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**Executive Summary**

The Maldives is inherently vulnerable to climate and other natural hazards due to its geographic and geophysical characteristics including the small size, low elevation, narrow width and unconsolidated nature of its coral islands. A major cause of increasing physical vulnerability to climate risks in the Maldives is that these are not systematically and comprehensively taken into account in the development planning process, particularly in the areas of land use, coastal protection and development. Consequently, natural island resilience and local adaptive capacity are being reduced unintentionally in many inhabited islands.

The LDCF support will enable the Government of Maldives to systematically assess the costs and benefits of different adaptation options in the fields of land use planning and coastal protection and to develop necessary institutional and individual capacity at national and local levels. The project aimed to contribute to the government’s goal of mainstreaming climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into the country’s development policy and planning frameworks across all sectors. The project tried to achieve this by overcoming the key barriers to such mainstreaming in the areas of land use planning, coastal protection and coastal development, which have been identified as areas needing urgent and immediate attention in the country’s NAPA.

The overall goal to which the project was supposed to contribute is to increase the resilience of the Maldives in the face of climate change and improve country capacity to respond effectively to climate related hazards. The project’s objective was to ensure that climate change risks are integrated into resilient island planning and that national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures. The project was funded with resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) of GEF. It was launched in February 2010, and its planned closure date was in March 2014. The total project budget is US$ 9,336,211, including funding coming from GEF/LDCF (US$ 4,485,000), UNDP (US$ 100,000) and other parallel and in-kind co-financing contributions with a total value of US$ 4,751,211.

The main purpose of the Terminal Evaluation is, internally, to assess the extent of the project accomplishments, particularly with regards to the evaluation criteria such as efficiency and effectiveness of delivery; relevance of the project 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 the project has made in the Maldives. Externally, it should help UNDP and GEF to get feedback on the issues that are recurrent across their respective portfolios, and to contribute to overall assessment of the results in achieving GEF strategic objectives.

The PD was approved by LDCF in 2009. The PMU staff came fully on board during the first half of 2010. The Project Document, in its Chapter 2: Project Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs/activities give relatively extensive overview of four ICCRRIP’s outputs and indicative activities. The Inception Report is quite elaborate providing precise definition of the project activities. The ICCRRIP’s programmatic structure consists of 4 outcomes:

* Outcome 1: Capacity Development. The project is expected to result in enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions.
* Outcome 2: Policy Support. The project is expected to result in integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development.
* Outcome 3: Climate Risk Reduction. The expected outcome is locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks. This outcome focuses on developing the adaptation capacity of island communities and local authorities.
* Outcome 4: Knowledge Management and Learning. Under this outcome, lessons learned and adaptation knowledge generated through the project will be systematically compiled, analyzed and disseminated nationally and internationally, thereby supporting further up scaling and replication.

Overall, the level of achievement of the results and the progress in the project’s implementation has been moderately unsatisfactory. Not all the outputs have been produced, while some have been produced in a somewhat reduced size. Some outputs are still in production and their finalisation is expected soon. The ICCRRIP’s attainment of objectives has to be analysed taking in consideration the fact that its LDCF financing is relatively modest, in particular having in mind the ambitious objectives put forward during the project design and formulation. It had “testing and trial” value and was not meant to be fully conclusive in its results. Subsequently, it also had the objective of delivering an overarching strategy and framework for coastal adaptation. The changes in the structure of project’s deliverables, i.e. their reduction, was the consequence of an inadequate design and financial planning of project’s outputs and activities as well as of deficient analysis of risks and provision of adequate response.

The overall rating for this project based on the evaluation findings is **Moderately Unsatisfactory.** The ratings in table below reflect consideration of the full set of issues affecting or characterising project performance and impact that are discussed in previous chapter of the report. Summary comments highlight aspects of the assessment that best illustrate the rationale for the rating given.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERION** | **SUMMARY COMMENTS** | **RATING** |
| **PROJECT FORMULATION** |
| Project concept and design | The concept is sound and logical but has not developed the Outcome 3 in more detail; demonstration projects lack basic design and financial considerations have been wrong | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| Stakeholder participation in formulation | There was a good level of stakeholder participation in the project formulation stage | **Satisfactory** |
| **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION** |
| Project governance | The role of Project Board is clear. It is composed of institutional stakeholders, but civil sector representatives are missing. Meetings held at most twice a year, which is not enough.  | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| Project administration and management | PMU initially composed of 4 experts, but technical officer left and was never replaced. PM only on half time basis. MTE recommendations to have full time PM were mostly not implemented. | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Implementation approach** |
| Use of the LogFrame and adaptive management | PRF well developed but there is no evidence of systematic use of LogFrame. PIRs are not fully following the structure of the PRF.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Partnerships | No partnerships were forged with other national or international entities as stipulated by Outcome 4.  |  **Highly Unsatisfactory** |
| Stakeholder participation in implementation | No Stakeholder Involvement Plan prepared. Only limited number of national stakeholders involved. Local communities not always consulted  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Risk management | Risk management was not properly addressed in the PD. No risk management strategy prepared including response to perceived risks. Consequence is that project faced large delays in implementation | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Project finance** |
| Financial planning and management | Financial planning inadequate, which resulted in shifting large sums from Outcome 2 to Outcome 3.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Disbursement process | Disbursement very slow, and accelerated only towards the end of 2015. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Co-financing | From the patchy and inconsistent information available, co-funding appears to be ineffectively solicited and inadequately reported | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation** |
| M&E design, plan and budget | Project uses standard GEF monitoring procedures. Reporting is relatively consistent. Very little feedback on M&E activities. | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| Project monitoring | PIR was used effectively by UNDP for monitoring the project's progress. Discrepancy in ratings between PM and RTA. | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| **PROJECT RESULTS** |
| **Objective**: To ensure that climate change risks are integrated into resilient island planning in the Maldives and that national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures | While progress has been made towards it, the ICCRRIP's Objective to integrate climate change risk into resilient island planning has not been fully achieved and the target values of respective indicators have not been reached. Project experienced large delays, while recommendations to correct project management were not implemented, which affected the realisation of the Objective. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| **Outcome 1**: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions | The Outcome 1's objective of enhancing capacity has been partially achieved. The CRIS is not functioning yet. | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| **Outcome 2:** Integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development | Land Use Planning Guidelines have not been prepared. Draft regulatory framework is a step in positive direction, but it has to be adopted yet.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| **Outcome 3**: Locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks demonstrated | Only 2 out of planned 4 site-specific demonstration interventions have started, but not completed yet. No revision of land use plans to integrated climate change risk has been made. No replication strategy prepared. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| **Outcome 4**: Project knowledge and lessons learned compiled, analyzed and disseminated locally, nationally and internationally | Very few activities in this Outcome have been realised. Project has very low visibility, communication with local stakeholders has not been efficient, and no lessons learned have been compiled. | **Highly Unsatisfactory** |
| **Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability** |
| Relevance | The ICCRRIP initiatives are still relevant.  | **Relevant** |
| Effectiveness | Project effective when building upon existing knowledge but less effective in implementation modalities. It was extended for 21 months, but some activities are not completed yet. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Financial sustainability | The outcomes and eventual impact of the ICCRRIP are highly dependent on continued financial investment and the implementation of project proposals acknowledges the need to mobilise resources at national, regional and international levels. | **Moderately Likely** |
| Socio-political sustainability | Project implementation was affected by socio-political change at national and/or local levels and affected to a lesser extent by organisation restructuring. | **Likely** |
| Institutional framework and governance | The institutional framework and governance mechanisms established or employed by the project at national and local level were modest in terms of allowing for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained. Stakeholders' participation at national level was confined mainly to the operation of the PB while the communication with local communities was not satisfactory. | **Moderately Likely** |
| Environmental sustainability | The project itself set out to address the issue of climate change risks that represent threats to the environmental resources of the affected islands. The project has managed to address these risks but has not done enough to control them in the future. The site demonstration activities do not pose environmental threat. | **Moderately Likely** |
| Country ownership | The project's strategy, outcomes, outputs and its overall design are in line with the Maldives' priorities. Adaptation to climate change is its highest priority. The project is based on all the important national strategies and policies. | **Satisfactory** |
| Mainstreaming | Project mainstreamed all major UNDAF and UNDP objectives. It is well integrated in relevant national policy. | **Satisfactory** |
| Impact | As some important activities are still being implemented full impact of the project is not easy to determine. However, the foundational impacts of delivering overarching strategy and framework for climate adaptation are there, but physical impacts from site interventions are not yet felt since works are still going on. | **Minimal** |
| **OVERALL PROJECT RATING** | Project Design was generally appropriate and relevant to the needs of the Maldives as well as being a good fit within GEF’s Operational Strategy. Administrative and managerial process was not very efficient particularly because PM was managing project on a half time basis. Its results were not fully commensurate with the PRF. Project still has the potential to create solid basis for climate risk integration into development plans if the activities will be completed.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |

The following recommendations are proposed:

* **Recommendation 1:** UNDP should close the project as planned on 31 December 2015 and no new contracts will be signed, while the existing contracts for project personnel, consultants and Executing Agency will be honoured within the limits of their stipulations. It should also initiate the financial closure of the project in collaboration with EA, for the purpose of GEF funds. However, the existing contracts should.
* **Recommendation 2:** Establish procedures for the GOM to complete the ongoing activities such as CRIS and construction works on two islands, and keep alive the guidelines and regulatory framework. The GOM should also prepare briefs on lessons learned from the project, summaries of the project results, achievements and good practices, and on impacts of coastal protection measures implemented in the project.
* **Recommendation 3:** In designing future projects of a related nature, adequate time should be allowed for the establishment of project implementation arrangements and undertaking all necessary initiation and preparatory activities. Outputs and activities have to be defined more precisely, clearly described and, where possible in the case of proposed construction works, preliminary design should be submitted in the preparatory stage. Project proposals should have better financial planning in terms of better matching financial resources to activities, and better identification of risks and mitigation measures.
* **Recommendation 4:** With regards to management arrangements it is important to have an independent PMU in order to avoid government policy changes from affecting projects as well as to retain institutional memory regarding the project. Project manager should be engaged full time and be better accountable to the implementing agency of the project.
* **Recommendation 5:** Project activities should start as planned by the work plan. This particularly refers to the construction works, or other works on the ground that are costly to accommodate the procurement process if nationally executed.
* **Recommendation 6:** Convergence among project activities should be better executed. Informing partners/stakeholders of other activities need to be improved. There should be more transparency between stakeholders in particular between national and local levels.
* **Recommendation 7:** The GEF National Operational Focal Point, together with UNDP, should organise a follow up meeting, eventually with the ICCRRIP Project Board and local stakeholders, to discuss this evaluation and reflect on experience at the national and local level and identify lessons learned that could inform the design and implementation for future national initiatives and projects in support of the climate adaptation efforts in Maldives.

This evaluation has highlighted a number of good practices as well as problems encountered that provide potentially useful lessons for future projects operating in Maldives but also in other regions:

* Building the knowledge base: Even if not all guidelines were prepared, ICCRRIP succeeded in preparing some valuable documents that should be widely used in future endeavours, namely: survey of soft adaptation measures, regional climate change scenarios and guidelines on for climate risk resilient coastal protection. These exercises certainly have involved large group of national experts, resulting in a knowledge base that could be a source of ideas for future projects.
* Demonstration projects: Even if reduced in number, demonstration projects are always a good initiative that can attract attention of local stakeholders because they represent something tangible and show direct impact of the project. What should be improved is the financial planning and technical design of these interventions, as well as involvement of local stakeholders in decision-making. This will certainly enhance the ownership of the project at the local level.
* Better project management: ICCRIP is an example of inadequate project management practice. It is essential that any future project have a full-time permanent staff that will be relatively secure from impacts of political changes. The Project Manager has to be a person with good technical and communications skills.
* Better monitoring and adaptive management: ICCRRIP has experience extensive delays in the implementation of activities. In addition to better identification of risks, which should contain mitigation measures, better monitoring of the project's implementation should warn of possible risks, while the adaptive mechanism should allow for the immediate action.

**1. Introduction**

**1.1. Purpose of evaluation**

The purpose of this Terminal Evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of ICCRRIP impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation provides an assessment of project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation focuses on the progress the project has made towards the achievement of its objectives.

The main purpose of the Terminal Evaluation is, internally, to assess the extent of the project accomplishments, particularly with regards to the evaluation criteria such as efficiency and effectiveness of delivery; relevance of the project 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 the project has made in the Maldives. Externally, it should help UNDP and GEF to get feedback on the issues that are recurrent across their respective portfolios, and to contribute to overall assessment of the results in achieving GEF strategic objectives. The information gathered during the evaluation process, as well as the final output – the Terminal Evaluation Report, will be used by the project management team to finalize the project, as well as by the Government of Maldives respective administration, local communities and other stakeholders to use ICCRRIP’s results in the future.

**1.2. Approach and methodology**

An overall approach and method for conducting project Terminal Evaluations of UNDP - Implemented and GEF-financed projects has been developed over time and is provided in UNDP document entitled ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP- Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’. The Terminal Evaluator (TE) was expected to consult this guidance notes while framing the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. The evaluation had to provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator followed a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser (RTA) based in Bangkok and key stakeholders.

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation note that the evaluator was expected to conduct a field mission to Maldives including visits to the project sites G.Dh Thinadhoo and H.Dh. Kulhudhuffushi. The mission to Maldives took place on 18-29 December 2015. The TE visited the island of Kulhudhuffushi on 24 December 2015 and the island of Thinadhoo on 27 December 2015. During the mission, interviews have been held with the following organizations and individuals: Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE), National Disaster Management Center (NDMC), Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA), Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure (MHI), Maldives Meteorological Service (MMS), Maldives Road Development Corporation (MRDC), members of Island Councils, UNDP, PMU and the Project Manager. Table 1 shows the number of interviewees per institution visited.

Table 1: Number of persons interviewed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Institutions** | **N° of Interviewees** |
| Ministry of Environment and Energy  | 2 |
| EPA  | 3 |
| MHA | 1 |
| MHI | 3 |
| MMS | 2 |
| NDMC | 1 |
| Kulhudhuffushi Local Council | 7 |
| MRDC | 1 |
| Thinadhoo Local Council | 8 |
| MTCC | 1 |
| UNDP | 3 |
| PCU | 1 |
| Total  | 33 |

Evaluations of this nature should be independent and confidential. They should also be comprehensive and fair and disclose the full set of findings. There are a number of other requirements relating to sound accounting procedures, accuracy and transparency, which are covered by a Code of Conduct. To this effect, the TE has signed a relevant Agreement Form. The Terms of Reference and UNDP use a set of standard ratings to assess the Project as provided.

The Terminal Evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and serve as an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. The evaluation also aims to provide answers, *inter alia*, to the following basic questions:

* Did the project achieve its objectives?
* Did it do it well?
* Are the results likely to be sustainable ?

Like all GEF terminal evaluations, this one is being carried out:

* To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
* To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
* To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and
* To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

**1.3. Structure of the report**

The structure of this report follows the outline as provided in the TOR and updated in the Terminal Evaluation Inception Report. After the introduction, the ICCRRIP’s development context and design, as presented in the Project Document, are reviewed (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). Conclusions and overall ratings are presented in Chapter 4, while recommendations and lessons learned are presented in Chapter 5. Several annexes are added at the end of the report.

**2. The project description and its development context**

**2.1. Brief description of the project**

The Maldives is inherently vulnerable to climate and other natural hazards due to its geographic and geophysical characteristics including the small size, low elevation, narrow width and unconsolidated nature of its coral islands. Historically, the islands have exhibited considerable natural resilience to fluctuating sea levels, varying climatic conditions, wave action, extreme weather events and other major hazard events. The coral reefs, in particular, play an important role in protecting the islands from the impacts of extreme weather events, along with coastal sand ridges, natural vegetation and other natural features. The economic and biological values of the reefs have long been recognized. Additionally, the natural protective functions of the reefs as the country’s first line of defense against a range of natural hazards including climate risks, became more widely understood during the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, the impacts of which would have been far greater without the buffering role of the reefs and other natural features.

A major cause of increasing physical vulnerability to climate risks in the Maldives is that these are not systematically and comprehensively taken into account in the development planning process, particularly in the areas of land use, coastal protection and development. Consequently, natural island resilience and local adaptive capacity are being reduced unintentionally in many inhabited islands. As a result of direct experience, there is now far greater general understanding of how land use planning and coastal development can adversely impact islands and increase vulnerability to climate and other natural hazards, especially flooding and erosion. However, there is still a number of constraints to modifying existing approaches to land use planning, coastal protection and development in the Maldives due to gaps in the policy framework, weak intersectoral coordination, limited institutional and individual capacity for climate risk management and adaptation planning, including gaps in technical knowledge and know-how as well as major financial constraints.

The LDCF support will enable the Government of Maldives to systematically assess the costs and benefits of different adaptation options in the fields of land use planning and coastal protection and to develop necessary institutional and individual capacity at national and local levels. The project aimed to contribute to the government’s goal of mainstreaming climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into the country’s development policy and planning frameworks across all sectors. The project tried to achieve this by overcoming the key barriers to such mainstreaming in the areas of land use planning, coastal protection and coastal development, which have been identified as areas needing urgent and immediate attention in the country’s NAPA.

The project has been designed through a process of close stakeholder consultation and engagement led by GOM through MHTE (now, split and the ministry responsible for the project is MEE). The project has built upon existing development baseline and has sought to secure on-going interventions against current and future climate risks, particularly in the fields of land use planning, coastal protection and development. Sustainability and replication considerations have also been integrated into the project design by ensuring that the project is closely aligned with key national policies and priorities that are most relevant to integrating climate change adaptation into development planning and investment decisions.

The overall goal to which the project was supposed to contribute is to increase the resilience of the Maldives in the face of climate change and improve country capacity to respond effectively to climate related hazards. The project’s objective was to ensure that climate change risks are integrated into resilient island planning and that national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures.

The project was planned to result in 4 major outcomes, namely:

* Outcome 1: Capacity Development. The project is expected to result in enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions. Under this outcome, the project will strengthen institutional and individual capacity for climate risk planning at the national, atoll and island levels.
* Outcome 2: Policy Support. The project is expected to result in integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development. This outcome addresses key policy and intersectoral coordination gaps, and seeks to strengthen the enabling environment for future decentralized planning, by integrating climate risk reduction measures into key national policies on environment, land use, decentralization, privatization and disaster risk reduction. Additionally, detailed technical guidelines on climate resilient coastal protection, coastal development and land-use planning relevant to the Maldivian context will be developed to assist planners, decision-makers and technical specialists evaluate climate risks when making development and investment decisions.
* Outcome 3: Climate Risk Reduction. The expected outcome is locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks. This outcome focuses on developing the adaptation capacity of island communities and local authorities. Under this outcome, the project will demonstrate practical, locally prioritized adaptation options for flooding and erosion control on at least four islands in four different atolls, focusing on “soft” adaptation measures.
* Outcome 4: Knowledge Management and Learning. Under this outcome, lessons learned and adaptation knowledge generated through the project will be systematically compiled, analyzed and disseminated nationally and internationally, thereby supporting further up scaling and replication.

The project was funded with resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) of GEF. It was launched in February 2010, and its planned closure date was in March 2014. The total project budget is US$ 9,336,211, including funding coming from GEF/LDCF (US$ 4,485,000), UNDP (US$ 100,000) and other parallel and in-kind co-financing contributions with a total value of US$ 4,751,211.

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

Maldives is exposed to a series of climate related hazards, which are expected to be aggravated by climate change effects, increasing the risks of flooding and coastal erosion, and the vulnerability of 44% of settlements and 70% of the critical infrastructure, which are located within 100m from the shore line. The Project Document (PD) identifies a number of root causes for the increased vulnerability to climate change related risks in Maldives, namely: inherent physical vulnerability and natural island resilience; threats arising from current land use, coastal protection and development planning and practice; weak intersectoral coordination; limitations in institutional and individual capacity; and financial constraints. ICCRRIP aims at increasing institutional capacity by supporting the integration of climate risk reduction measures into key environmental, land use, privatization and disaster risk reduction policies and plans.

Table 2: Outcomes and outputs of the project

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcomes** | **Outputs** |
| 1: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions | 1.1 Orientation, survey, training plan and training of trainers |
| 1.2 Regional climate change scenarios |
| 1.3 Demonstration island’s stakeholders understand climate change risks and are able to prioritize land use planning and costal protection measures |
| 1.4 Technical training on coastal protection guidelines |
| 1.5 Climate risk information system |
| 2: Integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development | 2.1 Guidelines for climate risk resilient land use planning in the Maldives |
| 2.2 Guidelines for climate risk resilient coastal protection in the Maldives |
| 2.3 National Research Strategy |
| 2.4 Policy recommendations on climate risk management |
| 3:Locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks demonstrated | 3.1 Climate change resilient land use plans and specific measures demonstrated |
| 3.2 “Soft” measures for coastal protection demonstrated |
| 3.3 Replication strategy for adaptation measures |
| 1. 4: Project knowledge and lessons learned compiled, analyzed and disseminated locally, nationally and internationally
 | 4.1 Project information availability |
| 4.2 Education and public awareness |
| 4.3 International collaboration |

The project was expected to contribute to the government’s goal of mainstreaming climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into the country’s development policy and planning frameworks across all sectors. The project planned to achieve this by overcoming the key barriers to such mainstreaming in the areas of land use planning, coastal protection and coastal development, which have been identified as areas needing urgent and immediate attention in the country’s NAPA. In order to build a reliable foundation to align policies, plans and practices to climate change risks, ICCRRIP intended to produce and consolidate climate related data and information, addressing key knowledge gaps, and fund demonstration projects to prove the costs and benefits of “soft” adaptation measures that are potentially ecosystem based.

**2.3. Changes in objectives during the lifetime of the project**

A review of the Project Document (PD), Inception Report (IR), Project Board (PB) Meeting Minutes, Quarterly Reports and PIRs did not identify any significant changes in the ICCRRIP's objectives during its lifetime other than some minor re-direction and steering as is appropriate as part of the expected adaptive management approach related to such a Project. The most important change was reduction in the number of demonstration projects from 4 to 2.

**3. Findings and Conclusions**

**3.1 Project Design and Formulation**

**3.1.1. Project concept and design**

ICCRRIP was formulated in accordance with standard UNDP procedure during 2008-2009 period in close collaboration with the GOM, taking in consideration the priorities identified in the Maldives NAPA. During the preparation period appropriate consultations were held with a wide range of stakeholders. The project was approved in 2009 under the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF). The following paragraphs are evaluating the approach to the project's design, in particular the initial assumptions adopted during the ICCRRIP's preparation phase.

Neither PD nor IR give a good account of the activities that preceded the development and approval of ICCRRIP's PD. This information seems to be in exclusive ownership of those that directly participated in these activities. However, a concise account of these activities can provide valuable information for future projects.

Once the project was approved, the PMU was established. The main counterpart was the MHTE, which was later split in two ministries: Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure (MHI) and Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE). After the split, the host government institution for the project has been the MEE, and PMU was located there.

Concept of the PD is well structured. The PD gives a good account of the physical vulnerability to climate risk encountered in Maldives and analyses, in a condensed manner, the main root causes of this problem. The PD also gives a good account of threats and barriers to long-term solution to the identified problem.

The PD states one overarching goal and one project specific objective. The project's goal is quite general and gives way to incorporation of many diverse activities in the project as long as they contribute to increased resilience. It would help if the term "resilience" has been defined and its meaning in the context of Maldives explained. The goal and objectives are linked, and the latter follow the former. Outcomes are in line with the project's goal and objective.

In the PD, the development of outcomes gradually moves from strengthening capacities, to preparation of relevant studies and guidelines, implementation of demonstration activities and, finally to awareness raising and knowledge building. Project management, as a cross cutting activity is present in all components of the project. The PD also assesses how the situation within specific outcome will develop with and without LDCF intervention. The outcomes of the "No LCDF Intervention" are not always fully justified while the "LDCF Intervention" is sometimes presented as overambitious. The Project Results Framework is well developed with targets defined for every indicator. Work plan and budget are formulated following the UNDP rules. The definition of each budget item, given in a separate table, is particularly useful.

The management arrangements are logical, with Project Board being on top and PMU in the centre of operational activities. The Project Technical Support and Advisory Team, comprised of international and national consultants and advisors, assists PMU. PMU was initially planned to be embedded within MHTE, which would provide some staff time and all operational support. This has been changed later after MHTE split in two ministries and MEE was created.

It is not clear why the PD labels activities within each outcome as "indicative", because during the PD preparation phase, these activities should be defined with a high level of precision. Financial resources are split among project's outcomes. However, the funds were not always divided commensurately to the size of the tasks within each outcome. For example, the Outcome 2, where several guidelines and national climate change research strategy were to be developed, was given disproportionally large amount of financing. At the same time, the Outcome 3, where concrete actions "on-the-ground" were to be implemented, was underfinanced. This disproportional division of funds was later corrected. However, this fact points to the lack of integration between operational and financial planning. The work plan as presented in the PD is inadequate and lacks even the basic level of detail. The annexes were later compiled in a separate document, but there is mention of them in the main text of the PD.

The Inception Report was finalised in May 2010, i.e. 3 months after the official start of the project, which was well within the project's work plan. It gives a good account of the activities in the Inception Phase of ICCRRIP. An international consultant was specifically hired to prepare the Inception Report. The account of activities in the Inception Phase, as found in the IR, shows that this phase was taken very seriously and that all the relevant activities were mentioned. It has also developed the first AWP.

**3.1.2. Project Results Framework approach and performance indicators**

During the Inception Phase some changes were made in the project's outputs and activities, in particular within the Outcome 1. In the PD, listing of activities within and between outcomes is not always logical, and this fact has been already mentioned in the MTE. One clear example is the Output 1.3., which would more logically be placed in Outcome 2, as technical training on guidelines should be carried out after these guidelines are produced in Outcome 2.

The IR presents in detail the activities within each output, thus complementing the PD. This is presented in a very clear manner in two tables: Project Schedule, and Summary of Project Outcomes, Outputs and Activities. Practically, all the outputs remained as initially planned, while only one is added (new Output 1.1). However, the TE thinks that new Output 1.1, which refers to the activities of the Inception Phase, should have been planned earlier, i.e. in the PD itself. The IR is very precise on the dates for the completion of every activity. The activities are evenly spread, with "soft" adaptation measures (Output 3.2.) planned to be implemented during the second and third year of implementation. It should be noted, however, that implementation of activities in Output 3.2. started very late, and that they have not yet been finished when the EC visited Maldives in December 2015.

The Project Results Framework (PRF) is well developed in the PD. It goes into considerable detail. Indicators, and baseline and target values (qualitative in the case of former, and quantitative in the case of latter) are given for every indicator. However, there is certain discrepancy in the way outcomes are described in the respective part of the text and in the PRF table, such as in Output 3.2. This may somehow confuse the reader.

The performance indicators in the Inception Report have remained unchanged when compared to those in the PD, except for the target value of the indicator for new Output 1.2. (former Output 1.1.), and for Output 4.2. However, both were only minor changes. It is understandable that major changes were not expected at this stage, because the Inception Phase took place shortly after the start of the ICCRRIP's implementation.

**3.1.3. Assumptions and risks**

Assumptions and risks are described in the PD in opening paragraphs of the respective chapter. While major assumptions are described, the degree of probability and impact of each identified risk is not clear. The PRF contains the column on risks and assumptions for every objective, outcome and output. However, in that column it is only the assumptions that are presented, while no risk has been identified. One could only infer that if an assumption does not materialize that it, by default, constitutes a risk. There is no risk matrix, which is something that is usually found in GEF project documents. If such a matrix would exist it would then be easy to assess the status of every risk at the moment when Terminal Evaluation was carried out. IR also doesn't contain the risk matrix.

The risk management strategy has not been elaborated in the PD. The IR proposed some amendments to the risks presented in the PD, but they are dealt with in a non-systematic manner. It does mention the Risk Log, but it has not been added to the list of annexes neither in the PD nor in the IR. The TE never got these annexes either. The MTE has a short paragraph on risks and identifies similar problems associated with risk assessment as the Terminal Evaluation. The PIRs for 2013, 2014 and 2015 (the only PIRs that were given to the TE) have a table indicating risks faced during each reporting year as well as the measures taken to mitigate potential consequences. The treatment of risks in PIRs is very general and, considering the fact that neither in PD nor in IR risks were not dealt with in a systematic manner, it was not easy to link the risks mentioned in PIRs to those outlined in PD and IR. Overall, it can be concluded that management of risks has not been dealt with appropriately in this project.

**3.1.4. Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project  design**

In the PD or IR there is very little reference to other projects. The MTE has also mentioned this fact. However, it should be noted that several other projects were carried out in parallel to this one, such as TAP. These projects have been focused on adaptation to impacts of climate change and on increasing the resilience of island communities to these impacts.

**3.1.5. Planned stakeholder participation**

The PD gives an analysis of stakeholders participating in the project. They are divided in two stakeholder groups: primary and secondary, but not enough distinction is made between them. There is an elaboration on the key (presumably, primary) stakeholders but their role is not precisely defined. Only MHTE is clearly defined as key stakeholder. In the accompanying table, all stakeholders together with their roles in the project, are listed, but it is not clear which stakeholder is primary or secondary. This distinction is important because it may affect the design of the project management structure, as well as the stakeholders' participation in project management bodies.

The Stakeholder Involvement Plan is mentioned in the PD as Annex 3 but it could not be found in the PD version that was submitted to the TE. Interestingly, the same comment was given in the MTE Report (it has evaluated the involvement of stakeholders at national and local level as moderately unsatisfactory). Also, the IR doesn't contain the Stakeholder Involvement Plan.

The modalities of the stakeholders' involvement could only be found dispersed among different sections of the PD and IR, which makes grasping clearly their concrete role very difficult. The stakeholders' involvement has been planned through training courses, workshops and visits to exchange experiences. There is no communications strategy developed although it is considered as one of the major stakeholders' involvement tools. The PD states only that "...good communication and constant engagement with key stakeholders will be key to ensuring their support and active involvement, at national, atoll and island levels as well as ensuring the timely delivery of planned project outputs" but does not elaborate further on that except, marginally, in Outcome 4.

**3.1.6. Replication approach**

Project design envisages development of a replication strategy for adaptation measures implemented in the project (Output 3.3.). In the PD, the replication strategy is only briefly presented, but it exposes all the ingredients that a good replication strategy should have. It is mainly aimed at disseminating knowledge and experience to other atolls that will be affected by negative impacts of climate change. Replication is also considered as vital for the long-term sustainability of the project. The PD also states that replicability is integrated in all project outputs. However, no replication strategy as such has been developed during the lifetime of the project.

**3.1.7. UNDP comparative advantage**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the GEF Implementing Agency for the ICCRRIP. 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 UNDP CO has been an active partner in the project's implementation. It is represented at the Project Board. UNDP has been responsible for the preparation of the Project Document, in full coordination and consultation with GOM. The responsible officer for the project in the UNDP CO has been actively following the 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 Regional Office in Bangkok, where the Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), whose task is to oversee the implementation of the project, is located.

**3.1.8. Management arrangements**

ICCRRIP is executed under UNDP's NEX procedures. The project's lead Executing Agency was initially MHTE and its Climate Change Division (CCD). When the MHTE was split in two ministries, the execution was handed over to the MEE and its CCD. While one may conclude that transition after the MHTE's split up will be smooth, because CCD remained practically the same in terms of staffing and mandate and only changed the ministries, it seems that there has been some problems, which have caused delays in the implementation of the project. It was pointed to the TE during the interviews that these problems mainly stemmed out of the conflicting mandates of the two ministries. This may have also caused a certain loss of commitment on behalf of the newly formed MHI, which after stopped being in charge of the project (now handed over to MEE), had lost some interest in the project, even if it has remained one of its most important national partners and beneficiaries.

The PD proposed quite an elaborate project management structure with the Project Board being on top of the ladder acting as a strategic body of the project. Initially, it had to be composed of 17 members, representing all key stakeholders but in order to make it more operational, this number was reduced to 7 during the Inception Phase. PD proposed establishment of the Project Technical Support and Advisory team, which was renamed as Technical Team during the Inception Phase. Inception report also proposed establishment of the Project Coordination Committee with a purpose of providing advice and assistance to project implementation. IR also gave the composition of all these bodies, but no flowchart of the revised management structure was provided in the report.

The proposed management structure seems to be quite complex. During the implementation of the project, it seems that only PB had held regular meetings. The TE was given seven reports of their meetings, which indicates that roughly there were less than 2 PB meetings held every year. TE was given no record of any Coordination Committee activity whatsoever.

The PD envisages that a Project Management Unit (PMU) be established within the relevant government department (CCD). It was to be manned by the PM, Senior Technical Officer, Finance Assistant and Administrative Assistant). All four planned positions were filled, but the Technical Officer left in 2013 and no replacement was found since. This has created an additional burden on the PM. However, the biggest problem was the PM arrangement itself. While the project was considered as a complex one, the PM was spending only 50% of her time to ICCRRIP because she simultaneously managed another complex project in the same ministry (Adaptation Fund Project). This fact was also clearly exposed in the MTE report, which proposed a recommendation that ICCRRIP should have a full-time PM. In the TE's opinion, the fact that PM was not filled as full-time position has greatly affected the overall implementation of ICCRRIP, and may have caused delays over time. During the interviews, local stakeholders complained that their communication with the PMU was not satisfactory, that their inquiries remained unanswered and that their proposals were not listened to carefully enough. TE himself also experienced some problems with PM , for example when he was not accompanied to the field trips by the PM herself, which he has considered as necessary. UNDP also insisted, in writing via letters as well as during Project Board meetings, that the PM should be a full-time dedicated position and not shared with any other project, but it has never been approved by PB.

The PD gives good description of each project management component. It proposed three executive managers of the project: National Project Director (NPD), National Project Coordinator (NPC) and Project Manager (PM). There seems to be no clear distinction between NPD’s and NPC’s tasks, as both are supposed to oversee the project's implementation. At the end, NPC was never hired, and no explanation for that was given in the documents handed over to the TE.

**3.2. Project Implementation**

**3.2.1. Adaptive management**

The PD gave basic elements for the initial work planning. It defined outcomes and outputs but only indicated the activities that could be carried out. However, the actvities are not described, and although the internal logic of the project is clear, more details on how the activities would be carried out should have been given at this stage.

The Inception Report, prepared three months after the approval of the PD, makes a step further in work planning. The original objectives have remained unchanged. The IR defined the activities to be carried out within each output as well as the timetable for the implementation of the activities. As mentioned above, the Inception Report introduced several changes. The most important one is the introduction of new Output 1.1 in Outcome 1. The project governance structure was also modified in order to make it more operational.

Outcome 3 was not changed. While the PD was very clear on the need to implement “soft” measures in a number of sites, it gave only the location of the sites where the demonstration projects would be implemented, and it did not develop the conceptual design of these site-specific investments. But, as mentioned earlier, there was a misbalance between the funds originally allocated to the Outcomes 2 and 3 when compared to the actual tasks within each outcome. Outcome 2 had much more resources allocated to it than it was necessary to perform the activities indicated in the PD, while the opposite was the case with the Outcome 3. During the Inception Phase, the overall budget was not revised, and abovementioned budgetary misbalance remained. The MTE did not point to this issue.

The PB later corrected the above situation. It was first discussed at the meeting on 14 August 2012, while the decision was taken on 16 February 2014, when it was decided that activities in Outcome 3, because of the lack of funds, would focus on two demonstration projects only instead on initially planned four demonstration projects. The islands where two interventions would take place were the most populous ones of the three initially proposed: HDh. Kulhudhuffushi and GDh. Thinadhoo. However, the idea remained that the lessons learned on two islands selected could later be replicated for the remaining sites. The meeting also decided that this change should be dealt delicately with the islands' communities in order to manage their expectations after the decision. Furthermore, at the meeting between UNDP and MEE, held on 24 April 2014, the agreement was reached that US$700,000 will be shifted from Outcome 2 to Outcome 3 to cover partially for the missing funds. The advice to do so was also received from UNDP RTA.

The above example shows that project management bodies were relatively slow to make critical decisions. An analysis of the PB’s minutes shows that, as a rule, the PB Chairman started the meeting by expressing dissatisfaction with the project implementation delays incurred. Therefore, the problem was constantly being perceived but little was done to correct it. It is the opinion of the TE that it is the task of the project management, the PM in particular, to take timely actions and warn the PB of the critical issues, such as when a certain activity is not being implemented or delayed. PM should examine the reasons for the problem and propose a solution to PB or any other project management body. It has to be mentioned that PMU was without the Senior Technical Officer for three years, whose task would be to assist PM in the above matters.

Another example of lax project management was the issue of the extension of the project. After three and a half years of the project implementation, and after only 18% of the total budget was spent, the PB discussed the extension of the project (23 September 2014). It continued discussing it during the next meeting (16 February 2014), i.e. a month before the project was supposed to close down. The decision at that meeting was to prepare a justification to GEF for an extension to be granted. The TE was not given any written proof that an extension was granted, or when it was granted and for how long. At the time when the Terminal Evaluation was carried out, the project was extended for almost two years.

The MTE proposed 12 recommendations. Analysis of the proposed management response shows that most of the recommendations were not implemented. Notable is the response to the Recommendation 4 (revision of the project manager's position). Although there was an explicit request to have a full time PM, the position continued to be on the half-time basis, which has significantly affected the subsequent implementation of the project. The project web site was never developed (Recommendation 8), while awareness raising campaign (no evidence of it was presented to the TE) produced no results. During interviews it became clear that ICCRRIP is not much known beyond the circle of stakeholders that actively participated in its implementation.

**3.2.2. Partnership arrangements**

As stated earlier, no Stakeholder Involvement Plan was presented to the TE. MTE was also critical towards stakeholders' involvement. The position of public involvement officer was not envisaged neither in the PD nor in the IR. It was not clear who was responsible for maintaining contacts with the stakeholders, in particular the local ones. It became an important issue considering the significant change caused by the reduction of the number of site investment initiatives. One could only conclude that maintaining close contacts with the local communities should have been the task of the PM. However, because of her half-time involvement in the project, this task was inadequately performed.

During the interviews with national stakeholders it became obvious that only relatively narrow group of stakeholders, almost exclusively those that have been involved directly in the project’s implementation or those that have been members of project management bodies, were well informed about the project. During the interviews at local level (Thinadhoo and Kulhudhuffushi local councils) dissatisfaction was expressed with the lack of communication with the project management, because many of their inquiries were not responded by PMU. They have been consulted in relation to construction works in their communities, but they have not always been happy with the decisions taken, which means that their views were not always taken in consideration. The construction of the drainage facility at Kulhudhuffushi is a clear example: local council proposed another location for the drainage works instead of the one that was finally decided on.

The primary objective and activities related to stakeholder participation and engagement were under Outcome 4 and the delivery from this component is discussed below in the appropriate section on Project Results.

**3.2.3. Monitoring, evaluation  and reporting**

The project uses standard GEF procedure for monitoring and evaluation. The Project Results Framework contains indicators to monitor and measure the effectiveness of project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. In addition to independent Mid-Term Evaluation, which was undertaken towards the end of the third year of implementation (December 2012), this independent Terminal Evaluation was planned to be undertaken upon completion of the project (December 2015). The PD also mentions reports that should be regularly prepared by the project management to monitor the implementation of the project, namely: Annual Work Plan; Quarterly Progress Reports to record progress towards results; APR/PIR; and Annual Audit. The PD gives relatively detailed instructions how M&E should be carried out, including M&E Work Plan and Budget.

The PRF is relatively detailed and gives baseline and target values for every indicator. The MTE is very critical of the M&E performed. TE found that many of the findings of the MTE are still relevant, because very little was done to improve the M&E activities.

Reporting on the project is relatively consistent. The PB reports are relatively brief, but it is not always evident which was the exact decision taken on a specific issue. QPRs were regularly prepared but the practice of repeating the same statements from the previous ones, as the MTE stated, was frequent. It was not always easy to identify what exactly was done in the quarter reported.

The EC was given only three PIRs (2013, 2014, 2015). They follow the standard GEF procedure and format. A certain discrepancy in ratings between PM, UNDP CO Programme Officer and UNDP RTA is evident.

There has been very little feedback or adaptive measures resulting from M&E activities (this finding was also mentioned in the MTE). This has been particularly evident while analysing the PB Meetings' Minutes. In almost every report, the PB Chairman was expressing concern about the delays in the project and slow delivery of the project. After some justification was given during the meeting, the same statement was repeated during the next meeting. While some reasons for the delay given could be considered as "systemic" (procurement problems; lack of adequate capacities in the country, resulting in difficulties to fill positions in the PMU), there has been no adequate response to the concrete concerns expressed as well as no proposal for measures to solve the problems. The QPRs end with a section explaining the implementation delays/problems faced in the project, but the response as well as solution to the problems were not given.

**3.2.4. Mid-term evaluation**

The MTE was carried out at the end of 2012 (draft report is dated in December 2012). MTE doesn't give an overall rate to the project, but rates each evaluation aspect separately. It states that ICCRRIP is still highly relevant; that country ownership is moderately satisfactory; and that the stakeholders' participation is unsatisfactory. Management of the project was not rated according to the UNDP rating system, but key findings point to several serious shortcomings. These were also repeated in this report, because remedial actions taken to correct the situation were minimal. MTE rated project implementation as moderately unsatisfactory, because it has experienced great delays. However, it states that, at the time when MTE was performed, many project activities to achieve most of the outputs were in the pipeline. Based on that, the MTE assessed that the likelihood of achieving outputs and revised outcomes was very high. It has found that its achievements are of high quality, but that they have produced little impact in changing behavior. Finally, MTE concluded that ICCRRIP had very low visibility and has had limited impact on raising awareness about climate change related risks and soft adaptation measures.

MTE is extremely brief on financial management of the project. There is one short paragraph on the subject saying that PD is very clear on the budget. However, there is a remark that additional information is needed to analyse disbursements, but in the version of the document that was given to EC, no such analysis exists.

The MTE gave 12 recommendations to overcome the barriers that were seen as hindering project success. There was no Project Board meeting soon after the MTE was submitted and it is not, therefore, clear what actions were taken soon after the MTE was submitted to the PMU. According to the PB minutes that were placed at TE's disposal, the PB meeting following the MTE was held on 22 September 2013. This may be considered as rather late because the MTE draft report is dated in December 2012. The TE does not know if there was a PB meeting held between December 2012 and September 2013. At the September 2012 PB meeting Mr. Tony Lisle (UNDP Resident Representative at that time) addressed the meeting by saying that MTE "...needed to be revisited to address issues in delivery (...) He expressed the view that the Mid-term evaluation recommendations were critical and remained relevant. Including the knowledge management component to reach out to the different users by implementing a strong communication plan." The management response to MTE's recommendations was prepared and it contained a number of concrete actions, but majority of these response actions were never implemented. The TE concludes that while management response to the MTE's recommendations was fairly adequate, the implementation of these measures was highly unsatisfactory.

 **3.2.5.   Project finance**

The project's financial planning and management has been carried out according to the UNDP rules. The total amount allocated to ICCRRIP (LDCF grant and co-financing) is US$ 9,336,211. This amount doesn't comprise the Indirect Support Cost (ISC) of 7%. The GEF (LDCF) grant amounts to US$4,485,000 (including the project preparation grant), while US$4,485,211 of the co-financing is expected to be provided jointly by the Government of Maldives (US$3,738,336), UNDP (US$877,875; US$100,000 in cash) and UNISDR (US$235,000). 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 PD envisages that 10.7% of the funds will be spent in the first year of the ICCRRIP implementation, 30.8% in the second, 33.3% in the third, and 25.2% in the fourth year. The annual allocation of the grant funds seems logical, as 2/3 of the grant was planned to be spent in the second and third year of the project allocation. This was in line with the work plan because site intervention initiatives, where most of the funds were to be spent, were planned to be implemented early enough to take into account eventual delays. However, there were inconsistencies in planning and budgeting specific project activities, in particular the discrepancy between Outcomes 2 and 3. The funds for the former were obviously over budgeted, while the latter were under budgeted. Hence the decision, albeit taken relatively late, to shift almost 75% of the Outcome 2 funds (US$700,000) to the Outcome 3. Second problem with budgeting was the fact that even when Outcome 3 funds were increased by US$700,000, they were not enough to cover the cost of all four site interventions indicated in the PD. The TE concludes that these activities should have been better planned and preliminarily designed in the project preparation phase.

The actual utilisation of funds was way below planned disbursement. At the end of the fourth year of the project's implementation, i.e. actually when the project should be closing down, only 19.2% of the funds were spent. However, if financial planning, and in particular planning of site specific initiatives, was better performed both in the project preparation phase and during the project implementation (through better annual work planning), and if the risks, which certainly were not unknown (such as the inflexible government procurement procedures or lack of good expertise in the country), were well assessed and mitigation measures envisaged in the project preparation phase, this could have been avoided. The rate of funds utilisation is increasing in the 5th and the 6th year of the project implementation, i.e. during the extension period, which is the result of increased payments for construction works. Finally, there are still about 10% of the funds that are not spent, even if the extension period has expired.

Table 3: Expenditure against planned budget

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Planned exp. (PD)** | **% of total****plan.** | **Actual expenditure** | **% of spent against planned (E/B)** |
| **Year** | **Amount****(CDR)** | **% of total actually spent** |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** |
| 1 | 478,896 | 10.7 | 2010 | 120,493.31 | 3.0 | 25.2 |
| 2 | 1,380,959 | 30.8 | 2011 | 160,304.39 | 4.0 | 11.6 |
| 3 | 1,492,880 | 33.3 | 2012 | 148,985.93 | 3.7 | 10.0  |
| 4 | 1,132,265 | 25.2 | 2013 | 433,045.39 | 10.7 | 38.2 |
|  |  |  | 2014 | 508,811.40 | 12.5 | - |
|  |  |  | 2015 | 2,683,040.45 | 66.1 | - |
| TOTAL | 4,485,000 | 100.0 |  | 4,054,680.87 | 100.0 | 19.2 |

The situation with co-financing is unclear. The PD states that co-financing should be reported in QPR. Close inspection of QPRs shows that no co-financing was reported so far. In the accompanying financial tables only expenditures are shown. The 2013 PIR shows that co-financing realized until mid 2013 was US$2,338.778, but the specifics of that amount (source of co-financing, purpose of co-financing, type of co-financing, etc.) were not explained in the report. Subsequent PIRs for 2014 and 2015 had no co-financing presented. It seems that the PIR template has changed and in the new format no co-financing table has been envisaged. The IR has proposed the Co-financing Plan and Status Report (Annex 3, and not Annex 5 as stated in the main body of the text in IR). However, the co-financing reporting that was shown to TE has not followed these instructions at all.

There is a discrepancy between financial information in PD and PIR. While PD states that GEF grant is US$4,485,000, the 2015 PIR states that grant is US$4,545,000. PR states that co-financing is US$4,485,211, while 2015 PIR states that it is US$4,210,000. The TE concludes that there is not enough clarity in the co-financing reporting, and that the impacts of co-financing on project outcomes are not possible to evaluate. Also, there is no evidence of any additional, leveraged resources that have been committed as a result of the project.

In terms of the value for overall available grant ($4.5 million) this project has delivered moderately unsatisfactory results. The previous section highlights some of the changes in budget allocation and where this has weakened delivery in certain areas against the original plans as presented in PD. Some of the deliverables have not yet been completed even if project has run its course (CRIS, regional climate change models, replication strategy, site interventions, etc.). ICCRRIP has also failed to attract leveraged funding while co-financing has not been described in a satisfactory way. Finally, ICCRIP has not fully succeeded in integrating the issue of climate change risk into planning.

**3.2.6. Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution and Executing Agency execution**

ICCRRIP was implemented by UNDP and nationally executed under UNDP NEX procedures. MTE made an evaluation of UNDP's role in the implementation of ICCRRIP and stated that UNDP CO was mainly concentrated on administrative tasks and logistical issues mainly related to organisation of PB meetings. Very little support was given to effective management of the project. This evaluation still remains valid. UNDP played an important role in PB, in particular by proposing important management decisions such as shifting of funds from Outcome 2 to Outcome 3, reduction of site demonstration interventions, or extension of the project. However, UNDP was less effective when trying to upgrade the project management by requesting that a full time project manager be put in place. This occurred because of UNDP’s limited power to influence due to implementation setup and no accountability lines to UNDP in PM’s TOR and contract.

GEF backstopping was conducted through UNDP CO and UND GEF Regional Office in Bangkok. UNDP RTA was very active in monitoring the implementation of the project. Annual project implementation reviews (PIRs) completed by PM and assisted by UNDP CO and TA accurately reflect project performance. The reports include elaboration of risks and an explicit discussion of adaptive management measures.  Analysis of ratings from 2011 to 2015 shows that in roughly half of the cases ratings of Progress Toward Meeting Development Objectives (DO) and of Implementation Progress (IP) was roughly the same for PM and TA, while in half of the cases it differed. Most notable difference was IP rating in 2012 when PM rated it as Moderately Satisfactory, while TA rated it as Highly Unsatisfactory.

MEE hosted PMU and provided logistical support, which was accounted against its co-financing pledge. The most critical aspect of the execution was the fact that PM was contracted to manage two complex GEF and AF projects, which negatively impacted implementation of the project in many aspects. Finally, the post of Senior Technical Officer was not filled after she left.

**3.3. Project Results**

The PD was approved by LDCF in 2009. The PMU staff came fully on board during the first half of 2010. The Project Document, in its Chapter 2: Project Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs/activities give relatively extensive overview of four ICCRRIP’s outputs and indicative activities. The Inception Report is quite elaborate providing precise definition of the project activities.

The ICCRRIP’s programmatic structure consists of 3 implementation levels, namely:

* Outcomes (4) plus Project Management,
* Outputs (15), and
* Activities (39).

The internal structure of the project, in terms of outcomes, outputs and activities, is well balanced and commensurate to the expected results and programmatic areas it is meant to cover.

Overall, the level of achievement of the results and the progress in the project’s implementation has been moderately unsatisfactory. Not all the outputs have been produced, while some have been produced in a somewhat reduced size. Some outputs are still in production and their finalisation is expected soon. The ICCRRIP’s attainment of objectives has to be analysed taking in consideration the fact that its LDCF financing is relatively modest, in particular having in mind the ambitious objectives put forward during the project design and formulation. It had “testing and trial” value and was not meant to be fully conclusive in its results. Subsequently, it also had the objective of delivering an overarching strategy and framework for coastal adaptation. The changes in the structure of project’s deliverables, i.e. their reduction, was the consequence of an inadequate design and financial planning of project’s outputs and activities as well as of deficient analysis of risks and provision of adequate response.

The realization of ICCRRIP’s experienced great delays. Main reasons for the delays in ICCRRIP’s implementation are the following:

* The project changed hands among several ministries. Initially the overseeing institution of the project was the MHTE, which later was divided into two separate ministries: MHI and MEE. This has resulted in some sort of conflicting mandates between the newly formed ministries, i.e. after the break up the project was overseen by MEE but MHI still had a very important stake in it; because of reduced influence MHI became less committed to the project;
* The Project Manager was managing two complex projects at the same time. Half-time nature of her involvement resulted in her inability to commit equally to all important aspects and components of the project;
* The cumbersome procurement process, which was fully under the auspices of the GOM, while UNDP was kept out of it;
* Lack of local capacity in terms of getting contractors to undertake project specific type of work;
* Inadequate decision making process, which resulted in delays in taking some important decisions;
* Difficulties in maintaining full PMU staffing.

**3.3.1. Attainment of outcomes/ Achievement of objectives**

The analysis of the attainment of the outcomes will be focused on the outputs and, where possible, on the analysis of outcomes and impacts that the project has produced. As the ICCRRIP's work plan has been revised during the Inception Phase, the analysis will be based on the work plan presented in the Inception Report.

3.3.1.1. Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions

According to the IR, the Outcome 1 has 5 outputs (1.1 Orientation, survey, training plan and training of trainers; 1.2 Regional climate change scenarios; 1.3 Demonstration island climate change risk management training; 1.4 Technical training on coastal protection guidelines; and 1.5 Climate risk information system) and 14 activities. As stated earlier, the Output 1.1. was added during the Inception Phase, and the activities were of the introductory nature, such as inception workshop which served the purpose of project mobilisation. Indicators and corresponding target values were added to the PRF during the Inception Phase of the project.

The activities within Outcome 1 aim at building "...institutional and individual capacity for understanding and prioritizing current and future climate risks faced by the Maldives as well as to evaluate and plan locally appropriate adaptation measures, particularly in relation to climate resilient land use planning and coastal protection." This should be done by developing relevant tools for climate risk management and by building respective national capacity through training.

The Output 1.1. was partially implemented. The project orientation and mobilization (Inception Phase) was implemented on time and the resulting Inception Report is of good quality. The document "Survey of Adaptation Measures" gives a good overview of the adaptation measures that exist in Maldives and it has proven to be a good orientation for subsequent site interventions. It was, however, completed after a 6-months delay, while the document itself was published only in 2015. For that reason, it may be concluded that the impact of the document was somewhat smaller than expected. MTE evaluator rated the training plan as being of low quality, while the training of trainers was conducted roughly on time, but no record exists of its results.

Regional climate scenarios were developed, and they should be considered as useful as much as this kind of exercise (downscaling from the regional models) may provide guidance for predictions of high certainty. The MMS is satisfied with the modeling results and thinks that it will help them make weather predictions. The document also provides an orientation for sectorial planners. The document has been prepared with a delay of almost one year in the first quarter of 2012, instead of the second quarter of 2011), and printed only in 2015. There is little evidence that results of this exercise are known besides MMS. Furthermore, as stated in MTE, there has been no awareness or training activity on climate change risk awareness rising in 4 islands. In the PIRs that were prepared after MTE, there was also no record of these activities being carried out.

The situation with Output 1.4. is very unclear. As stated earlier, this output was supposed to follow the activities in Output 2.1. i.e. the preparation of guidelines for climate risk resilient land use planning in the Maldives. The guidelines were never prepared, but MTE states that 1-day training session was conducted from the Land Use Planning department of (presumably) MHI. The session was never evaluated and it is not known what were its impacts. However, few other sessions were organised, namely on economics of climate change adaptation, session for MMS, on current adaptation measures, climate modeling and analysis of climate extremes (for MMS). PIRs are quite incoherent in reporting on these activities, and it is not clear to which output these training activities actually refer. PIR 2014 states that "a comprehensive Climate Change Policy Framework has been drafted by the Ministry during the reporting period that draws from the knowledge products developed through the Project", but it is not clear which output this result is linked to.

Preparation of CRIS caused a disagreement between PMU and MMS, both expressing different views on the hitherto success of the exercise. It was supposed to be completed at the end of 2011, but it has not been operational when the Terminal Evaluation was performed (delay of 4 years!). There is only one respective output that was used for the Terminal Evaluation (strategic framework for the system). It is quite general in its level of detail, and it is very difficult to discern the specifics of the system as well as of the benefits it would bring. There was disagreement regarding selection of the consultant (MMS stating it had no adequate qualification for the task; PM stating that it was the cheapest proposal and, therefore, there was an obligation to select that proposal according to the national procurement rules). Some stakeholders, like MHI, were not very much aware of CRIS. This is quite important because CRIS is supposed to be integrated with NGIS, which is now operated by MHI. The TE concludes that the activities aimed at achieving this outcome were only partially implemented and with great delay. This outcome can be rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

3.3.1.2. Outcome 2: Integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development

The Outcome 2 has 4 outputs (2.1 Guidelines for climate risk resilient land use planning in the Maldives; 2.2 Guidelines for climate risk resilient coastal protection in the Maldives; 2.3 National Research Strategy; and 2.4 Policy recommendations on climate risk management) and 9 activities. The target values of the indicators were not significantly changed during the Inception Phase of the project.

The TE considers this as the most critical outcome of ICCRRIP. It was supposed to set the stage for site-specific interventions by defining the most viable types of interventions in selected islands, but also to plant seeds for sustainable climate risk management in Maldives. It was planned to provide substance to the process for incorporating knowledge and information about climate related events, trends, forecasts and projections into decision making to increase climate resilience and reduce the potential damages and losses created by climate change.

Main activities under this Outcome were preparation of two guidelines: on climate resilient land use planning, and on climate risk resilient coastal protection. The former activity aimed at developing guidelines for long term land use strategic planning that would minimise climate risks, while the latter activity aimed at preparing technical guidelines that would be the basis for proposing practical interventions in the local context. The respective conceptual approach was well developed in the Project Document. However, it was only partially realised. Instead of fully-fledged guidelines, only the review of land use planning and EIA regulations was prepared. MTE Report suggests review has caused a lot of dissatisfaction, but does not elaborate further on that. The PIR 2015 reports that a draft regulation on coastal protection to streamline and incorporate climate change risks, incorporating project findings and relevant recommendations, was developed and shared with the key stakeholder agencies. The finalized draft was expected to be completed by October 2015 and it is not known if and when this regulation will be adopted. The Land Use Planning Guidelines (activity 2.1.2.) were never prepared.

The other guidelines document, on climate risk resilient coastal protection, was prepared. It is an extensive document, more a handbook than a guideline, which depicts all possible technical solutions that may be adapted to the Maldives islands' conditions. There is a section on planning, but it is by no means a substitute for the missing land use planning guidelines. No additional information materials were prepared.

National Research Strategy was prepared. It is rather short document that lists all necessary activities to increase Maldives' climate risk management capacities through appropriate research. However, no partnerships were established as envisaged in the PD. The activities under Output 2.4. were not carried out.

This outcome was Moderately Unsatisfactory in the attainment of its objectives because at the time Terminal Evaluation was performed climate risk planning was only marginally integrated into relevant national policies, while no regulation was adopted based on the recommendations of the guidelines. Its outputs were prepared only partially while all the activities were implemented with considerable delays. For example, climate risk protection guidelines were prepared three years behind schedule.

3.3.1.3. Outcome 3: Locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks demonstrated

Outcome 3 has 3 outputs (3.1 Climate change resilient land use plans and specific measures demonstrated in at least three islands; 3.2 “Soft” measures for coastal protection that incorporate future climate risks demonstrated in at least three islands; and 3.3 Replication strategy for adaptation measures developed) and 8 activities. The target values of the indicators were not significantly changed during the Inception Phase of the project. However, for the Output 3.2. the number of site-specific demonstration interventions has been reduced from 4 to 2, due to the lack of funds. Also, PB decided to shift unused funds in Outcome 2 to Outcome 3.

The overall structure of outputs within this outcome is as follows: based on the guidelines prepared under Outcome 2, land use plans should be revised on 4 islands, site demonstrations implemented on 4 islands and, based on the evaluation of experiences, a replication strategy will be prepared. PD and IR mention that land use plans will be revised in "4 demonstration islands" without mentioning their names, but it would be logical to assume that both documents meant the islands where demonstration interventions would be made. Critical precondition for detailed planning of site interventions within this outcome was preparation of both guidelines under the Outcome 2 including all the technical studies that underpinned the preparation of these guidelines. All these outputs were supposed to inform on the types of land use and coastal protection measures as well as their locations. The problem is that the land use guidelines to feed into the Outcome 3 were not prepared, while a detailed coastal protection handbook for coastal measures was not fully utilized because its preparation was delayed. The two outcomes (2 and 3) have, thus, been implemented in parallel without a clear evidence of technical material feeding into the on-the-ground measures.

There are two reports prepared for Kulhudhuffushi and Thinadhoo islands entitled "Detailed Island Risk and Vulnerability Assessment". It is not clear what the purpose of preparation of these reports was because they are mentioned neither in the PD nor in the IR. Both PD and IR mention, in Output 3.2, something called "the individual draft Island Disaster Risk Profiles". TE does not believe these are the same reports, because the latter were analyzed prior to the preparation of the Project Document, while the former were published only in 2013, practically after the project was supposed to be completed.

The design reports for both interventions have been prepared and they are of a good quality. Reports were prepared by Maldivian consultants. It has to be noted that local councils on two islands that were interviewed expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of transparency regarding the way decisions were taken (too "top-down", councils were not given interventions designs for inspection), the type of intervention to be realized on their islands (site in Kulhudhuffushi), or with some aspects of the design and purpose of the intervention (Thinadhoo). They are not convinced that the measures will fully work once construction works will be completed.

There were also problems during the construction, which could have been avoided if proper supervision was in place. On Thinadhoo, for example, the contractor (MTCC) failed to properly maintain GPS co-ordinates resulting in pegs being moved, which resulted in too much sand being harvested (extra sand harvested was close to half the volume of all the sand required). This issue came to PMU’s attention much later because of not having a full time supervisor on site. TE was told that PMU does not have the capacity to certify civil engineering works and had no funds to assign one. TE finds this hard to believe considering the fact that PMU has had an unfilled position (Technical Officer) for a long time. In addition, EPA has found that Thinadhoo intervention was not in compliance with the permission, in particular with regards to the extra sand being harvested. In the Kulhudhuffushi intervention, dewatering was carried out without EPA permission and MEE was in violation of the dewatering regulation. EPA noted that it is considering charging penalties to MEE for both projects.

Start of the construction works on both islands was greatly delayed. It is true that there were a number of obstacles (cumbersome procurement process, lack of qualified contractors) that have caused delays, but the fact that these activities are delayed by four years, and that the works are not finished yet, cannot be fully justified by the reasons explained by MEE and PM. First, these obstacles were never identified as risks and appropriate measures to mitigate them were not proposed. Second, these activities should have started much earlier so that all eventual obstacles could be well overcome. It cannot be justified that the construction works started in mid 2015, when the project was supposed to finish by the end of 2013. Finally, lack of proper and timely design resulted in gross miscalculation of costs, which has reduced the effectiveness of this outcome.

The PD stated that replication strategy would be developed under Output 3.3 to strengthen linkages and synergies between project activities under different outcomes, in particular the adaptation measures demonstrated under Output 3.2. Therefore, replication strategy was planned to be an output that would collect all good practices and lessons learned from all the project's activities and aim at up taking effective adaptation measures through promotion of integration of climate risk planning into the Atoll Development Plans in 4 demonstration atolls, which included 45 islands with a combined population of 42,000 inhabitants.  The IR was more concrete by stating that in Output 3.3 an evaluation of demonstration results, Replication Strategy and experience exchange (Activity 3.3.1) will be carried out. Evaluation of demonstration results is a critical activity that would establish if the proposed adaptation measures are good coastal protection and coastal inundation management measures or not. During the interviews with local councils some reservations were expressed regarding the viability of those measures, but TE is of the opinion that only technically competent evaluation could respond to this question. However, no evaluation of demonstration results was undertaken, partially because construction works on two demonstration sites are still going on and their impact could not be evaluated yet. Consequently, no replication strategy has been prepared and PIRs do not state reasons why it has not been produced. It has to be stated, though, that several replicable outputs have been produced within other outcomes of the project, such as guidelines, capacity building through specialised training courses, exchange visits etc., but that was not enough to conclude that a replication strategy exists.

This outcome was Moderately Unsatisfactory because it has resulted in significantly reduced site interventions, but has not produced a coherent replication strategy for future interventions in Maldives.

3.3.1.4. Outcome 4: Project knowledge and lessons learned compiled, analyzed and disseminated locally, nationally and internationally

Outcome 4 has 3 outputs (4.1 Information generated by the project publicly available through a web-based portal; 4.2 Increased understanding of climate change risks and community-based adaptation options among island communities in four provinces/atolls; and 4.3 International collaboration). The target values of the indicators were not significantly changed during the Inception Phase of the project.

This is the least successful component of the project. No web site for the project was developed, although TOR was prepared for that. MTE mentions that MEE argued against it, but TE is of the opinion that separate project's web site is always a good idea and, if regularly maintained, could produce very positive results in disseminating the knowledge accumulated through the project and contributing to the replication of its results. UNDP has an ICCRRIP's web page but it basically consists of the PD's texts and has not been changed since the day it was opened. No project's outputs are placed there. MEE web site doesn't have a page or a link to anything called ICCRRIP. The fact that web site was not opened could be considered as a great lost opportunity.

No six-monthly newsletter was ever produced. MTE states that MEE has a newsletter Pemphis, which could serve as a substitute for the project's newsletter. But, even such newsletter was never fully utilised for the project's needs.

No education and public awareness materials were produced. PIR 2015 mentions that project reports, discussed above, were edited and about to be published. However, the intention underlining these activities was to produce specific products that would be mass circulated and not specific technical reports aimed at a relatively narrow community of experts.

Finally, nothing is known of the international collaboration of the project, except that PM participated in some workshops. This could not be considered as collaboration as described in the project document.

This component of the project can be rated as Highly Unsatisfactory. No progress has been made to advance the knowledge generated and lessons learned in this project.

**3.3.2. Relevance of the project's outcomes**

The Project Document states that "...consistent with the guidance from the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC (COP-9), the project will implement priority interventions in the Maldives’ NAPA and therefore satisfies the criteria outlined in UNFCCC Decision 7/CP.7 and GEF/C.28/18 (GEF 2006)...The project’s focus of expanding the resilience of natural and social systems against climate change hazards by integrating climate risk planning into the policy frameworks for land use planning and coastal development and protection at national, atoll and islands levels; developing institutional and individual capacity at national and local levels for adaptation planning; and increasing adaptation knowledge and experience, particularly on locally appropriate “soft” adaptation measures, are within the scope of expected interventions of LDCF-supported projects, as articulated in the LDCF programming paper and decision 5/CP.9. Through alignment with the key national policies, including the MDP Alliance Manifesto, NSDS, and NEAP3, the project will improve the resilience and adaptive value of ongoing government investments and provide a case for the leveraging of additional bilateral and multilateral resources for development. The project thus satisfies the various eligibility criteria for LDCF support outlined in GEF/C.28/18 (GEF 2006)." Within this context ICCRRIP is clearly highly relevant to GEF Operational Strategy, both in its concept as well as in its planned delivery.

The project as implemented has remained relevant to the above GEF programme objectives as well as to the specific ICCRRIP's objectives as stipulated in the PD. It has specifically delivered strategic framework for addressing coastal adaptation that it did through development of guidelines and legal and regulatory framework. Its demonstration role was not supposed to produce conclusive results, because that would not be commensurate to available finances, but the project has established the basis for further activities in coastal climate risk management.

**3.3.3. Effectiveness and efficiency**

The cost-effectiveness of ICCRRIP has been enhanced by its building on existing knowledge and experience in respective technical subjects in Maldives. Specifically, the project built on and benefitted from the knowledge compiled and experience gained through other climate change risk related projects such as TAP and Increasing Climate Resilience Through an Integrated Water Resource Management Programme, that were implemented in parallel to this one, but also the LECReD project, which started later but which shares several common points with ICCRRIP.

At the administrative and governance level the project achieved savings by being embedded within MEE, which provided logistical and office support. However, the fact that PM was hired on a half-time basis for this project (she simultaneously managed the above mentioned AF Integrated Water Resource Management project) reduced the effectiveness and efficiency of the ICCRRIP's implementation.

The project period was extended by 21 months on the basis of "no-cost" extension, which was approved by the Project Board. The accumulated delays causing the extension reflected the slow start of the project, although the Inception Phase was run on time. During its implementation, project encountered problems of administrative nature, such as complicated procurement procedure in Maldives, or the lack of qualified experts and experienced contractors in Maldives.

Poor financial and project planning also contributed to reduced efficiency of the project because, due to the lack of funds, site specific demonstration activities in Outcome 3 had to be cut from 4 to 2 interventions. This has certainly contributed to demonstration impact of the project being less effective than expected.

The co-financing committed to the project was almost of the same size as LDCF grant. No leveraged contributions were reported. The actual co-financing realised was impossible to assess, because no financial audits were performed. Also, reporting on co-financing was largely inadequate. By the date of formal closure of the project (end December 2015), about 10% of the funds were still to be disbursed.

Overall effectiveness of the project is shown in Table 4. The "End of Project Situation" column is a synthesis of the project's aims and targets as stipulated by the PD, while "Terminal Evaluator's Comments" column presents his conclusions on the extent to which these targets have been met.

Table 4: Achievement of "End of Project " situation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **END OF PROJECT SITUATION** | **TERMINAL EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS** |
| Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions | Capacity was enhanced, but less effectively than expected, and that was done mainly at national level. Training programme was not implemented in full, while knowledge accumulated in the project was not distributed appropriately. Climate Risk Information System not yet functional. |
| Outcome 2: Integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development | Legislation developed only in draft form but not formally adopted and implemented. Guidelines only partially drafted, while distribution limited.  |
| Outcome 3:Locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks demonstrated | Interventions reduced in number, but demonstration effect not yet clear. Decision-making was "top-down", while local communities were kept out of it.  |
| Outcome 4: Project knowledge and lessons learned compiled, analyzed and disseminated locally, nationally and internationally | Several guidelines published but most of the outputs not achieved yet.  |

**3.3.4. Country ownership**

The project's strategy, outcomes, outputs and its overall design are in line with the Maldives' priorities. Adaptation to climate change is among country's highest priorities. 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, including Maldives.

Regarding country driveness, the project is based on all the important national strategies and policies. MTE has confirmed this statement. However, the MTE rates the country ownership as moderately unsatisfactory, because the participation of National Project Director and National Project Coordinator in the project's implementation has been minimal (Project Coordinator's post was never filled!), while the dissemination of results and impacts of the project were not felt much beyond the experts' circles.

The relevant country representatives from the government were involved in the project implementation, but representatives of the civil sector less so. The ministerial and agencies' representatives were members of the Project Board. However, no government’s interministerial committee was formed, which would be given responsibility to liaise with the project team. The PB may have been considered as a body fulfilling this role.

The country ownership has been somehow reduced by the fact that no respective legislation has been enacted during the course of the project's implementation. Draft regulation on coastal protection was prepared but not enacted. No additional financial resources were leveraged.

**3.3.5. Mainstreaming**

The PD clearly outlines the UNDAF and UNDP objectives as well as expected CPAP outputs. The project is aligned to UNDAF Outcome 2 "By 2010, communities enjoy improved access to environmental services and are more capable of protecting the environment and reducing vulnerability and disaster risks with enhanced disaster management capacity". The project is more aligned to the second part of the objective (vulnerability to disaster risk reduction). It has achieved some results, albeit not by the year UNDAF refers to, because the project's implementation started after. The physical interventions on Kulhudhuffushi and Thinadhoo will certainly reduce climate change risks although the exact extent of that has not yet been assessed.

In its design, the project has mainstreamed two UNDP Outcomes: promote climate change adaptation, and strengthened capacity of developing countries to mainstream climate change adaptation policies into national development plans. However, the actual implementation was less effective as not all the stated objectives of the projects were realised.

CPAP outputs were mainstreamed in the project design but not fully implemented. This particularly refers to the local governance because local communities were to a certain extent excluded from the decision making process while the implementation of the project was not transparent enough. Knowledge base of possible options for climate risk management was relatively well developed but not sufficiently disseminated.

**3.3.6. Sustainability**

The PD includes only a limited discussion on sustainability and risk. It states the following elements of project's sustainability strengthening: (1) project was designed through close consultation with key stakeholders; (2) it had the full support of GOM and other key stakeholders; (3) it is strongly anchored in several major national policies and programmes; (4) adaptation measures developed through the project will be mainstreamed into key sector planning guidelines, such as the EIA and Land Use Planning Guidelines, as well as into the development planning process more generally; (5) strong emphasis on developing institutional and individual capacity; (6) up-scaling and replication; and (7) an ‘exit strategy’ (replication strategy) that will be developed as part of the project.

The IR has a very short section on sustainability strategy, which was outlined in very general terms. It is not clear whether the report considers the replication strategy as sustainability strategy. However, neither project sustainability strategy nor replication strategy was not given to TE to review them. Under normal circumstances, at this stage of implementation, a project would be winding down its activities and implementing its exit strategy. At the time of the TE's mission to Maldives (mid-December 2015), about two weeks from the operational closure date of the project, the two demonstration projects and several other critical deliverables, such as CRIS, Land Use Planning Guidelines and Replication Strategy have not yet been realised and the TE is not confident that the these can be completed within the remaining time.

The elements of project's sustainability strengthening that were planned to be in place at the end of the project's implementation (points 4 to 7 above), were only partially realised. Points 4 and 5 were not fully developed, while points 6 and 7 were not developed at all. This has significantly reduced the chances for project's sustainability.

Comprehensively addressing climate change adaptation in Maldives is a major undertaking requiring substantial investment in infrastructure and in education and awareness programmes, and in this context the role of the ICCRRIP was intended to be catalytic. The outcomes and eventual impact of the ICCRRIP are highly dependent on continued **financial** investment, and the implementation of project's proposals acknowledges the need to mobilise resources at national, regional and international levels. Maldives is a middle-income country and, as indicated in PIR 2015, the government has provided financial contribution to the project. This clearly points to two things: (i) the government, and especially MEE, sees these protective measures as priority and worthy of investment; and (ii) the government has the financial capacity to allocate such resources to implement these measures. The combination of these two factors points towards likelihood of financial sustainability of this investment. But, the main risk to financial sustainability would be that these measures have not been fully integrated into the government plans and budgets. The financial sustainability of the project is rated as Moderately Likely.

Project implementation was affected by **socio-political** change at national and/or local levels and affected to a lesser extent by host organisation's restructuring. This type of change or uncertainty may continue to disrupt the work of agencies or organisations involved in climate adaptation-related actions and consequently delay onward progress, but is not considered to represent a substantial threat to long-term project impacts.  The socio-political sustainability is rated as Likely.

The **institutional framework and governance** mechanisms established or employed by the project at national and local level were modest in terms of allowing for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained. Stakeholders' participation at national level was confined mainly to the operation of the PB while the communication with local communities was not satisfactory. This sustainability aspect has to be greatly improved, and it is currently rated as Moderately Likely.

The project itself set out to address the issue of climate change risks that represent threats to the **environmental** resources of the affected islands. The project has managed to address these risks but has not done enough to control them in the future. The site demonstration interventions are not supposed to pose environmental threat. However, although EIA's were prepared for both interventions, the actual construction works have not fully complied with EIAs' requirements, hence this sustainability dimension is rated as Moderately Likely.

Overall, the sustainability of the project is rated as Moderately Likely. This means that only moderate risks to the sustainability of the ICCRRIP's results exist.

**3.3.7.  Impact**

Impacts are the long-term effects resulting from a project. For comparison, outputs are the immediate products of the project's activities, while outcomes are the short to medium term effects of the project's outputs and are expected to outlive the project. The PRF clearly depicts the strategy of project development towards impacts. The Outcomes 1 and 2 are of the foundational nature as they are aiming at delivering an overarching strategy and framework for coastal adaptation. First, these outcomes aim at building the knowledge base and, second, through developing guidelines and legal and regulatory framework, they aim at integrating climate risk planning into key policies and sectors. Both outcomes were supposed to create basis for long-term investments in climate adaptation measures. However, although their direct impacts are to be felt at national as well as local levels, they are not quantitatively measurable. Outcome 3, which aims at implementing site demonstration interventions, can produce direct and tangible impacts, albeit at a local level. These impacts are quantitatively measurable. However, if these impacts are to be felt at a larger scale, investments will have to be leveraged in a long term.

,

The Outcomes 1 and 2, as described earlier, have been implemented only partially. Although the general direction of the activities has been defined, the planned activities have to be fully completed to result in impacts that could be assessed during this evaluation, taking in consideration the Objectively Verifiable Indicators that were defined in the Project Results Framework. For the Outcome 3, the construction works on 2 islands were not completed, hence the direct impacts on increased resilience of these 2 islands can only be assumed but not verified yet. The PIR 2015 states that 0% of households and 0% of critical infrastructure were better protected. The PRF states that 50% of households and 50% of critical infrastructure will be better protected from flooding risks, and 30% of land area will be better protected through erosion control and coastal protection measures. Because the number of interventions has been reduced from 4 to 2 islands, the actual impacts, when works will be completed and tested, will be at best half of the projected target values.

Taking in consideration the level of fulfillment of project outputs, the Impact of the project is rated as Minimal.

**4. Conclusions and rating**

The ICCRRIP was approved in 2009. Activities started in early 2010 with the Inception Phase and the establishment of the PMU. The duration of the project was planned for 4 years, from February 2010 to March 2014. The project got 21 months no-cost extension, which was expiring at the end of 2015. This Terminal Evaluation started in December 2015 and will be completed in February 2016.

The overall rating for this project based on the evaluation findings is **Moderately Unsatisfactory.** The ratings in Table 5 reflect consideration of the full set of issues affecting or characterising project performance and impact that are discussed in previous chapter of the report. Summary comments highlight aspects of the assessment that best illustrate the rationale for the rating given.

Table 5: Project ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERION** | **SUMMARY COMMENTS** | **RATING** |
| **PROJECT FORMULATION** |
| Project concept and design | The concept is sound and logical but has not developed the Outcome 3 in more detail; demonstration projects lack basic design and financial considerations have been wrong | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| Stakeholder participation in formulation | There was a good level of stakeholder participation in the project formulation stage | **Satisfactory** |
| **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION** |
| Project governance | The role of Project Board is clear. It is composed of institutional stakeholders, but civil sector representatives are missing. Meetings held at most twice a year, which is not enough.  | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| Project administration and management | PMU initially composed of 4 experts, but technical officer left and was never replaced. PM only on half time basis. MTE recommendations to have full time PM were mostly not implemented. | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Implementation approach** |
| Use of the LogFrame and adaptive management | PRF well developed but there is no evidence of systematic use of LogFrame. PIRs are not fully following the structure of the PRF.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Partnerships | No partnerships were forged with other national or international entities as stipulated by Outcome 4.  |  **Highly Unsatisfactory** |
| Stakeholder participation in implementation | No Stakeholder Involvement Plan prepared. Only limited number of national stakeholders involved. Local communities not always consulted  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Risk management | Risk management was not properly addressed in the PD. No risk management strategy prepared including response to perceived risks. Consequence is that project faced large delays in implementation | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Project finance** |
| Financial planning and management | Financial planning inadequate, which resulted in shifting large sums from Outcome 2 to Outcome 3.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Disbursement process | Disbursement very slow, and accelerated only towards the end of 2015. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Co-financing | From the patchy and inconsistent information available, co-funding appears to be ineffectively solicited and inadequately reported | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation** |
| M&E design, plan and budget | Project uses standard GEF monitoring procedures. Reporting is relatively consistent. Very little feedback on M&E activities. | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| Project monitoring | PIR was used effectively by UNDP for monitoring the project's progress. Discrepancy in ratings between PM and RTA. | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| **PROJECT RESULTS** |
| **Objective**: To ensure that climate change risks are integrated into resilient island planning in the Maldives and that national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures | While progress has been made towards it, the ICCRRIP's Objective to integrate climate change risk into resilient island planning has not been fully achieved and the target values of respective indicators have not been reached. Project experienced large delays, while recommendations to correct project management were not implemented, which affected the realisation of the Objective. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| **Outcome 1**: Enhanced capacity of national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and civil society leaders to integrate climate risk information into policy, planning and investment decisions | The Outcome 1's objective of enhancing capacity has been partially achieved. The CRIS is not functioning yet. | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| **Outcome 2:** Integration of climate risk planning into key national policies that govern or impact land use planning, coastal protection and development | Land Use Planning Guidelines have not been prepared. Draft regulatory framework is a step in positive direction, but it has to be adopted yet.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| **Outcome 3**: Locally prioritized, appropriate adaptation options that reduce exposure to climate change risks demonstrated | Only 2 out of planned 4 site-specific demonstration interventions have started, but not completed yet. No revision of land use plans to integrated climate change risk has been made. No replication strategy prepared. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| **Outcome 4**: Project knowledge and lessons learned compiled, analyzed and disseminated locally, nationally and internationally | Very few activities in this Outcome have been realised. Project has very low visibility, communication with local stakeholders has not been efficient, and no lessons learned have been compiled. | **Highly Unsatisfactory** |
| **Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability** |
| Relevance | The ICCRRIP initiatives are still relevant.  | **Relevant** |
| Effectiveness | Project effective when building upon existing knowledge but less effective in implementation modalities. It was extended for 21 months, but some activities are not completed yet. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |
| Financial sustainability | The outcomes and eventual impact of the ICCRRIP are highly dependent on continued financial investment and the implementation of project proposals acknowledges the need to mobilise resources at national, regional and international levels. | **Moderately Likely** |
| Socio-political sustainability | Project implementation was affected by socio-political change at national and/or local levels and affected to a lesser extent by organisation restructuring. | **Likely** |
| Institutional framework and governance | The institutional framework and governance mechanisms established or employed by the project at national and local level were modest in terms of allowing for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained. Stakeholders' participation at national level was confined mainly to the operation of the PB while the communication with local communities was not satisfactory. | **Moderately Likely** |
| Environmental sustainability | The project itself set out to address the issue of climate change risks that represent threats to the environmental resources of the affected islands. The project has managed to address these risks but has not done enough to control them in the future. The site demonstration activities do not pose environmental threat. | **Moderately Likely** |
| Country ownership | The project's strategy, outcomes, outputs and its overall design are in line with the Maldives' priorities. Adaptation to climate change is its highest priority. The project is based on all the important national strategies and policies. | **Satisfactory** |
| Mainstreaming | Project mainstreamed all major UNDAF and UNDP objectives. It is well integrated in relevant national policy. | **Satisfactory** |
| Impact | As some important activities are still being implemented full impact of the project is not easy to determine. However, the foundational impacts of delivering overarching strategy and framework for climate adaptation are there, but physical impacts from site interventions are not yet felt since works are still going on. | **Minimal** |
| **OVERALL PROJECT RATING** | Project Design was generally appropriate and relevant to the needs of the Maldives as well as being a good fit within GEF’s Operational Strategy. Administrative and managerial process was not very efficient particularly because PM was managing project on a half time basis. Its results were not fully commensurate with the PRF. Project still has the potential to create solid basis for climate risk integration into development plans if the activities will be completed.  | **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |

**5. Recommendations**  **and lessons learned**

**5.1. Recommendations**

The ICCRRIP is closing on 31 December 2015. In addition to laying the foundation for future work in integrating climate change risk into development planning on Maldives islands, the project has also left some unfinished activities as well as the activities that have not started at all. The following recommendations are divided in three groups:

* Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at national level;
* Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature; and
* Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at national level are aimed at activities that follow the immediately after the formal closure of the project. They are of a relatively short nature and should be financed either by the unspent funds or through GOM co-financing.

**Recommendation 1:** *UNDP should close the project as planned on 31 December 2015 and no new contracts will be signed, while the existing contracts for project personnel, consultants and Executing Agency will be honoured within the limits of their stipulations. It should also initiate the financial closure of the project in collaboration with EA, for the purpose of GEF funds. However, the existing contracts should.*

**Recommendation 2:** *Establish procedures for the GOM to complete the ongoing activities such as CRIS and construction works on two islands, and keep alive the guidelines and regulatory framework. The GOM should also prepare briefs on lessons learned from the project, summaries of the project results, achievements and good practices, and on impacts of coastal protection measures implemented in the project.*

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature are aimed at UNDP as well as the respective GOM ministries and departments that will be in a position to prepare new projects, either as a follow up to ICCRRIP or complementary ones.

**Recommendation 3:** *In designing future projects of a related nature, adequate time should be allowed for the establishment of project implementation arrangements and undertaking all necessary initiation and preparatory activities.* *Outputs and activities have to be defined more precisely, clearly described and, where possible in the case of proposed construction works, preliminary design should be submitted in the preparatory stage. Project proposals should have better financial planning in terms of better matching financial resources to activities, and better identification of risks and mitigation measures.*

**Recommendation 4:** *With regards to management arrangements it is important to have an independent PMU in order to avoid government policy changes from affecting projects as well as to retain institutional memory regarding the project. Project manager should be engaged full time and be better accountable to the implementing agency of the project.*

**Recommendation 5:** *Project activities should start as planned by the work plan. This particularly refers to the construction works, or other works on the ground that are costly to accommodate the procurement process if nationally executed.*

**Recommendation 6:** *Convergence among project activities should be better executed. Informing partners/stakeholders of other activities need to be improved. There should be more transparency between stakeholders in particular between national and local levels.*

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance are aimed at identifying possible new thematic subjects for projects.

**Recommendation 7:** *The GEF National Operational Focal Point, together with UNDP, should organise a follow up meeting, eventually with the ICCRRIP Project Board and local stakeholders, to discuss this evaluation and reflect on experience at the national and local level and identify lessons learned that could inform the design and implementation for future national initiatives and projects in support of the climate adaptation efforts in Maldives.*

**5.2. Lessons learned**

This evaluation has highlighted a number of good practices as well as problems encountered that provide potentially useful lessons for future projects operating in Maldives but also in other regions. The following paragraphs describe several examples of good and bad practices experienced in the project.

Building the knowledge base: Even if not all guidelines were prepared, ICCRRIP succeeded in preparing some valuable documents that should be widely used in future endeavours, namely: survey of soft adaptation measures, regional climate change scenarios and guidelines on for climate risk resilient coastal protection. These exercises certainly have involved large group of national experts, resulting in a knowledge base that could be a source of ideas for future projects.

Demonstration projects: Even if reduced in number, demonstration projects are always a good initiative that can attract attention of local stakeholders because they represent something tangible and show direct impact of the project. What should be improved is the financial planning and technical design of these interventions, as well as involvement of local stakeholders in decision-making. This will certainly enhance the ownership of the project at the local level.

Better project management: ICCRIP is an example of inadequate project management practice. It is essential that any future project have a full-time permanent staff that will be relatively secure from impacts of political changes. The Project Manager has to be a person with good technical and communications skills.

Better monitoring and adaptive management: ICCRRIP has experience extensive delays in the implementation of activities. In addition to better identification of risks, which should contain mitigation measures, better monitoring of the project's implementation should warn of possible risks, while the adaptive mechanism should allow for the immediate action.

**ANNEXES**

**Annex 1: Evaluation TORs**



BASIC INFORMATON

Location: Maldives

Application Deadline: 16 November 2015

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: International Consultant

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 15 December 2015

 Duration of Initial Contract:  15 December 2015 to 21 January 2016

Expected Duration of Assignment: 35 Days

BACKGROUND

In accordance with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) procedures, all regular UNDP supported financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project titled Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives programme (PIMS #4093).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Title: Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning ICCRRIP Project ID: 00072423 UNDP

Project ID (PIMS#): 4093

Executing Agency: Ministry of Environment and Energy

Other Partners involved: Ministry of Housing, Environment and Transport

 LDCF financing at endorsement (Million US$): $4,485,000

 Total co-financing financing at endorsement (Million US$): $4,851,211

ProDoc Signature (date project began): 03 December 2009 (

Operational) Closing Date (proposed): 31 December 2015

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

The project was designed to: contribute to the government’s goal of mainstreaming climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into the country’s development policy and planning frameworks across all sectors. The project was expecting to achieve this by overcoming the key barriers to such mainstreaming in the areas of land use planning, coastal protection and coastal development, which have been identified as areas needing urgent and immediate attention in the country’s National Adaptation Plan of Action. Thus, under Outcome 1, the project was expected to strengthen institutional and individual capacity for climate risk planning at the national, atoll and island levels. Outcome 2 of the project was expected to addresses key policy and intersectoral coordination gaps, and seeks to strengthen the enabling environment for future decentralized planning, by integrating climate risk reduction measures into key national policies on environment, land use, decentralization, privatization and disaster risk reduction. Additionally, detailed technical guidelines on climate resilient coastal protection, coastal development and land-use planning relevant to the Maldivian context was expected to be developed to assist planners, decision-makers and technical specialists evaluate climate risks when making development and investment decisions. Outcome 3 was expected to focus on developing the adaptation capacity of island communities and local authorities. Under this Outcome, the project is expected to demonstrate practical, locally prioritized adaptation options for flooding and erosion control on at least four islands in four different atolls, focusing on “soft” adaptation measures. However The project board has decided to reduce the number of demonstration islands from 4 to 2 based on fund availability as coastal protection interventions cannot be done for just one portion of a shoreline. Under Outcome 4, lessons learned and adaptation knowledge generated through the project is expected to be systematically compiled, analyzed and disseminated nationally and internationally, thereby supporting further up-scaling and replication.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures reflected in the ‘UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects’ (2012), henceforth referred to as ‘TE Guidance’.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD:

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported AF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the TE Guidance. A set of questions covering each of these criteria will be provided to the selected evaluator. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the AF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Maldives including the following project sites G.Dh Thinadhoo and H.Dh Kulhudhuffushi. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Ministry of Environment and Energy

Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture

Ministry of Tourism

Ministry of Finance and Treasury (Economic Development Policy Department (EDPD))

Ministry of Economic Development

National Disaster Management Center

Ministry of Education

Private Sector

Provincial Utility Companies

 Members of Island Council and Atoll Council, island authorities

 Environmental NGOs

Relevant UN Agencies

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, ICCR tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. The project team will provide these documents to the selected evaluator.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS:

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria:

* + Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry
	+ Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Implementation
	+ Overall quality of M&E
	+ Relevance
	+ Effectiveness
	+ Efficiency
	+ Overall Project Outcome Rating
	+ Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)
	+ Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)
	+ Overall quality of Implementation / Execution
	+ Sustainability of Financial resources
	+ Socio-political Sustainability
	+ Institutional framework and governance sustainability
	+ Environmental sustainability
	+ Overall likelihood of sustainability

The completed Required Ratings table (as found in the TE Guidance) must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales can be found in the TE Guidance.  A full recommended report outline can be found in the TE Guidance.  PROJECT FINANCE AND CO-FINANCE:  The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the Required Co-financing Table (as found in the TE Guidance), which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.  MAINSTREAMING:  UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT:

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements [a useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the 2009 Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office].

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS:

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Maldives. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators 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 Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME:

The total duration of the evaluation will be 60 working days over a time period of 2 month according to the following plan:

* Start date:
* Mission: 2 weeks later
* 1st draft for review:
* Final report:
* DELIVERABLES:
* The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:
	+ Inception Report: Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, Evaluator submits to UNDP CO no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission
	+ Presentation of Initial Findings: Evaluator submits to project management and UNDP CO at the end of evaluation mission
	+ Draft Final Report: Full report (per template provided in TE Guidance) with annexes, Evaluator submits to CO within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission, reviewed by RTA, PCU, AF OFPs
	+ Final Report: Revised report, Evaluator submits to CO within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft \*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how  all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.
* PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS:
* 10%- at submission and approval of inception report
* 40%- Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
* 50%- Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

COMPETENCIES

CORPORATE COMPETENCIES:

* + Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
	+ Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UN/UNDP;
	+ Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* FUNCTIONAL COMPETENCIES:
	+ Ability to lead strategic planning, results-based management and reporting;
	+ Builds strong relationships with clients, focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively  to feedback;
	+ Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
	+ Demonstrates good oral and written communication skills;
	+ Demonstrates ability to manage complexities and work under pressure, as well as conflict resolution skills.
	+ Capability to work effectively under deadline pressure and to take on a range of responsibilities;
	+ Ability to work in a team, good decision-making skills, communication and writing skills.  Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guideline for Evaluations.’
* REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE
* The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.
* EDUCATION:

 An advanced degree in relevant field: Climate Change Adaptation

EXPERIENCE:

* + Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience in area of integrated water resource management, with particular focus on water production and distribution technologies
	+ Knowledge of and experience with UNDP and/or AF (10%);
	+ Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (25%);
	+ Technical knowledge and experience in the area of integrated water resource management, with particular  focus on water production and distribution technologies (20%);
	+ Evidence in providing technical assistance to and / or in evaluating water sector related projects (10%);
	+ Experience with evaluating similar projects is an advantage;
* LANGUAGE:
* Fluency in written and spoken English is required.
* APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS:
* Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:
* CV In English
* Financial Proposal\*- (using the standard template) Costs related to missions will be paid separately as per UNDP rules and regulations;
* Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.
* Please note that UNDP jobsite system allows only one uploading of application document, so please make sure that you merge all your documents into one single file.
* \*Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...).
* Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org
* General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.  Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.
* Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.
* EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS:
* Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal.  The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:
	+ Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
	+ Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (desk reviews based  on cv) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
* Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation

**Annex 2: Itinerary and persons interviewed**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Venue** | **Stakeholder** | **Attendees/Participants** |
| **20th December 2015, Sunday** |
| 10:30am – 10:45am | UNDP | UNDP Briefing |  |
| **21st December 2015, Monday** |
| 11:00am – 12:00pm | Green Bldg | Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE) | * Mr. Abdulla Ziyad, *Minister of State* for MEE
* Ms. Najfa Shaheem Razi, *Project Manager*– ICCRR
 |
| 12:00pm – 12:30pm | Green Bldg | ICCRRIP Project Management Unit | * Ms. Najfa Shaheem Razi, *Project Manager* – ICCRR Project
 |
| 1:00pm – 2:00pm | Green Bldg | Ministry of Environment and Energy – Climate Change Dept. | * Mr. Ali Shareef, *Director* – Climate Change Dept. – MEE
 |
| **22nd December 2015, Tuesday** |
| 9:00am – 9:45am | NDMC | National Disaster Management Center (NDMC) | * Mr. Hisan Hassan, *Project Director*-NDMC
 |
| 10:00am – 10:30am | EPA, Green Bldg | Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) | * Mr. Ali Mishal, *Engineer* – EPA
 |
| 1:40pm – 2:30pm | MMS Office,Hulhule' | Maldives Meteorological Services (MMS) | * Mr. Ali Shareef, *Deputy Director General*-MMS
* Mr. Abdullah Wahid, *Executive Director*-MMS
 |
| **24th December 2015, Thursday** |
| 10:00am – 11:00am | Kulhudhuffushi Council Office,H.Dh Kulhudhuffushi | Kulhudhuffushi Island Council | * Mr. Mohamed Aiman, *Vice President*
* Ms. Aminath Majeedha, *Council Member*
* Ms. Shaufa Ibrahim, *Council Member*
* Mr. Ibrahim Rasheedh, *Council Member*
* Mr. Ismail Ibrahim, *Asst. Director*
* Mr. Ibrahim Abbas, *Council Member*
* Mr. Abdul Rahman, Male’ Water & Sewerage Company Pvt. Ltd. (MWSC)
 |
| 11:15am – 11:30am | MRDC Site Office, Kulhudhuffushi | Maldives Road Development Corporation (MRDC) | * Mr. Mujthaba Ahmed, *Site Asst. Manager* – MRDC
 |
| **Time** | **Venue** | **Stakeholder** | **Attendees/Participants** |
| **26th December 2015, Saturday** |
| 10:30am-12:30pm | Male’ | ICCRRIP Project Management Unit | * Ms. Najfa Shaheem Razee, *Project Manager* – ICCRR Project
 |
| **27th December 2015, Sunday** |
| 9:15 am – 9:45 am  | MTCC Site Office, G. Dh Thinadhoo | Maldives Transport and Contracting Company Plc (MTCC) | * Mr. Mauveen Abdullah Saeed – *Project coordinator* - MTCC
* Mr. Ahmed Saeed – MTCC Site Office staff
* Mr. Abdulla Waheed, *Knowledge Management & Administrative Officer* – ICCRRIP PMU
 |
| 10:00am – 11:00am | Thinadhoo Council Office, G. Dh Thinadhoo | Thinadhoo Island Council | * Mr. Ahmed Naseer, *Council Member*
* Mr. Saud Ali, *Council Member*
* Mr. Gussayyu Abdulla, *Council Member*
* Mr. Ibrahim Assad, *Council Member*
* Mr. Almars Zuhair, *Council Member*
* Mr. Abdulla Saneef, *Council Member*
* Mr. Ahmed Nashid, *Council Member*
* Mr. Abdulla Waheed, *Knowledge Management & Administrative Officer* – ICCRRIP PMU
 |
| **28th December 2015, Monday** |
| 9:00 am – 10:00am | MHA, Velaanage Bldg | Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) | * Mr. Ahmed Shareef Nafees, *Director General*-MHA
 |
| 11:00am – 12:00pm | MHI Office | Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure (MHI) | * Mr. Abdulla Ziyad, *Deputy Minister* – MHI
* Mr. Hussain Rasheed, *Director Physical Planning* – Physical Planning Section – MHI
* Ms. Zulaikha Yoomi Rasheed, *Planning Officer* – Physical Planning Section – MHI
 |
| **29th December 2015, Tuesday** |
| 11:00am – 12:00 pm | EPA, Green Bldg | Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) | * Mr. Riffath Naeem, *Senior Environmental Analyst*
* Mr. Mohamed Hamdhaan Zuhair, *Assistant Director*
 |
| 12:45pm – 1:00pm | MEE, Green Bldg | Ministry of Environment and Energy | * Ms. Najfa Shaheem Razee, *Project Manager* – ICCRRIP PMU
 |
| 1:00pm – 2:00pm | MEE, Green Bldg | Terminal Evaluation – wrap up meeting  | * Mr. Abdulla Ziyad, *Minister of State for Min. of Environment & Energy*
* Ms. Najfa Shaheem Razi, *Project Manager*– ICCRRIP PMU
* Ms. Aminath Shuza – *Programme Associate*  - UNDP
 |

**Annex 3: List of documents reviewed**

* Project Document
* Inception Report
* Mid-Term Evaluation Report
* Designing of Soft Coastal Protection Measures in Gdh. Thinadhoo and Hdh. Kulhudhuffushi: Inception Report
* Designing of Soft Coastal Protection Measures in Gdh. Thinadhoo and Hdh. Kulhudhuffushi: Draft Final Report
* Designing of Soft Coastal Protection Measures in Gdh. Thinadhoo and Hdh. Kulhudhuffushi: Preliminary Design Report
* Planning and Design of Storm Water Management System for the Gdh. Thinadhoo and Hdh. Kulhudhuffushi Island: Conceptual Design Report
* Planning and Design of Storm Water Management System for the Gdh. Thinadhoo and Hdh. Kulhudhuffushi Island: Final Detail Design Report
* Planning and Design of Storm Water Management System for the Gdh. Thinadhoo and Hdh. Kulhudhuffushi Island: Final Design Report
* Quarterly Reports
* Project Board Meetings Reports
* Project Implementation Reviews (2013, 2014, 2015)
* Survey of Climate Change Adaptation Measures in Maldives
* Development of High-resolution Regional Climate Model for the Maldives
* Guidance Manual for Climate Risk Resilient Coastal Protection in the Maldives
* Climate Risk Information System - Strategic Framework
* Detailed Island Risk and Vulnerability Assessment - Hdh. Kulhudhuffushi
* Detailed Island Risk and Vulnerability Assessment - Gdh. Thinadhoo
* National Climate Change Research Strategy

**Annex 4:  Questionnaire used during interviews with stakeholders**

1. To what extent the project is consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries in the country?
2. How the project’s intended results have been achieved 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. Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
6. Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
7. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
8. Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project design?
9. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
10. Can the management arrangement model employed in the project be considered as an optimum model?
11. Were the management arrangements implemented and how efficient they are?
12. What is the quality of your communication with PMU?
13. Assess the role of UNDP.
14. Assess whether or not national and local stakeholders have participated in project management and decision-making.
15. Have you perceived problems in the execution of the project? If yes, what were they?
16. Has the project contributed to improved interaction and cooperation between central and local level with regard to mainstreaming climate change? If yes, how and to what extent?
17. Have results on output level contributed to the overall achievements of the project's objectives?

**Annex 5: Co-financing table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co-financing (type/source)** | **UNDP own financing** | **Government** | **Partner Agency** | **Total** |
| **Planned**  | **Actual** | **Planned**  | **Actual** | **Planned**  | **Actual** | **Planned**  | **Actual** |
| Grants | 100,000 | 21,096 |  |  |  |  | 100,000 | 21,096\* |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  | 1,700,000\* |  |  |  | 1,700,000\* |
| In-kind support | 777,875 |  | 3,738,336 | 600,000\* | 235,000 |  | 4,751,211 | 600,000\* |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 877,875 |  | 3,738,336 | 2,300,000\* | 235,000 |  | 4,851,211 | 2,321,096\* |

Note: All figures are in US$

\*Figures are taken from PIR 2013, the only document made available to TE that has reported on the co-financing.