often, which hasaffected the "institutional" memory of the project. It is the impression of the evaluator that other than participating in the project meetings (TC and PB) and workshops, these stakeholders are not participating very much in the implementation of the project. As stated earlier, their role might be more pronounced in the preparation, selection and implementation of the demo projects.

The involvement of the tourism industry has been relatively modest so far. MATI, LAM and Divers Association are members of the TC, and the Divers Association is even chairing the MTAP Committee. On the other hand, MATI (perhaps the most influential of the tourism sector associations) has been absent on many occasions. The evaluator was not able to meet MATI representative during his mission even if an appointment was fixed. The impression the evaluator got is that, in general, tourism operators are not that fully acquainted with the project and, therefore, show certain reservation towards it. It is obvious that the PMU has not fully succeeded to reach out to them and involve them in the project's implementation as much as it has been needed. Workshops and similar gatherings may be an opportunity, *inter alia*, to engage the private sector, in particular the tourism industry. As stated earlier, the planned demo projects may be another opportunity to bring more strongly the private sector, in particular the low to mid-end resorts, in the project.

In addition to the above, the stakeholders participate in the MTAP Committee. Since it was established only recently, only one meeting was held (September 2013), and it is too early to evaluate its performance.

The evaluator concludes that the project is still relevant in view of its national importance and consistency with the national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change.The evaluator rates the overall Project Design as **moderately satisfactory (MS)**.While the conceptual approach to the issue is fundamentally correct, the approach to the implementation of the MTAP and demo projectshas not been developed enough. There is no communications strategy developed, while the issues of stakeholder involvement and replication are only marginally dealt with. The evaluation has found that, overall, certain progress has been made towards attainment of the TAP objectives. However, having in mind that the project is exhibiting serious delay in the implementation of all three components, and in particular the Outcome 2, the overall project's Progress towards Resultsis rated as**moderatelyunsatisfactory (MU)**.

**3.2. Adaptive Management**

3.2.1. Work planning

The Project Document serves as the basis for the initial work planning. In addition to the detailed account of outcomes, outputs, activities and deliverables, it should also have a generic timetable where the project is divided in the years of implementation with a clear indication when each of the above is supposed to be taking place, which are the milestones of the project and when deliverables are expected. The PD is very scant on all of the above, except on the account of outcomes, outputs and activities. There is no list of deliverables, and the overall workplan and timetable are missing. That certainly made preparation of annual workplans, which is the task of the PMU, and their approval by the PB very difficult.

The 2012 Workplan was prepared during the Inception Phase and adopted at the Inception Workshop. It is combined with the 2012 budget. The table is illustrative and easy to follow. However, because of the delay in the actual start of the implementation of the project, the 2012workplan practically covers only the second half of 2012. The Inception Report also contains the table with key milestones for 2012. The 2012 Workplan and Key Milestones for 2012 table are results based and clearly annotate what results will be produced until the end of the respective year.

At the PMU meeting on 17 October 2012, the project management held preliminary discussions on the 2013 workplan. No details of the workplan were mentioned in the minutes of the meeting except concern over the elections and resulting political situation in 2013. Subsequently, the 2013 workplan was approved in early 2013, reasonably on time. It follows the same format as the 2012 workplan and it indicates quarters of the year when certain activity/deliverable has to be completed/delivered. The workplan for 2014 should have been prepared before the end of 2013. It was not yet readyduring the evaluator's visit to Maldives in early December, but it was delivered to the evaluator soon after the mission was completed.

The Project Results Framework has undergone minimal changes during the Inception Phase. The outcomes have remained unchanged and only Output 1.1. had some additions (explained above). The specific indicators for verification were added for outputs in Outcomes 1 and 2 (not for Outcome 3), but that has not changed the course of activities whatsoever. With regards to the substance, there is no need to make changes in the Framework. This implies that the implementation of the 20 demonstration projects, as the most critical component of the project, will be carried out as planned, albeit with a delayed start. This would be possible only under certain assumptions. The first assumption is that the implementation of the demonstration projects will have to start in the near future. To do that, the finalisation of the project selection criteria has to be finished by mid February 2014 at the latest; the end of the application process should be planned for mid March 2014; and selection and contracting should be done by end April 2014.If concrete implementation will start in early May 2014, and if it will take 6 to 9 months to complete the projects, then the soonest the whole exercise could be closed is the end of the first quarter of 2015. The second assumption is that at least one-yearextension of the project has to be granted, meaning that the project will end in June 2015. This will, then, allow relatively smooth completion of the demo projects. In addition to these two assumptions, the strengthening of the PMU's capacity should be considered to secure effective and permanent monitoring of the implementation of demo projects.

3.2.2. Finance and co-finance

The project's financial planning and management has been carried out according to the UNDP rules. The total amount allocated for the project (grant and co-financing) is US$3,300,876. The GEF (LDCF) grant amounts to US$1,650,438, while US$1,650,438 of the co-financingis expected to be providedjointly by the Government of Maldives (US$1,630,438) and UNDP (US$20,000). The GoM co-financing is split between MEE (US$997,148), MT (US$543,690) and Ministry of Finance's DNP (US$89,600), and it is all contribution in kind. The resulting ratio between grant and co-financing is 1:1. During the Inception Phase no changes to the overall budget as well as to the annual budget allocations were made.

The critical point of the project financing lays in the Outcome 2 of the project (on-the-ground measures, i.e. demo projects), with US$944,043 allocated for the purpose (around 57% of the total grant). Considering that implementation of the demoprojects has not practically started yet, the risk of financial non-performance remains reasonably high.

The project management arrangement, in particular with the PMU being located at MT premises, is cost-effective, because it allows Project Manager and its staff to use all the organizational, technical and other facilities of the Ministry.

General distribution of funds (grant and co-financing) is given in Chapter 4 of the PD (page 41). The distribution of funds for each component/outcome of the project, using the standard budget lines and divided per project year, is providedin the mentioned table.In the table, there is a description of the specific use for each budget line. This is being done in a rather unconventional and not very transparent manner, and a lot of crosschecking needs to be done when someone wants to find where the funds are actually going to be spent. The overview of theco-financing is also not very transparent. The total amounts are given per budget/project year, but they are not broken down to specific components and, thus, it is not practically clear on which activities exactly the co-financing will be spent.

The actual annual expenditures show discrepancy with the budget presented in the PD. Overall, for the period 2012-2013, the originally planned budgetaccording to PD was US$979,750 (59.3% of the total grant). The approved budgets for 2012 (found in the Inception Report) and 2013, signed on 18 February 2013, had a combined value of US$732,257.10 (US$212,094.00 and US$520,163.10 respectively) to be charged to LDCF. The budget for 2013 was then revised to US$341,693.26, making the comparable total of US$554,787.26 to be charged to LDCF. However, during that period, only US$263,007.93 (15.93% of the initially planned expenditure for that period, or 47.41% of the latest revised figure) was actually spent. It is clear that the major reason why the expenditure was not realised according to plans was the fact that the implementation of the demo projects, which were supposed to consume large portion of the grant, has not taken place as planned. The reasons for the delay in implementation of the demo projects have been explained earlier. This means that without an extension being granted, duringthe remaining year of the project’s implementation the remaining amount of theLDCFgrant will have to be spent (up to 84% of unspent funds for 2012-2013 plus the remaining amount for the last year of the project’s implementation).This is absolutely not realistic. There is one encouraging sign, though, and that is that the rate of expenditure in 2013 has increased by almost 50% compared to 2012 (see the last column in the table below). It should be mentioned here that, in addition to that, if the demo projects implementation will be successful as proposed above, then the actual expenditure rate could significantly improve in 2014.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Planned expenditure in the PD | % total | Actual expenditure | % total | Ratio planned/ actually spent |
| 1 | 300,750.00 | 18.2 | (2012) 61,264.19 | 3.71 | 0.20 |
| 2 | 679,000.00 | 41.1 | (2013) 201,743.74 | 12.22 | 0.30 |
|  | 979,750.00 | 59.3 | 263,007.93 | 15.93 |  |

However, the annual budgetary planning is not fully clear. The annual distribution of grant funds as indicated in the PD is as follows:

* year 1: US$ 300,750
* year 2: US$ 679,000
* year 3: US$ 670,688

Knowing that the project has experienced a significant delay, it is obvious that the above distribution of funds is not sustainable and that it could not be strictly followed. However, since that fact was known already in early 2012, it is not clear why the overall budget revision has not been done during the Inception Phase.

The budget for 2012, adopted at the Inception Workshop, had a planned expenditure of US$ 212,094 (71% of the figure in PD, out of which only US$61,264.19 was spent, i.e. 29% of the figure adopted at the Inception Workshop, or 20% of the amount for the year 1 as indicated in the PD). The budget for 2013, as presented earlier, was revised to US$341,693.26 to be charged to LDCF (50% of the amount planned in the PD). As of mid December 2013, the total amount spent during 2013 was US$ 201,743.74, which is only about 60% of the revised figure.

The PIR indicates that until June 2013 no co-financing was provided. However, it is obvious that this statement needs to be changed because the country is delivering its co-funding. It should be mentioned that, *inter alia*, the PMU is located in the premises of MT, that PMU is using some of MT's services, and that large number of stakeholders has participated in the project's workshops and other meetings. The problem is that co-financing has not been timely reported because no template has been developed to calculate it. After the evaluator's mission to Maldives the co-financing table was submitted (see Annex 6). It shows that US$665,246.10 was provided until the end of 2013 (roughly, 40% of the total co-financing). It would be useful, however, if in the future reports the co-financing will be broken down into more details to show on which concrete activities of the project it has been spent. The PMU should help major providers of the co-financing by developing a practical template for this purpose.

As the project is being nationally executed, the attention of the evaluator was often brought to the fact that the procurement of goods and services nationally provided has to follow the national regulation, which is quite inflexible. The problem seems to be made worse by the lack of trust of the service providers in the government capacity to execute payments on time (even if project is financed by GEF grant, all payments have to go through government financial channels). Even if that is true, this fact has, until now, only marginally affected the implementation of the project and the rate of expenditure, because majority of hitherto payments was executed through UNDP CO (mainly for international consultants’ fees and their travel). It has to be kept in mind, however, thatin the absence of practical procurement solution, the implementation of the demo projects maybe affected.

3.2.3. Monitoring systems

Project Monitoring and Evaluation component is planned to be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The Project Results Framework provides clear indicators to monitor and measure the effectiveness of project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification, which form the basis upon which the project's Monitoring and Evaluation system is built. In addition to the current independent Mid-Term Evaluation, which is undertaken at the end of the second year of implementation, an independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting.

The M&E plan envisages, as elaborated in the PD, a reporting schedule consisting of periodic monitoring, quarterly reporting, and annual monitoring. Project Monitoring Reporting will take place at regular intervals throughout the project's implementation. The Inception Report was prepared after the Project Inception Workshop (held 5 months after signing of the PD, and not two months as envisaged in the PD). The Inception Workshop adopted the first Annual Workplan, as well as slightly revised Project Results Framework (logframe). The revised framework introduced additional indicators to monitor the preparation of the project's outputs. The Inception Report also contains the Key Milestones table for 2012, which includes 2 Project Board meetings, 12 Technical Committee meetings, 6 consultancies involving international and local experts, and 11 deliverables including reports and reviews. Most of these products were actually delivered. Finally, the Inception Report gives more elaborate monitoring structure than the PD. It consists of: day-to-day monitoring, periodic monitoring, annual monitoring, PIR, and terminal monitoring.

The day-to-day monitoring is being executed by the PM, who is also in frequent contact with the UNDP CO. Periodic monitoring reports have not been produced until now, but the UNDP CO, PM and stakeholders seem to be meeting on a periodic basis. Annual monitoring is being conducted through PB meetings. The PB and TC meeting reports should be available at the project's web site.

The projects' web site practically doesn't exist. There is one page on the MT web site, which is not easily accessible, and no indication ofTAP is provided on the MT’s home page. The TAP page is very poor and it is not even closely utilised to its full potential. The documents (some could not even be opened!) are placed on the page in a haphazard manner and very difficult to follow. The web site should be considered as an important monitoring tool, because of the stakeholders (future owners of the project's results) who should be in a position to know about it, access and navigate it easily, and always find up-to-date information.

The project's concept transposed into Project Results Framework (PRF) shows that SMART indicators (i.e. the indicators that are **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**elevant, and **T**ime-bound) were proposed to measure the progress of implementation of the outcomes. The project's results framework includes nine indicators at the project overall objective/outcome level. Most of them (eight) are process indicators (addressing capacity building, legal and planning measures, institutional strengthening, investments, and knowledge generation) and only one isa stress reduction or impact indicator that signal reduced vulnerability to climate risks (Outcome 2). Most of the indicators/outputs are clear products whose finality, i.e. timeliness, could be easily established. The PRF and the indicators contained in it, including the milestones as proposed in the Inception Report, have been used while performing the Project Implementation Review (PIR) in 2013.

The project monitoring and evaluation budget is considered to be satisfactory, since adequate financing has been provided for its implementation.

3.2.4. Risk management

The risks identified in the PD and in the Inception Report were adequately assessed at the time of the preparation of these documents. A revision of risks has been proposed in section 3.1.1.1.

3.2.5. Reporting

The PIR was prepared in mid 2013, which is according to the reporting schedule. The project was rated as Moderately Satisfactory for progress in reaching its development objectives, and Moderately Unsatisfactory for the implementation progress. The descriptive remarks related to the ratings given by the Project Manager, UNDP CO Programme Officer, and UNDP RTA are elaborate and adequately explain the situation. The PIR schedule is according to the monitoring plan.

No evidence was found of the adaptive management changes being reported to the PB. Although existing, no report of the PB meetings is available on the web site of the project.

Financial reporting is following UNDP rules. The CDRs are regularly updated by the UNDP CO. The titles of the budget lines in the CDR are very generic, but they are explained in a more detailed transaction report, which is available at the UNDP. However, it would be useful if in the CDR, for example, the title of the report to which a certainexpenditure is related will begiven.

The meeting reports are not always prepared fully up to the standards. The Inception Workshop Report doesn't contain the conclusions and recommendations, while the list of participants is not fully legible. The Inception Report, while substantial in its contents, doesn't have the table of contentsand the pages are not numbered, which makes it very difficult to follow. As stated earlier, the PMU meetings, Technical Committee meetings, Project Board meetings and MTAP Committee meeting reports and records mostly exist.All the reports should have conclusions and recommendations clearly presented, as that is a very efficient means of monitoring implementation of the meeting decisions. The PMU should explore the possibility of placing the most important meeting reports on the web site.

The evaluator concludes that the Adaptive Managementaspect of the project is **moderately satisfactory (MS)**. There are no major shortcomings perceived, but there are areas that need improvement, such as work planning,financial planningand reporting, which should be made more transparent and accessible.

**3.3. Management Arrangements**

3.3.1. Overall project management

The TAP PD stipulates that it will be implemented by UNDP and executed following established UNDP national execution procedures. The PMU is located at MT, which is offering full logistical support to the project, as part of its co-financing commitment to the project. Most of the project staff envisaged by the PD has been appointed: the National Project Director, responsible for overall implementation of the project; the National Project Manager, responsible for the successful implementation of project activities and the achievement of planned project outputs; and the Project Management Unit (PMU), responsible for the day-to-day implementation and management of the project. The PMU operates under the overall guidance of the Project Board (composed of the MT, MEE, MATI, MF, NDMC, DoM, and UNDP), which is responsible for steering its activities and strategic decision-making. Thus, the PD stipulates that the PMU will be composed of a full time PM, Senior Technical Officer, and an administrative and financial assistant. The PD proposed the composition of the Project Board. PD also elaborates in reasonable detail the TORs for the key project staff.

The responsibilities and reporting lines seem to be clear. The PD explains in reasonable detail what are the responsibilities of each project entity and management. No deficiencies were observed. The decision-making seems to be transparent. All major decisions are brought, first, to the Project Management meeting, discussed by the Technical Committee and approved by the Project Board.

During the Inception Phase, several changes were brought to the overall project management arrangement. The composition of the project staff was changed, and the post of Senior Technical Officer was abolished, with part of duties being taken over by the Project Manager. Also, the Technical Committeeis undertaking some of the tasks originally envisaged for the Senior Technical Officer, in particular the closer scrutiny of the technical reports. It may be concluded that for most of the technical review tasks the TC has the capacity, but some go beyond the level of their technical expertise, such as review of the valuation of climate impacts, or insurance schemes. It would be helpful if some outside expertise could be hired to undertake peer review of these specific studies.

There have been significant changes in the composition of the PMU recently. The National Project Manager left the PMU in August 2013 and in November 2013 the new PM was hired. Fortunately, the new PM is the former NPD, who has closely followed the hitherto implementation of the project, and the transition was relatively smooth even if the project was without the manager for several months. The new PM seems to be capable and committed to his work. After the former NPD became the new NPM, the Permanent Secretary of the MT became the new NPD. It look, though, that because of his many tasks he cannot commit himself fully to the project.

In October 2013, the Administrative and Financial Assistant was also replaced. Finally, in September 2013, the Communications and Stakeholder Relations Officer was hired. Overall, the PMU shows a lot of enthusiasm for the work on the project, and it could be considered to be a guarantee for a more successful implementation of the project's activities in the future.

3.3.2. Quality of execution of Implementing Partners

PD elaborates in reasonable detail the TORs for the key project bodies. During the Inception Phase there were several institutional changes, which were adequately reflected in the Inception Report. The MHE was split into two ministries: MEE and MHI. The MEE has been appointed as a member of the PB and TC, while both ministries reaffirmed their support to the project. This fact was confirmed during the evaluator's interviews at both ministries.

During the Inception Phase, two more project management bodieswere created: the Technical Committee and the MTAP Committee.

The PD has not envisaged establishment of a partners' coordination body, a body that has been present in many GEF projects. The Technical Committee, planned to be such a body, is composed of the representatives of major implementing partners, ministries and tourism operators associations. Its tasks are quite important. First, the TC is reviewing all reports before they are being approved. Hence, it is a sort of a quality control body, responsible for the issue that seems to be of critical importance for the project, because there was a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the quality of some reports. As stated above, this function of the TC will have to be enhanced in the future. Second, the TC was also aimed to be the body where differences among various stakeholders would be ironed out, in particular differences among various tourism organisations such as MATI, LAM and Divers Association. The TC was overwhelmed with work and, although meeting regularly (once a month and sometimes even more often), could not always fulfil its tasks. The members of the TC have been changing relatively often, and the sense of the continuity,as well as institutional memory,hasnot been secured. To conclude, in spite of some shortcomings, the decision to establish the TC was justified.

The second new project bodyis the MTAP Committee. It is chaired by the representative of the Divers Association, one of the main tourism organisations in the country. This could be considered as an attempt to "diversify" project management and secure an early "buy in" on behalf of the stakeholders to secure longer-term sustainability of the MTAP. The Committee had only one meeting so far and it is too early to evaluate how its functions have been performed. Specific TOR for MTAP were not produced but the MTAP Report contains some guidance on how the platform should be run. It mentions the establishment of a steering committee or a board, which has practically been realized with the creation of the MTAP Committee. The report proposes the composition and structure of the MTAP but doesn't provide too many details on its mandate. It is evident that the report envisages MTAP as a longer-term instrument, which would be managed by private sector representatives through MTAP Committee with a strong logistical support of the MT. This seems to be the correct assumption. However, it would be very useful if TOR for MTAP Committee will be produced soon. They would clearly indicate the composition, means of operation (different from the Standard Operating Procedure laid down in the report), expected benefits and outputs, financing, support to be provided by the MT, reporting, and type of activities to be involved in.

3.3.3. Quality of support provided by UNDP

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the GEF Implementing Agency for the TAP. Its comparative advantage lies in the fact that its Country Office in Maldives is well positioned to assist the country in design and implementation of the project. The PD correctly describes the UNDP position in the Maldives, but doesn't describe how concretely it will, particularly in logistical matters, assist the implementation of the project. Also, it doesn't mention the UNDP Office in Bangkok, where the Regional Technical Specialist/Advisor (RTA), whose task is to oversee the implementation of the project, is located.

UNDP has been responsible for the preparation of the Project Document, in full coordination and consultation with GoM. During the execution of the project, UNDP Regional Office is not providing operational support but has a supervising role only. Its main responsibility is monitoring and evaluation of the project's implementation. All reports (PIR and quarterly reports, in particular) are sent to UNDP Office in Bangkok. RTA reviews the reports and gives final rate in the PIR.

The UNDP CO is an active partner in the project's implementation. It is represented at the Project Board. The responsible officer for the project in the UNDP CO is very actively involved in the implementation of the project. In addition to his role in supervising contracting, procurement and other assistance that is being carried out by the UNDP CO, he is in regular contact with the PMU. He has very good understanding of the project's context and execution and is working actively towards removing barriers to its efficient implementation.

The UNDP CO efficiently performs the part of the goods and services procurement process related to advertising, selecting and contracting. So far, most of the procurement went through this office (mostly international consultants and their travel). The delivery of some of the project outputs is, however, being delayed (this has been dealt with earlier in the MTE report), but this part of the process is largely in the hands of the PMU.

Overall, the management of the project by the UNDP CO is efficient, and all the interviewees expressed their satisfaction with their performance and swift response when it was needed.

The evaluator finds the Management Arrangements of the TAP as **moderately satisfactory (MS)**. The additions to the management arrangement made during the Inception phase were beneficial to the project, while the PMU has been recently consolidated.

**4. CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

**4.1. Conclusion**

From the above, the following conclusions could be drawn:

* The TAP was approved in July 2011, and the Project Document was signed in October 2011. After a rather lengthy mobilisation period, the implementation of project's activities started in March 2012, when the Project Manager was hired and the Inception Workshop was held. The TAP Inception Phase was completed with the publication of the Inception Report in June 2012. Its duration is planned for 36 months, and the projected closure date is, judging by its approval date, is June 2014. This completion date does not reflect the delayed start of implementation of activities, and the need for the extension of the project is evident. This Mid Term Evaluation was undertaken more thantwo years sinceTAP's approval, around two years since the signing of the PD, and a little morethan year and a half since the actual start of the project's implementation. The table below presents summary of ratings based on progress achieved.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspect of the project** | **Summary assessment** | **Rating** |
| Project design | The project is still relevant in view of its national importance and consistency with the national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change. Conceptual approach fundamentally correct, but the approach to the implementation of the MTAP and demo projects has not been developed enough.  | **MS** |
| Progress towards results | Certain progress has been made towards attainment of the TAP objectives. Project is exhibiting serious delay in the in implementation of all three components, and in particular the Outcome 2. | **MU** |
| Adaptive Management | No major shortcomings perceived, but there are areas that need improvement, such as work planning and financial planning, and reporting, which should be made more transparent and accessible | **MS** |
| Management Arrangement | Additions to the management arrangement made during the Inception phase were beneficial to the project, while the PMU has been recently consolidated | **MS** |

* The conclusions, based on the findings of the MTE, are presented in the form of a brief consolidated assessment based on the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
* The TAP is still relevant with respect to its national importance, consistency with national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change, but also because of its global importance and innovations that are integrated in the project design. Its overall structure should remain unchanged. The speed of its implementation is far from being satisfactory, and it will have to be improved in order to keep the perception of the project's relevance and appropriateness active. The Project Result Framework's indicators, as amended during the Inception Phase, are still relevant because they are well designed and reflect the relevance of the project, but also because the major outputs still have tobe produced. Consequently, there is no need to propose any change in the indicator system.
* The project has been moderately effective in achieving its objectives. The results, i.e. the outputs, produced so far are only the basic studies and preparatory reports for the most important outputs of the project, the MTAP and demo projects. The implementation of the demo projects is still waiting to happen. The definition of the selection criteria for the demo projects, announcement of the call and selection of the projects haveyet to be done. Reports produced have been of mixed quality and were delivered with considerable delay. Obviously, the quality control of the outputs is an issue that will be dealt with in the future, possibly with the appointment of a peer review group. The stakeholders' mobilisation process is taking place with moderate speed, while the tourism operators, as one of the most important stakeholder groups in the project, arenot yet fully brought into the process. Those mobilised are mainly of the administrative/governmental provenance.
* The project's efficiency is moderately satisfactory. The project's management and decision-making structure has faced problems, particularlyat the time when, practically, the entire PMU has been changed, while the newly established bodies (TC and MTAP Committee) havenot yet been fully efficient. The role played by UNDP, has been effective, even if the implementation of the project has been taking place in politically very sensitive time for Maldives, which is affecting negatively the delivery of project outputs. TAP's administrative arrangements are cost-effective and rational. The PMU is rather small (three staff members) and the support of MT is significant. The new project manager wasappointedrecently, and in order to avoid additional risk to the project, he should be assisted by all project implementing and executing partners. The use of financial resources is way below planned expenditure rate, and it reflects the problems project is facing in delivering outputs. While the co-financing has been delivered, it has not been recorded and/or reported consistently.
* The TAP's progress towards results is moderately unsatisfactory. While a number of outputs, mainly specific technical studies, have been delivered, serious work is still expected to be carried out to produce major project's outputs (particularly in Component/Outcome 2. This carries relatively high degree of risk, because of large portion of grant funds allocated to this component. The project's major lines of intervention (increasing the knowledge base, testing the measures to increase resilience of tourism sector on the ground, and introduction of innovative financial instruments) are still relevant, but the effective delivery of respective outputs is faced with problems, because, of inadequate quality of some consultants' reports.
* The sustainabilityof the project has not yet been secured. The absenceof well-designed post-project mechanisms in the PD increases the risk to the project's sustainability. Although started, the intensity of the capacity building activities should be increased. The sustainability strategy doesn't exist, while the replication strategy, although not envisaged in the PD, should be prepared. The communications strategy of the project practically doesn't exist, while the web site and MTAP are still in early stages of development and implementation. The interest and participation of stakeholders is gradually increasing and the range of stakeholders groups involved should be expanded, notably with the representatives of the tourism sector.

The evaluation has found that certain progress has been made towards achievement of the TAP objectives. However, having in mind that in some important aspects the project has achieved marginal results, in particular in the Component/Output 2 (implementation of concrete measures towards increasing resilience of the tourism sector to impacts to climate change), which are critical for the attainment of major objective of the project, the overall rate of the project is set at **moderately satisfactory**. Keeping in mind that the TAP is,practically, only mid way through its implementation course, and that UNDP CO and PMU are very much committed to the successful implementation of the project, there is a possibility that the project's performance will be improved, leading to a better terminal mark, particularly if the MTE'srecommendations will be fully taken intoaccount.

**4.2. Recommendations**

While the overall approach taken to the project's design has proven to be relevant, its implementation has faced several barriers that need to be removed to allow the satisfactory progress towards the finalization of the project. Some major recommendations are proposed to improve the course of the implementation of the project.

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

**Recommendation 1:** *The adaptive management approach taken by the project to-date needs to be continued as it permits adjustments to project activities in response to changing circumstances. Any adjustments should be based on clearly developed justification, but without losing sight of the overall objective of the project.* Responsibility: PMU, UNDP CO, PB.

**Recommendation 2:** *Improve the functioning of thecoordination mechanism, in particular the Technical Committee. Partners and other stakeholders who are members of the TC should be requested to keep the membership of the TC by the respective individuals as permanent as possible, because that secures continuity of “institutional” memory. PM should insist on keeping regular schedule of TC meetings. After each meeting the minutes or report should have clear indication of decisions taken and responsibilitiesassigned.* Responsibility:TC, PMU.

**Recommendation 3:***Secure more active participation of major “non-institutional” stakeholders, in particular the private sector of the tourist industry including MATI, other segments of private sector, and representatives of island tourism dependent communities. This should be paralleled with the creation of a better enabling environment and improved regulatory framework to facilitate sector's growthcoupled with the maintenance of high environmental standards. The creation of enabling environment will be stimulated by putting to use the improved knowledge base on the impacts of climate change and outcomes of adaptation measures, as well as through implementation of demo projects. The demo projects will assist in solving the urgent environmental and climate change problems,and show the tourism sector and tourism dependent communities that investing in climate change adaptation pays. To this respect, the outreach of the project needs to be improved through more frequent visits to the communities and resorts;targeted presentations to MATI and other stakeholder groups; development of products showing that improving resilience to climate change pays and brings economic benefits (in particular the economic valuation and risk transfer studies);and by seeking similar examples in other countries and adapting them to the Maldivian context.* Responsibility: PMU, TC, EPA, MATI, LAM, Divers Association.

**Recommendation 4:** *Facilitate more active role of the most important “institutional” partners and stakeholders such as MEE with EPA and MHI, in the utilization of the TAP’s results. Thatwill contribute to thelonger-term sustainability of the project. Their participation in the project should extend beyond the membership in the TC. They could, for example,be more actively involved in proposing, selecting and monitoring the implementation of demo projects.* Responsibility: PMU, MEE, MHI, MT.

**Recommendation 5:** *As the start of the implementation of demo projects is still pending, it is recommended,as a matter of the highest priority for the entire project,to make a bold move in this direction very soon.Starting from the proposal given in the MTAP study, the final list of selection criteria should be produced. It is important to stress that even if the impetus for project ideas would be solution of imminent and urgent environmental and climate change problems, the longer-term perspective emanating from the overall project goal should always be kept in mind. The findings and recommendations from the project reports and studies already produced should be “distilled” to identify potential areas for demo projects.* Responsibility: PMU, TC.

**Recommendation 6**: *Very detailed procedure for projects selection, contracting, implementation and monitoring needs to be prepared. PMU should examine the possibility of having a two-step selection process. During the first step, a general call for ideas could be announced and, based on the ideas proposed, somewhat larger group of projects could be selected. During the second step, more detailed project proposals could be prepared, with the assistance of PMU and other implementing partners (see Recommendation 4). This procedure may minimise the risk of not getting enough good proposals. The drawback is that the selection process might last a bit longer than the standard one, but the project proposals will be better prepared. In the event of project extension of12 to 18 months, the remaining 1.5 to 2 years of project's duration, i.e. 0.5 years currently remaining plus 1 to 1.5 year of extension, would be enough for the demo projects’ selection, preparation, contracting, implementation and monitoring of results.The possibility of hiring an additional staff member/consultant who will manage demo projects should also be explored.* Responsibility:PMU, TC, UNDP CO.

**Recommendation 7:***The TAP overall workplan envisages that the thematic studies aimed at increasing the knowledge base on impacts of climate change and adapting to it (Outcome 1), be prepared prior to the implementation of demo projects, so that the projects can take on some of the recommendations of the studies.As in finalisation of some studies is delayed,certain number of demo projects could be initiated earlier, i.e. before all studies are finalised and validated. The first batch of demo projects could focus on issues of water, wastewater and solid waste.* Responsibility: PMU, TC.

**Recommendation 8:** *MTAPhas to be finalized and become operational very soon. The current Facebook profile is far from being considered as a platform. On the basis of the consultant’s MTAP report, a detailed structure of MTAP will have to be developed, and material to be uploaded selected.Project’s virtual community needs to be expanded by involving large group of stakeholders in its design, “population” of materials, and maintenance. PMU should prepare a proposal for the future of MTAP. It is recommended to consider MTAP extending its “life” after the project closure. It could serve as a tool to maintain and expand the knowledge base (studies and results of the demo projects).This will assist the tourism sector and tourism dependent communities to continue with climate change adaptation. While the existing MTAP committee could remain as a steering body, the logistics of MTAP could stay with MT.* Responsibility: PMU, MTAP Committee.

**Recommendation 9:** *Disbursement of funds has to be increased by speeding up the implementation of the project's activities. The current rate of expenditure is very low, and it reflects difficulties the project’s implementation is going through.* Responsibility:PMU, TC, PB, UNDP CO.

**Recommendation 10:** *Make financial reporting more transparent. Revision of the project’s budget should reflect changes inannual expenditure rate. It is important that revised budget takes in consideration the dynamics of the future implementation of the project, in particular the need to avoid the expenditure of large funds during the last year of the project’s implementation. The budget revision should be detailed enough to show division of funds among outcomes, outputs and activities of the project. Eventual extension of the project’s duration should immediately be followed by the respective budget revision.* Responsibility: PMU, UNDP CO, PB.

**Recommendation 11:** *Consistent system of reporting on co-financing needs to be established. The co-financing report should contain, as a minimum, the information on the amount of annualco-financingprovided by partner, separately in cash and in kind; distribution of co-financing per component/outcome; rate of co-financing provided and the amount left for the remaining period of the project’s implementation; budgetary items co-financing is referred to (experts, equipment, offices, other); perceived risk in provision of co-financing by partner and proposal for actions to be taken to mitigate risks; and other elements that PMU will propose and PB adopt as necessary. The co-financing report should be presented to, discussed at and adopted by the PB on a yearly basis.* Responsibility:PMU, UNDP CO, PB.

**Recommendation 12:***Take measures to improve the quality of outputs and avoid lengthy delays in their delivery by making the respective TORs very precise in terms of objectives, expected benefits, contents of the output, methodology of the preparation of outputs, interim reporting, etc. Better monitoring of the outputs' preparation process should be implemented, preferably on a periodical basis during each phase of the preparation of the output. Consider using the peer reviewers and, if necessary, offer financial remuneration for their work. This is particularly important for the Outcomes 1 and 3 studies (valuation study, and financial instruments studies) because adequate capacity to assess the quality of these innovative studies is not easy to find nationally.* Responsibility:PMU.

**Recommendation 13:***Improve annual work planning. While the present annual workplan have budgets and quarterly timetables only, the future ones should have: timetables on a monthly basis; budgets based on the revised overall TAP budget; list of meetings and workshops with the title, brief description, location, tentative date, and responsible person; developed activities with indication of the deliverable; key milestones, etc. The annual workplan needs to be discussed and approved by PB before the end of the current year.* Responsibility: PMU, PB.

4.2.2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

**Recommendation 14**: *In order to achieve long term sustainability TAP, during the remaining period of its implementation the project management needs to focus on two critical areas: onturning the knowledge base into an element of the enabling environment that will facilitate implementation of the adaptation measures, and on practical demonstration of ways to solve concrete problems on the ground to stimulate long term interest of major stakeholder groups. Improved advocacy, dissemination and application of results, in particular within the context of MTAP, but also through larger involvement of the implementing partners and other stakeholders (see Recommendations 4 and 5) will be the instruments of focusing on the first critical area. Selecting demo projects that will aim at solving environmental problems (including “no regret” measures), and showing that the implementation of adaptation measures could pay off, will be the instruments of focusing on the second critical area. It would help if the PMU prepares an action plan to achieve the abovementioned proposal for a strategic direction of TAP.* Responsibility: PMU, PB.

**Recommendation 15:** *Improve the project’s web site. Efforts should be madeto updateit regularly. It would be useful if the date were always placed when an update is being made. The access to the project documentation needs to be made easier by making the availability of documents as wide as possible. Reports of the most important project meetings should be placed on the web site. Page should be prepared to monitor the progress of implementation of the project’s activities per outcome.* Responsibility:PMU*.*

**Recommendation 16:** *Prepare the Replication Strategy. While the Project Document doesn’t request this strategy, it may be necessary to prepare one with a view to making the project more sustainable. The PB should adopt the strategyat its next meeting in 2014.*Responsibility: PMU, PB.

**Recommendation 17:***The communication products already produced are few and new ones have to be prepared with a view to presenting the project’s achievements.Prepare the communications strategy of TAP as a matter of priority.Improve existing and develop new communication products, such as popularly written annual reports, leaflets, short videos, eventually ipad/iphone applications, etc. Widely use and disseminate the new TAP logo and develop guidelines for its implementation.* Responsibility: PMU.

**Recommendation 18:** *Increase the number and duration of workshops, when feasible, and try to gather as large group of stakeholders as possible. Utilise the existing positive experiences. Try to involve more representatives of the tourism sector operators.* Responsibility: PMU, TC.

4.2.3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

**Recommendation 19:** *Request a no-cost extension of 12 to 18 months duration. The justification for an extensionis: (1) delayed start of the project because of lengthy mobilization period, and for administrative purposes of filling up the posts of the PMU; (2) unstable political situation in Maldives during the last two years; and (3) quality issues with some of the deliverables.* Responsibility:UNDP CO, PMU, RB, UNDP-GEFRTA.

**Recommendation 20:** *Finalise consultations and reporting on the Outcome 3 outputs, notably the risk transfer instruments. Open the discussion with a view of developing other innovative instruments such as tourism levy, environmental guidelines and standards for tourism resorts, climate change labelling, etc. These initiatives need lengthy periods to secure the “buy in” of the tourism industry. MTAP needs to be made fully operative as soon as possible to facilitate effective exchange of experiences and information on this subject.* Responsibility: PMU, TC, MTAP Committee.

**Recommendation 21:** *Improve linkages and partnerships and create synergies and partnerships with other projects and initiatives in Maldives as this may create opportunities for long-term project’s sustainability.* Responsibility:PMU, MT, MEE.

**Recommendation 22:** *The gender strategy was not developed during the initial phase of the project and its importance has not been raised as an issue. However, the issue should be revisited and eventually followed by the development and implementation of a gender-mainstreaming plan.*Responsibility:PMU.

**4.3. Lessons learned**

The major lessons learned from the TAP’s implementation to date are summarized below. As the project is only at its mid-term stage, these lessons should be viewed as preliminary, and subject to re-evaluation and confirmation at the project's closure. While TAP could not be considered as a large project in terms of financial resources employed, it is certainly a complex one with regards to the subject it is tackling – the adaptation to climate change and increasing resilience inespecially sensitive area of Maldives, and for a sector upon which the entire economy of the country depends on. Maldives is also one of the world’s climate change “hot spots”. The situation is made even more complex because the project is being implemented in very sensitive political, economic and societal situation in Maldives.

While great care has been taken during the preparatory phase to develop a project that has tackled the issue of increasing resilience to climate change in tourism sector in Maldives from many angles, the project document produced for situations similar to this one should not omit defining in a greater detail some critical outputs. In the case of TAP, these are the tourism adaptation platform and demo projects, as well as developingstandard project components such as communications and information strategy, replications strategy, project's timetable, etc.

The commitment of the project staff, and the project manager in particular, is of critical importance for the success of the project. Continuity is another important ingredient for the project’s success, both of the project’s staff as well as of the membership of project's coordinating bodies.

The advice to be given to similar projects is certainly to try to make an attempt to start some activities as early as possible, and especially those that might require ample time to mobilise and/or to be implemented, such as thedemo projects, capacity building activities, and communication and replication activities.

The quality control procedure has to be integrated into the project’s workplan. Without it the project risks delays and poor quality of outputs. This aspect should also be reflected in the budget.

Finally, the stakeholders' involvement should not be considered as a phrase. In the project that aims at beingsustainable in a long-term,bringingin stakeholdersearly in the process is of critical importance. The stakeholders’ involvement plan should not be taken as a routine exercise, but something that has to be prepared before the project actually starts.

**ANNEX 1**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATION**

INCREASING CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCE OF MALDIVES THROUGH ADAPTATION IN THE TOURISM SECTOR (TAP)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the UNDP and AF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term evaluation of the medium-size project Increasing Climate Change Resilient of Maldives through the Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (TAP) implemented through the Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture is to be undertaken in 2013. The project started on the (project implementation start date) and is in its (X) year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term evaluation.The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **Increasing Climate Change Resilient of Maldives through the Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (TAP)** |
| UNDP Project ID: | 76855 | **Project financing** | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at MTE (Million US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 76855 | GEF financing: | 1,650,438  |  |
| Country: | Maldives | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | Asia Pacific | Government: | 1,630,438 USD |  |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change Adaptation | Other (UNDP): | 20,000 |  |
|  |  | Total co-financing: | 1,630,438 USD |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture | Total Project Cost **in cash**: | 3,300,876 USD |  |
| Other Partners involved: |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | 17 August 2011 |
|  | Planned closing date: | Revised closing date:17 August 2014 |

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVESApart from the significantly large contribution of the tourism sector to the annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the sector is also one of the most important providers of employment in the Maldives. The tourism sector also maintains critical economic linkages with remote and highly dispersed inhabited islands, and is linked to a diverse range of value chains and opportunities related to agriculture, fisheries, manufacturing, construction, transport, communication, energy, water and waste management. The tourism sector’s vulnerability to climate change lie in the fact climate change undermines the resilience, viability and profitability of the industry as well as its value-chains both directly and indirectly. Major climate hazards to which tourism resorts in the Maldives are exposed regularly include windstorms, heavy rainfall, extreme temperatures and draught, sea swells and storm surges. Of these, the risks associated with swell waves, heavy rainfall and windstorms are believed to be the most serious, due to their high frequency occurrence and great potential for physical destruction and erosion. The combined effect of storm surges and tides, or storm tides, are perceived as especially destructive to the tourist resorts. The rising ocean water temperature, acidification and coral bleaching is expected to have a serious impact on snorkeling and diving – the two main tourist activities in Maldives.Male’ , Maldives In response to this nationally prioritized challenge, the government of Maldives, in partnership with UNDP, has developed the project tilted “Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector” (TAP) that is currently under implementation and financed from the GEF/LDCF. The overall goal of the TAP is to support Maldives to become climate resilient by integrating adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions, while the overall objective of the project is to increase the adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures. 1. Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses.
2. Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change.
3. Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions**.**

*)****(X)* outcomes will contribute to this objective; the progress toward the objective and outcomes is measured through the following indicators:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective / Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Target by end of project, relativeto the baseline of 2009 (unless specified otherwise)** |
| **Project Objective**:**Increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures**.  | Number of tourism-related policies, strategies and action plans which stimulate investment by tourism operators in climate resilient water, waste, energy and infrastructure management Number of tourism operators who invest in concrete initiativesthat enhance their climate risk resilience, based on guidance provided by the project.Number of tourism-associated communities which reduce their vulnerability to climate hazards, based on investment activities facilitated by the project  | An Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all tourism resorts. At least 10 tourism resorts invest in new climate risk management initiatives which increase their resilience to climate-related risks and reduce economic losses from extreme events At least 10 tourism-associated communities reduce the vulnerability of their water, waste, energy and infrastructure management systems, based on partnerships, guidance and private sector investment facilitated by the project.  |
| **Outcome 1:**Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses | Number of island resorts and tourism operators with increased capacity to reduce risks of climate variability Number of new investment projects in the tourism industry that are designed and implemented in accordance with revised tourism policies and planning frameworks | By the end of the project, 100% of relevant MTAC staff and at least 60% of all trained tourism operators recognize the economic impacts of climate change on tourism operations and know the cost/benefit aspects of different adaptation investmentsBy the end of the project, an Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all new tourism development projects.  |
| **Outcome 2:**Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change  | Number of island resorts, tourism operators and tourism-associated communities who report reduced vulnerability to climate risks as a result of guidance provided by the projectPrivate sector investment in climate change adaptation measures which reduce economic losses in tourism operations and tourism-associated communities from extreme climate events (US$) | By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism-associated communities have planned and implemented concrete adaptation projects which reduce the vulnerability of their infrastructure, water, waste, land-use planning or energy management systems to climate-related hazards By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism operators are adopting project guidance to invest in climate- resilient water, wastewater, solid waste and infrastructure management systems  |

**Outcome 3:**Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions |

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MID-TERM EVALUATION(MTE)**

The objective of the MTE is to provide an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTEwill identify potential project design problems, evaluate progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF supported AF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTE will evaluate early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework (see Annex 1).

The MTE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluation team is expected to conduct field missions to Maldives including the following project sites *(list).* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
2. Executing agencies
3. The Chair of Project Board
4. The NPD and ANPD
5. Project stakeholders, to be determined at the inception meeting; including academia, local government and CBOs

The team will evaluate all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, AF Tracking Tools, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the team for review is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference.

# SCOPE OF THE MTE

The evaluation team will evaluate the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the evaluation team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex 3.

* 1. **Progress towards Results**

Project design:

* Evaluate the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Evaluate the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.
* Evaluate the relevance of the project strategy (and theory of change) and whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Evaluate how the project addresses country priorities.
* Evaluate the baseline data included in the project results framework and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

* Evaluate the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze, beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis. Suggest measures to improve the project’s development impact, including gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Examine whether progress so far has led to,or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
* Evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners, and how the different needs of male and female stakeholders has been considered. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
	1. **Adaptive management**

Work Planning

1. Are work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
2. Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and evaluate any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and evaluate the impact of the revised approach on project management.

Finance and co-finance:

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Complete the co-financing monitoring table (see Annex 4).
3. Evaluate the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems.

1. Evaluate the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective?Are additional tools required?
2. Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators meet UNDP-GEF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
3. Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators as necessary.
4. Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

1. Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, PPRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Give particular attention to critical risks.
2. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

1. Evaluate how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
2. Evaluate how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
	1. **Management arrangements**
3. Evaluate overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the project document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
4. Evaluate the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
5. Evaluate the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
6. ***MID TERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| Inception Report | Evaluation team clarifies timing and method of evaluation | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission | Evaluation team submits to UNDP Country Office |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management and UNDP Country Office |
| Draft Final Report | Full report (as template in annex 5) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, … |
| Final Report | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report). | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP CO |

1. ***IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS***

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in *Male’ , Maldives*. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visitswith missions to(*location)*.

1. ***TIMEFRAME***

The total duration of the evaluation will be 4 weeks starting ( April 2013 according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe**  |
| Preparation | 1 day |
| Evaluation mission and debriefing | 10 days |
| Draft evaluation report | 5 days |
| Finalisation of final report  | 4 days |

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the evaluation - one international team leader and one national expert. The consultants will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The team should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with AF financed projects is an advantage.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Excellent English communication skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience working in *Asia Pacific* region.
1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| 50 | Upon approval of 1st draft mid-term evaluation report |
| 50 | Upon approval of final mid-term evaluation report |

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

All applications including [P11 form](http://www.undptkm.org/files/vacancy/p11.doc), CV, and technical and financial proposals should be submitted to the UNDP Country Office in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “International Consultant for Mid term Evaluation for Increasing Climate Change Resilient of Maldives through the Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (TAP))” or by email at following address ONLY:*Zeeniya.ahmed@undp.org/aminath.shooza@undp.org*This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by *(16:15& 28 October 2013***.** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:** Introduction about the consultant/CV; Proposed methodology and workplan (max 1 page); Financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc)..

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** The selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring

**Annex 1:**

## Project Results Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** OUTCOME 8: Communities have access to safe drinking water & adequate sanitation and sustainably manage the natural environment to enhance their livelihoods OUTCOME 9: Enhanced capacities at national and local levels to support low carbon life-styles, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk reduction  |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**No. of sectors in which adaptive mechanisms are adopted to minimize losses from climate related impacts; No. of community level partnerships with private sector for sustainable environment management |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:** Promote climate change adaptation  |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program:** Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) |
| **Applicable SOF Expected Outcomes (relating to the LDCF Results-Based Management Framework):****Outcome 1.1:** Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas**Outcome 2.2:** Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses  |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g .GEF) Outcome Indicators (relating to the LDCF Results-Based Management Framework):** **Indicator 1.1.3** % of development frameworks and sectoral strategies that reach adaptation targets **Indicator 1.2.2** Economic losses through effective climate resilient infrastructure ($US) **Indicator 2.2.1** No. of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability (Number) |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**[[1]](#footnote-2)**Increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures**.  | Number of tourism-related policies, strategies and action plans which stimulate investment by tourism operators in climate resilient water, waste, energy and infrastructure management Number of tourism operators who invest in concrete initiativesthat enhance their climate risk resilience, based on guidance provided by the project.Number of tourism-associated communities which reduce their vulnerability to climate hazards, based on investment activities facilitated by the project  | Existing tourism policies, laws and regulations do not integrate climate risk information and require/enforce private sector investments in climate change adaptation measures Most tourism operators do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for no-regrets adaptationmeasures to increase resilience to climate-related risks and extreme eventsLimited examples of cooperation between tourism resorts and communities on joint risk management efforts.  | An Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all tourism resorts. At least 10 tourism resorts invest in new climate risk management initiatives which increase their resilience to climate-related risks and reduce economic losses from extreme events At least 10 tourism-associated communities reduce the vulnerability of their water, waste, energy and infrastructure management systems, based on partnerships, guidance and private sector investment facilitated by the project.  | Policy documentsField survey with tourism operatorsField surveys; Interviews with tourism resorts and associated communities | No contradictory incentives provided/compliance required by different sector policies Government decision-makers continue to recognize the importance of climate change adaptation in the tourism sector and are committed to facilitate the necessary policy changes Tourism operators recognize the economic benefits of adaptation measures and are willing to invest in changes to their current resource management practicesTourism operators react to improved enforcement of environmental legislation in the tourism sectorTourism resorts and associated communities are willing to undertake joint planning efforts to increase climate resilience and environmental sustainability of their shared value chain Stable government/ governance structure throughout project lifetime  |
| **Outcome 1**Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses | Number of island resorts and tourism operators with increased capacity to reduce risks of climate variability Number of new investment projects in the tourism industry that are designed and implemented in accordance with revised tourism policies and planning frameworks | Most tourism operators are concerned about their increased vulnerability to climate change, but do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for effective no-regrets adaptation measures to increase resilienceNational policies and laws regulating tourism operations do not contain functional references to climate-proofing and fail to incentivizeprivate sector investment in climate risk management  | By the end of the project, 100% of relevant MTAC staff and at least 60% of all trained tourism operators recognize the economic impacts of climate change on tourism operations and know the cost/benefit aspects of different adaptation investmentsBy the end of the project, an Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all new tourism development projects.  | Training reports attendance listsTraining feedbackBuilding code addendum and associated compliance documentsField observations | Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related training initiativesand are willing to engage in intensified and regular debate about climate risks in the tourism sectorSenior planners and decision-makers continue to recognize the importance of climate change adaptation and are committed to support necessary policy changes MATI has appropriate leverage to represent the diversity of situations and interests in the tourism industryUncertainties pertaining to climate change modelling are within the acceptance range of decision-makersTourism operators are willing to engage in the review, revision and adoption of new building standards Policy recommendations are actively endorsedand signed into law by national decision-making bodies |
| **Output 1.1.**Inventory of adaptive and maladaptive practices on island resorts and safari boat operations in Maldives  |
| **Output 1.2.**Policy recommendations developed to enable and incentivize private sector investment for climate change adaptation in the tourism industry |
| **Output 1.3.**Addendum to national building codes on the physical planning and construction of infrastructure in tourist resorts is developed and disseminated to all tourism operators |
| **Output 1.4.**Technical guidance provided to all tourism operators on how to climate-proof sensitive resource management systems and infrastructure (freshwater management; solid waste and wastewater management; physical and energy infrastructure) |
| **Outcome 2**Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change  | Number of island resorts, tourism operators and tourism-associated communities who report reduced vulnerability to climate risks as a result of guidance provided by the projectPrivate sector investment in climate change adaptation measures which reduce economic losses in tourism operations and tourism-associated communities from extreme climate events (US$) | Most tourism operators are concerned about their increased vulnerability to climate change, but do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for effective no-regrets adaptation measures by the government to increase resilienceEconomic losses in tourism-related value chains from climate-induced hazards and extreme events are quantified only after catastrophic events | By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism-associated communities have planned and implemented concrete adaptation projects which reduce the vulnerability of their infrastructure, water, waste, land-use planning or energy management systems to climate-related hazards By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism operators are adopting project guidance to invest in climate- resilient water, wastewater, solid waste and infrastructure management systems  | Interviews with community representativesQualitative field surveys | Tourism operators find reduced costs associated with the proposed adaptation measures sufficiently attractive to invest in changes to existing setups and practices Tourism operators react to improved enforcement of environmental legislation in the tourism sector.New tourism projects have access to project informationGuidelines developed by the project are considered practical, locally appropriate, innovative, sustainable and cost effective Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related training initiatives Communal plans can be systematically connected with new investment projects by tourism resorts  |
| **Output 2.1**National tourism adaptation platform created to establish and support effective public-private partnerships for climate change adaptation in the tourism sector |
| **Output 2.2**Development and implementation of at least 10 new investment projects on climate-proofing water supply/storage/distribution, solid waste management, wastewater management, energy management, and/or new physical infrastructure in island resort and/or safari boat operations |
| **Output 2.3**Development of at least 10 new investment partnerships between island resorts and tourism-associated communities which result in joint climate risk management activities  |
| **Output 2.4**South-South transfer of tourism adaptation case studies between Maldives and other SIDS  |
| **Outcome 3**Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions  | Number of staff from government agencies and tourism operators who have increased knowledge of climate risk financing instruments Type and number of climate risk financing products and services (such as index-based insurance) available to public and private sector entities  | Government entities and tourism sector operators in Maldives have limited knowledge of climate risk financing products and their potential application in the Maldivian context No climate risk financing products and services are available on the Maldives market | At project completion, all representatives in relevant MTAC and MHE departments andallrepresentatives of different tourist facility groups (including resorts, safari boats and hotel operators)re aware of climate risk financing and –transfer instruments and their potential in the Maldivian context By the end of the project, the Government of Maldives has access to at least one climate risk financing solution  | Qualitative surveysAttendance listsAwareness and training materials Interview with risk financing service providerQualitative surveys | Tourism operators are interested in innovative insurance products to address the residual climate risk that cannot be addressed through other investments in risk reductionInsurance service providers are willing to develop and offer innovative and affordable climate risk financing/transfer products for the Maldives marketSufficient cooperation between relevant government agencies, the tourism industry and representatives of insurance providers in the sharing of relevant information.Insurance and reinsurance service providers interested in engaging with the Maldivian market |
| **Output 3.1**Training of tourism operators and government representatives on climate risk financing options and their potential application in the Maldivian context |
| **Output 3.2**Feasibility study on micro-insurance for tourism-associated communities to buffer climate-related shocks from extreme events.  |
| **Output 3.3.**Feasibility study on index-based insurance and risk pooling options to address risk transfer priorities of the Maldivian government |

**Annex 2: List of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. AF Project Performance Reports (PPRs) & AF Tracking Tool
3. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Audit reports
5. Financial scorecards
6. The Mission Reports and Lessons learnt study
7. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
8. Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
3. Maps
4. The AFOperations guidelines; and
5. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

**Annex 3: Mid-term Evaluation Rating Scale**

**Progress towards results: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**  | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.  |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

**Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**  | The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”.  |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | The project has minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | The project has moderate shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | The project has significant shortcomings. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has major shortcomings. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The project has severe shortcomings. |

**Annex 4: Co-financing table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sources of Co-financing[[2]](#footnote-3) | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing[[3]](#footnote-4) | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval in USD | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm | Actual Amount Materialized at Closing |
|  | UNDP | In cash | 20,000 |  |  |
|  | Department of National Planning | In kind | 89,600 |  |  |
|  | Ministry of Tourism Arts and Culture | In kind | 543,690 |  |  |
|  | Ministry of Housing and Environment | In kind | 997,148.74 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **TOTAL** | 1,650,439 |  |  |

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:

**Annex 5: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported AF financed project
* UNDP and AF project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings  |
| **3.1** | Progress toward Results:* Project Design
* Progress
 |
| **3.2** | Adaptive Management:* Work planning
* Finance and co-finance
* Monitoring systems
* Risk management
* Reporting
 |
| **3.3** | Management Arrangements:* Overall project management
* Quality of executive of Implementing Partners
* Quality of support provided by UNDP
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Co-financing table
 |

**ANNEX 2**

Itinerary

December 6, 2013

Departure from Split

December 7, 2014

Arrival to Male

December 8, 2014

09:00 - 10:00 UN Building: Meeting with TAP Team and Meeting with UNDP Team

10:30 - 12:00 MT: Meeting with the TAP Technical Committee

13:00 - 14:00 MT: Meeting with the Hon. A. Adheeb Abdul Gafoor, Minister of Tourism

December 9, 2014

08:00 - 16:00 Field Trip: Visit to holiday Inn Resort, Kandooma and Guradhooo Island, and Cocoa Island Resort

December 10, 2013

09:00 - 10:00 DPM: Meeting with Mr. Mohamed Imad, Department of National Planning, Assistant Executive Director

10:00 - 10:30 MEE: Meeting with Hon. Thoriq Ibrahim, Minister of Environment and Energy

10:30 - 11:30 MEE: Meeting with the Permanent Secretary and Climate Change Department

13:30-14:15 EPA: Meeting with the Mr. Ibrahim Mohamed, Environmental Protection Agency, Deputy Director General

December 11, 2013

09:00 - 14:00 Traders Hotel: Validation Workshop

December 12, 2013

10:00 - 11:30 MHI: Meeting with the Permanent Secretary and Infrastructure section

12:00 - 15:00 MT: Meeting with the TAP Team

15:15 - 17:00 UNDP building: Debriefing with the TAP Team and UNDP CO

19:30 Departure from Male

December 13, 2013

Arrival to Split

**ANNEX 3**

List of persons interviewed

1. Hon. A. Adheeb Abdul Gafoor, Minister of Tourism
2. Hon. ThoriqIbraim, Minister of Environment
3. Ms. Azusa Kubota, UNDP Maldives, Deputy Resident Representative
4. Ms. KetiChachibaia, UNDP Bangkok, GEF Technical Advisor
5. Mr. Mohamed Inaz, UNDP Maldives, Assistant Resident Representative Environment and Energy
6. Mr. Mihad Mohamed, UNDP Maldives, TAP Programme Officer
7. Mr. MoosaZameer Hassan, Ministry for Tourism, TAP Project Manager
8. Mr. EezanShahulHameed, Ministry of Tourism, Communications Officer
9. Ms. FatimathZeena Ali, Local Government Authority, TAP Technical Committee Member
10. Mr. Ahmed ShareefNafees, MHI, TAP Technical Committee Member
11. Mr. Hussein Abdulla, Divers Association of Maldives, TAP Technical Committee Member
12. Mr. Ahmed Rasheem, Divers Association of Maldives, TAP Technical Committee Member
13. Ms. ZeenaNaseem, Divers Association of Maldives,TAP Technical Committee Member
14. Mr. Mohamed Shahid, Holiday Inn, Kandooma Island
15. Mr. HussainShahid, Holiday Inn, Kandooma Island, Director of Human Resources
16. Mr. Hussein Yameen, Guraidhoo Island Council, President
17. Mr. Liushan, Guraidhoo Island Council, Member
18. Ms. GustiniKurniawaty, Cocoa Island Resort, Executive Assistant Manager
19. Mr. Mohamed Imad, Department of National Planning, Assistant Executive Director
20. Mr. Ali Sharif, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change Department
21. Mr. Ibrahim Mohamed, Environmental Protection Agency, Deputy Director General
22. Mr. Mohamed Shareef, Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure, Permanent Secretary

**ANNEX 4**

List of documents reviewed

* ADDENDUM TO EXISTING MALDIVES NATIONAL BUILDING CODE (NBC) HANDBOOK
* ADDENDUM TO THE NATIONAL BUILDING CODE GREEN CODE (Green Building Code)
* ADDENDUM TO THE NATIONAL BUILDING CODE:Guideline to Compliance Document
* ADDENDUM TO THE NATIONAL BUILDING CODE:Infrastructure/Construction Code
* ADDENDUM TO THE NATIONAL BUILDING CODE:Tourism Planning Code
* Assessment of Solid Waste Management Practices and Its Vulnerability to Climate Risks in Maldives Tourism Sector
* Baseline Analysis of Adaptation Capacity and Climate Change Vulnerability Impacts in the Tourism Sector
* Budget revision 10 Oct 2013
* Consultancy to Address Barriers to Effective Climate Change Adaptation in the Water and Wastewater Services in Resorts and Dependent Communities: Final Report
* Consultancy to design and establish a National Tourism Adaptation Platform (MTAP) to Support Effective Public-Private Partnerships for Climate Change Adaptation in the Maldives Tourism Sector: Final Report
* Cumulative expenditure 2012 and 2013
* Expenses 26 Nov 2013
* FOURTH TOURISM MASTER PLAN 2013-2017: VOLUME 2: BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS
* FOURTH TOURISM MASTER PLAN 2013-2017: VOLUME 2: STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN
* Follow-up Report: Building Partnerships for Climate Change Adaptation Forum 27th June 2013 Bandos Island Resort and Spa, Maldives
* Gaps and Disincentives that Exist in the Policies, Laws and Regulations which Act as Barriers to Investing in Climate Change Adaptation in the Tourism Sector of the Maldives: Final Project Report
* Inception Workshop Report
* Introduction of Financial Instruments to Cover and Transfer the Risks of Climate Hazards in the Sector of Tourism for the Maldives: Final Report
* Maldives Fourth Tourism Master Plan Environment and Conservation Write-up: Summary of Legislation and High level government policy related to influencing the environmental and conservation component
* Maldives: NAPA Project Profile
* National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA)
* Project Document
* Project Inception Report
* 2013 Project Implementation Review (PIR)
* Report on vulnerability of tourism products and associated management practices
* TAP 2012 CDR Final
* TAP CDR January - 26 November 2013
* TAP Signed AWP 2012
* TAP signed AWP revision 2013
* Workplan 2013

**ANNEX 5**

Questionnaire

1. To what extent the project is consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries in your country?
2. How the project’s intended results have been achieved half way through its implementation (Opinion of the stakeholders!)?
3. Assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project. Is it a good value for money?
4. Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation and execution?
5. Is the host country delivering its financial commitment to the project?
6. Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
7. Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
8. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
9. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project design?
10. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
11. Can the management arrangement model employed in the project be considered as an optimum model?
12. Were the management arrangements implemented and howefficient they are?
13. What is the quality of your communication with PMU?
14. How is the role of the country’s Project Focal Point being executed? What is the quality of your communication and dissemination of results with project’s beneficiaries?
15. Assess the role of UNDP. Assess contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination).
16. Assess whether or not local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making.
17. Do you perceive problems in the execution of the project? If yes, what are they?

**ANNEX 6**Co-financing table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Co-financing** | **Name of Co-financer** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval in USD** | **Name of Co-financer** | **Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm** | **Actual Amount Materialized at Closing** |
|  | UNDP | In cash |  20,000.00  | UNDP | 12,232.75 |  |
|  | Department of National Planning | In kind |  89,600.00  | Department of National Planning (DNP) | not available |  |
|  | Ministry of Tourism Arts and Culture | In kind |  543,690.00  | Ministry of Tourism (MoT) | 185,718.80 |  |
|  | Ministry of Housing and Environment | In kind |  997,148.74  | Ministry of Environment & Energy (MEE) | 101,818.81 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Ministry of Housing & Infrastructure (MHI) -*Construction Industry Section only* | 195,297.67 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Environment Protection Agency (EPA) | 170,178.07 |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |  |   |
|  |  | **TOTAL** | 1,650,439.00 |  | 665,246.10 |  |

1. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-4)