



Midterm Evaluation Report

Enhancing resilience of coastal communities of Samoa to climate change

UNDP ID# 4667

Evaluation Mission: 08/11-21/11/2015
Report Date: 01/02/2016

TYPE OF IMPLEMENTING ENTITY:	MIE Implementing
IMPLEMENTING ENTITY:	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
EXECUTING ENTITY/IES:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)

Prepared by Guido Corno, guidocorno@gmail.com

Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5
1.1. Programme Progress towards results 6
1.2. Concise summary of conclusions 7
2. INTRODUCTION 8
2.1. Purpose of the MTE and objectives 8
2.2. Scope & Methodology 9
2.3. Structure of the MTE report 10
3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT 10
3.1. Background 10
3.2 Project Description and Objective 11
3.3 Implementation Arrangement 12
3.4 Stakeholder Analysis 13
4. FINDINGS 13
4.1. Programme Strategy 13
Relevance 14
Effectiveness and Efficiency 15
4.2. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management 15
Management Arrangements 15
Work planning 16
Programme-level monitoring and evaluation systems 16
Log-frame analysis and amendements 17
Programme Risks Review 18
Stakeholder engagement 20
Communication 21
Delivery rate 22
Co-financing 23
4.3 Progress towards outcomes analysis 23
Progress towards results 25
Impact 31
4.3. Sustainability 32
Financial risks to sustainability 32
Socio-economic to sustainability 33
Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability 33
Environmental risks to sustainability 34
4.5 Gender Sensitive Review Analysis 34
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 34
5.1. Conclusions 34
5.2 Strategic and Outcome Recommendations 35
5.3 Corrective and adaptive actions for programme implementation 38
5.4. MTE Ratings 38

Annex 1. MTE ToR (excluding ToR annexes) **42**
Annex 2. MTE evaluative matrix + Ratings Scales **43**
Annex 3. Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection + Gender Sensitive Analysis. **49**
Annex 5. List of persons interviewed **51**
Annex 6. List of documents reviewed **52**
Annex 7. UNEG Code of Conduct for Midterm Review Consultants **53**

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Ratings
Table 2. List of MTE recommendations
Table 3. Programme Delivery rate (as per September 2015)
Table 4. Programme delivery rate (as per October 2015)
Table 5. Programme progress towards results
Table 6. MTE Review and Observation of Project Risks

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Programme Information

PROGAMME CATEGORY	REGULAR
COUNTRY	SAMOA
TITLE	ENHANCING RESILIENCE OF COASTAL COMMUNITIES OF SAMAO TO CLIMATE CHANGE
TYPE OF IMPLEMENTING ENTITY	MIE
IMPLEMENTY ENTITY	UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
EXECUTING ENTITY	MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT (MNRE)
AMOUNT OF FINANCING REQUESTED	US $ 8,048,250

MILESTONES	EXPECTED DATES	MTE Comments
Start of Project/Programme Implementation	November 2012	Actual implementation start mid 2013
Mid-term Review (if planned)	November 2014	1 year behind the planned schedule
Project/Programme Closing	May 2016	Extension to November 2017
Terminal Evaluation	May 2016	Postopone to November 2017

Samoa's Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change reports best estimates of long term, systematic changes in the future climate for Samoa. They indicate that by 2050 sea level is likely to have increased by 36 cm, rainfall by 1.2%, extreme wind gusts by 7% and maximum temperatures by 0.7 C. This Adaptation Fund (AF) programme is designed to complete a holistic and country-wide approach to climate change adaptation in the coastal zones in Samoa.

The proposed programme contributes to all outcomes listed within the 2 objectives of the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework (AFB/EFC.2/3 from 31 August 2010), and corresponds particularly to the following higher order fund-level outputs:

Output 1.1. Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated at national level;
Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems;
Output 1.3 Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities; and

Output 2.2 Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability.
Output 2.4. Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability

The strengthening, engagement and coordination of key institutions at the national, island and community levels will combine with the integration of both Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) in national and community policies, plans and work programmes, and with training of key players at national and community levels, to ensure the success of interventions designed to enhance national and community resilience to climate change, including climate-related disasters. These actions will be supported by, and contribute to, knowledge management initiatives.

The programme has a three-pronged approach, focusing on the implementation of on-the ground adaptation and DRR measures at national and community levels, integrated with sustainable national development processes and supported through enhanced national institutional and knowledge management capacities and initiatives. The programme is supporting the integration of climate change considerations into national and sectoral policies and related instruments. In particular, the programme provides the financial and technical means to implement the approved Coastal Infrastructure Management (CIM) Plans on the ground as a practical community based response to adaptation. The programme enables the necessary technical and financial resources to be used in a programmatic manner which, when combined with the parallel complementary works undertaken through the CRIP/PPCR, will result in a —whole of country adaptation response for coastal management on a national scale.

The Programme is being implemented through UNDP's National Implementation (NIM), with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) as the designated national executing agency ("Implementing Partner") of the project in coordination with the Planning and Urban Management Agency (PUMA). The MNRE has the technical and administrative responsibility for applying AF inputs in order to reach the expected Outcomes/Outputs as defined in this project document. The MNRE is responsible for the timely and effective implementation of the project, and in this context, for the coordination of all other responsible parties, including other line ministries, civil society organizations and other relevant key stakeholders.

1.1. Programme Progress towards results

The programme is progressing **moderately satisfactory (MS)** towards the achievement of its objective. Significant implementation delays (of 18 months) at project start were due to the Government attempting to align the AF project and the Worl Bank funded PPCR initiative in a coordinated effort at administrative, procurement and technical levels. This coordination effort led to significant technical and administrative analysis of both programs and government procedures, leading to poor programme implementation during the first 18 months. However, the programme performance (i.e. administrative management, disbursement, activities implementation, stakeholder involvement) has significantly improved since Q2-2015, and the MTR has assessed that the programme could be satisfactory (S) by the programme end in November 2017.

The programme activities, implemented through the MTR point, have been logically and sequentially addressing the core issues of climate change adaptation in Samoa with specific focus on CIM and 'no-regrets' solutions to build coastal resilience. The programme has progressed in implementing low-cost and replicable climate change adaptation activities as regards to water management, while adaptation activities in the infrastructure sector (seawall, road construction, river bank), albeit having a significant spatial and

temporal development impact, will require larger financial and technical commitments to be replicated in other sites. The programme has been Moderately Satisfactorly supporting (i) climate change mainstreaming of technical policy and plans for key development sectors (i.e. agriculture, infrastructure, tourism, water) and (ii) capacity needs assessments and capacity building for various government and community stakeholders for sound climate change adaptation planning and decision making. Finally, the ownership of programme outputs by key stakeholders is positively evolving towards more responsibility and appropriation, as indicated by line ministry interviews that suggested a willingness to integrate this programme targets into government targets.

The programme delivery rate is low (18%) at the MTR point, but could increase to a satisfactory level (i.e.>70%) by the programme closure in 2017, when considering the relative delivery rate during 2015 (82%). Some technical and management concerns remain for Outcome 1 and 2 planning and impact. A such, urgent adaptive management measures are required (Table 2), and the project team is capable of implementing these in collaboration with key stakeholders during Q2-2016, as verified by the MTR.

The programme log-frame should be revised in terms of some outcome indicators, and programme targets (e.g. km of climate resilient infrastructure)- taking into consideration the remaining programme timeframe and technical constrains to deliver some planned adaptation activities in Samoa (i.e. coastal protection seawall and road construction). Some adaptive management measures have already been implemented, such as more regular information sharing meetings (i.e. 6 monthly meetings to coordinate CIM, quarterly Steering Committee meetings with relevant key ministries and stakeholders to update on programme progress and financial reports); however, other key measures are urgently required for all outcomes (in particular, strengthening the programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E) between UNDP and MNRE/PUMA, and supporting a regular CC capacity building for various stakeholders).

1.2. Concise summary of conclusions

At the MTR point, the programme is on-track to meet its overall objective, but is still at risk to underperform in two outcomes (1 and 2). Further to a slow start due to administrative and planning issues (i.e. administrative and technical alignment with Samoa PPCR), the programme has significantly increased its performance and technical/ strategic impacts to advance in building Samoa's resilience in coastal communities with key applied activities. The programme is underperforming in building adaptive capacity in coastal communities, as well as strengthening government institutional- adaptive capacity. The programme activities have potentially significant impacts beyond the project implementation in building climate change resilience in Samoa coastal communities.

The programme implementation has mainly focused on Outcome 2. The MTE strongly suggests focusing, from Q2-2016 onwards, on: capacity building, CIM implementation and awareness raising on CC impacts and response. The MTR also finds that the programme could further capitalize on some implemented feasibility studies (water and tourism), under Outcome 2, to support the development of CCA policies and plans for water and tourism sectors in Outcome 3.

Key stakeholder partners (government line ministries, village councils, appointed focal points, and beneficiaries) are increasing their engagement in the AF programme activities implementation and planning. This engagement represents a significant support towards the programme overall objective, and a clear signal for the long-term sustainability of the programme results. However, the programme M&E system for each outcome activities should be reviewed and strengthened (i.e. increase in M&E frequency by line ministries and UNDP, data systematization, evaluation and adaptive management response) as well as the

subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the outcome activities progress (particularly in Savaii).

The programme results achieved at the MTR point can be estimated of moderate/low impact for CCA capacity building, support to CCA policy development, and applied CCA activities for coastal communities in Samoa. The overall interest and acceptance of the programme activities among various stakeholders is high, and it has been increasing. Key stakeholders at the central government level (MNRE/PUMA, Ministry ofHealth, MWCSD[1], LTA, Samoa Water Authority, Tourism) are interested in further technical and management collaborations, and to develop updated climate change adaptation policies based on this programme results. At the community and district level, key stakeholders (village councils, communities) have been involved towards the planning implementation of CCA activities (seawall, water schemes, road and river bank construction). At the MTR point, the programme has shown moderate potential to replicate water management schemes of the Outcome 3 activities due to cost-effective, environmental friendly, in situ techniques.

At the end of the programme, in 2017, the potential programme impact at national, island and district level, while still not measurable, can be estimated to be moderate, if all adaptive management recommendations are swiftly implemented during Q2-2016. The programme could play a pivotal role in supporting national institutions in implementing CIMs, and developing CCA for various economical sectors (infrastructure, tourism, and water management) and further building island communities' resilience to CC impacts. The programme has high potential to catalyze technical and financial interests (i.e. GCF, EU-GCCA+) further before its completion in 2017, if an effective, detailed and well-advertised communication strategy about lessons learnt is shared among key government and private stakeholders. Finally, the ownership of programme outputs by key stakeholders is positively evolving towards more responsibility and appropriation, but requires a more robust M&E approach.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Purpose of the MTE and objectives

The purpose of this MTE is providing an overall project assessment and an opportunity to critically review administrative and technical strategies and issues at half-way project implementation. This MTE gives recommendations to improve the project potential in achieving expected outcomes and objectives within the project timeframe.

This MTE serves primarily as a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that the project is on track in achieving maximum results by its completion. The primary output/deliverable of a MTE process is this MTE report.

Main objectives of this MTE are:

1. Assessment of progress towards results;
2. Monitoring of implementation and adaptive management to improve outcomes;
3. Early identification of risks to sustainability;
4. Emphasis on supportive recommendations.

[1] Ministry of Women Community and Social development

In order to asses these four objectives, the MTE reviewed the following documents:

1. AF- PRODOC;
2. Inception reports;
3. Quarterly progress reports;
4. Project Performance Reports (PPRs) to the Adaptation Fund
5. Consultant's Inception reports (if any);
6. All AWPs (annual work plans);
7. All annual and quarterly financial project reports;
8. Consultancy products (report, technical studies, etc.)
9. Financial auditing, if any;
10. Budgeting documents by various stakeholders;
11. Community Meetings minutes.

Furthermore, the stakeholder interviews at various programme level (from beneficiaries to planners) helped assessing the progress of the MTE objectives.

2.2. Scope & Methodology

The MTE has been undertaken through a combination of processes including a desk study, selected sites visits (Upolu and Savaii), meetings and stakeholder interviews including: programme team, executing agencies, task team/ component leaders, key experts in the subject area, programme stakeholders, local government, village councils and beneficiaries.

Four field visits were conducted in Upolu (5 days visiting independent water schemes in various communities, seawall in Apia, road construction and relocation scheme) and Savaii (2 days visiting riverbank protection wall) islands, respectively, to observe actual implementation of demonstration projects, and to discuss with the key provincial departments and community leaders involving in the project implementation. A number of beneficiaries from the demonstration project were also selected on random basics for interviews.

The methodology for the evaluation covered the following areas:

1. Desk study review of all relevant Project documentation;
2. A performance assessment of the project against the 'Indicators of success';
3. Consultations and interviews with main project stakeholders;
4. Site visits in various communities on Upolu and riverbank protection on Savaii;

Interview questions are prepared based on the list of questions /requirement stated in the MTE TOR and in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Mid-term Review of UNDP-Supported GEF-financed Projects" published in June 2014. The evaluation has been carried out based on descriptive assessments and on the basics of a scoring system presented in Annex 2, i.e. 6-level score is applied for rating project objective/outcomes as well as project implementation and adaptive management, and 4-level score is applied for rating project sustainability. The evaluative criteria used by the MTE were UNDP/GEF evaluation criteria (i.e. effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability, and impact). The major limitation of the MTE was related to the relatively limited time (12 days) to assess all relevant data sources during the filed mission.

The potential limitation of this MTE include:

1. Limited field time to visit other programme activities being implemented in Upolu under outcome 3;
2. Limited stakeholder availability to conduct interviews;
3. Limited time to review in detailed proposed recommendations with key stakeholders;
4. Limited time to assess evolving risks and country uncertainties into the assessment of programme results.

This MTE process followed two implementation phases:

1. Implementation: MTE inception report, the MTE mission, and presentation of the initial MTE findings with key stakeholders;
2. Post-Mission: the drafting, review and finalization of the MTE report; and support to the preparation of the management response;

2.3. Structure of the MTE report

This report is divided into a number of key sections (i.e. this main report, presenting a summary of the findings, log-frame review, financial delivery analysis and recommendations for future activities). The report is also supported by a series of Annexes:

1. MTE ToR (excluding ToR annexes);
2. MTE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of data, methodology) + Ratings Scales;
3. Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection;
4. MTE mission schedule;
5. List of persons interviewed;
6. List of documents reviewed.
7. Gender Sensitive Analysis;

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

3.1 Background

Samoa's Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change reports best estimates of long term, systematic changes in the future climate for Samoa. They indicate that by 2050 sea level is likely to have increased by 36 cm, rainfall by 1.2%, extreme wind gusts by 7% and maximum temperatures by 0.7 C. The observed long-term trend in relative sea level for Apia is 5.2 mm/yr. But maximum hourly sea level is increasing by approximately 8 mm/yr, a rate far in excess of the observed local and global trends in mean sea level. For Apia an hourly sea level of 1.8 m above mean sea level is currently a 100-year event. It will likely be at least a four-year event by 2025.

The focus of climate change scenarios for Samoa is overwhelmingly on the nature and frequency of extreme events (e.g. tropical cyclones, drought), and how their impacts may be exacerbated by sea-level rise. Over a medium timeframe, sea-level rise will incrementally impact upon Samoa through events such as flooding, coastal erosion and damage to coastal infrastructure. While low islands (e.g. atolls) are often judged to be

more vulnerable to sea-level rise than high (e.g. volcanic) islands, the propensity for communities to be located along the coastal margins results in similar risks and vulnerabilities for all small island groups. In Samoa, 70% of the population is reported to live within 1 km of the coast and critical infrastructures (e.g. hospitals, schools, port facilities, power plants, airports, tourist infrastructure) are also located in this zone.

The programme provides the financial and technical means to implement the approved Coastal Infrastructure Management (CIM) Plans on the ground as a practical community based response to adaptation. The programme enables the necessary technical and financial resources to be used in a programmatic manner which, when combined with the parallel complementary works undertaken through the CRIP/PPCR, will result in a —whole of country-adaptation response for coastal management at the nationwide scale. The implementation of appropriate responses is supported by the programme through site specific design of adaptation interventions and active community engagement in the process.

3.2 Project Description and Objective

Alignment of this AF initiative with the Samoa's CRIP/PPCR has been a critical element of the programme design. This is achieved through high level co-ordination between the two programmes through the sharing of a Steering Committee, pursuit of coordinated and complimentary actions across the districts supported by each programme and common processes adopted to execute works items. The 41 districts of the country have been divided between the two programmes. CRIP/PPCR is financed through the WB with 25 million USD focusing on 8 districts along a major road climate proofing and upgrade project plus a further 8 districts which focus on the early version CIM Plans completed under Infrastructure Asset Management Programme 1 (IAMP1). There is also a balance of districts between the two major islands. The AF programme will target the remaining 25 districts in Samoa– the remaining 6 districts where CIM Plans were completed under the IAMP1 project between 2000 – 2003 plus a further 19 which were completed more recently under the Samoa Infrastructure Asset Management Phase 2 (SIAM2). Upon completion of the two programmes, the entire country will have made substantial progress toward adaptation to CC induced changes in the environment.

This programme is designed to complete a holistic and country-wide approach to climate change adaptation in the coastal zones in Samoa. The programme has a 3-pronged structure, focusing on the implementation of on-the ground adaptation measures at the community level, integrated with sustainable development processes and supported through enhanced national institutional and knowledge management capacities. The programme has a 3-pronged approach:

1. A main focus upon on-the-ground implementation of coastal adaptation measures, addressing climate change impacts on key infrastructure elements and coastal ecosystems in an integrated way. Integration is achieved within the framework of a comprehensive village land use plan – the CIM Plan.
2. Strengthened institutional policies and capacities to provide an enabling environment for climate resilient coastal development; and,
3. The systematic capture and dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned to aid and inform further implementation and pursuit of climate resilient development.

The programme components and relative outcome are:

Component 1: Community-engagement in coastal vulnerability assessment, adaptation planning and

awareness

The process of coastal adaptation in Samoa is strongly community-based. The CIM Plans are community based plans focusing upon response planning for individual villages taking into account their particular geographical circumstances and the community's perceptions of their needs. As the —partnership principle of the CIM Plans underpins the success of implementation of adaptation works (Component 2) and needs to be supported by increased institutional capacity and knowledge (Component 3), the proposed programme components have strong inter-dependencies.

Outcome 1: Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages.

Component 2: Integrated Community–Based Coastal Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management measures

This Component of the programme contains the bulk of the physical actions, outcomes and outputs. Essentially, it is the practical adaptation activities identified in the CIM Plans which are all designed to increase community resilience. In each village, a set of concerted adaptation actions will be carried out in a programmatic fashion, in order to have a significant impact on reducing community vulnerability. The actions will be implemented upon the plan base established and reconfirmed under Component 1 and require the capacity enhancements which Component 3 will deliver. Overall infrastructure related improvements represented around 35% of the combined District and village level actions identified in the CIM Plans.

Outcome 2: Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate change in 25 Districts and 139 villages.

Component 3: Institutional strengthening to support climate resilient coastal management policy frameworks

Component 3 has been designed to secure the institutional and capacity improvements to enable full realization of the benefits of Components 1 and 2. It provides for targeted support in key areas in the main Ministries responsible for CCA action. The focus has been upon capturing key lessons learned and building capacity improvements in a manner which will ensure they can be sustained as a core activity of the Government in future.

Outcome 3: Strengthened institutional capacity of government sectors to integrate climate and disaster risk and resilience into coastal management-related policy frameworks, processes and responses.

3.3 Implementation Arrangement

The Project will be implemented through UNDP's **National Execution Modality (NEX),** with the Ministry of natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) serving as the designated national executing agency ("*Implementing Partner*") of the project. MNRE will have the technical and administrative responsibility for applying AF inputs in order to reach the expected Outcomes/Outputs as defined in this project document. MNRE is responsible for the timely delivery of project inputs and outputs, and in this context, for the coordination of all other responsible parties, including other line ministries, local government authorities and/or UN agencies.

Upon the request of the Government of Samoa, UNDP will serve as the Multilateral Implementing Agency (MIE) for this project. Services that UNDP will provide to the Implementing Partner in support of achieving project Outcomes are outlined in Annex 1. UNDP's services will be provided by staff in the UNDP Multi-Country Office in Samoa, UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre in Bangkok (with a Regional Technical Advisor on Adaptation out-posted in Samoa) as well as UNDP Headquarters (New York).

To deliver specific Outputs as outlined in the logical framework, MNRE can delegate such responsibilities to external partners (to be referred to as *Responsible Parties*) through direct contracting. MNRE will bear responsibility for the delivery of those Outputs and put in adequate place measures to oversee such work. Such institutions will be contracted through appropriate modalities (as advised by UNDP). The corresponding Letters of Agreement (LoA) will be annexed to the project document that will be signed between UNDP and the Government of Samoa after the AF project document has been endorsed.

3.4 Stakeholder Analysis

This programme stakeholders include the following Government ministries and agencies:

1. Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)
2. Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSD)
3. Ministry of Works, Transport and Infrastructure (MWTI)
4. Land Transport Authority (LTA)
5. Samoa Water Authority (SWA)
6. Electric Power Corporation (EPC}
7. Ministry of Finance (MoF)
8. Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC)
9. Ministry of Health (MoH)

Furthermote, this programme actively engaged various stakeholders in Samoan communities during the programme's activities planning and relative implementation phase. These stakeholders include: representatives of all key vulnerable groups in the communites, including the matais (both men and women), women and youth groups, public and private sector stakeholders, the council of chiefs, and district authorities.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Programme Strategy

The programme is estimated to meet the key objective moderately satisfactorly (MS) presented in the PRODOC by the programme closure. At the MTE point, the programme is performing moderately satisfactory (MS). The programme management team is highly competent, motivated and knowledgable. This rating also reflects the relative technical and strategic implementation delays of Outcome 1 and 2 i.e. revision of CIM plans and applied climate change adaptation activities.

The overall Implementation Progress Rating is deemed MS meaning that implementation of project outcomes is in substantial compliance with the original plan except for delays that can be successfully

managed during Q2-2016. This rating could be significantly improved to Satisfactory (S) by the end of project closure if key recommendations are implemented swiftly.

The MTE considers that an appropriate balance between impact and resources has been achieved, and the project is being efficiently implemented. Overall, the programme inputs have been of a high quality and are clearly meeting the beneficiaries' needs. All stakeholders consulted believed that the training and technical assistance provided by the project has been important and valuable for increasing the capacity and knowledge on climate change adaptation for various key development sectors in Samoa. These training and technical assistance inputs are facilitating the achievement of the programme expected results in terms of investment, although significant scaling-up of inputs will be necessary to achieve levels to meet the programme targets. Furthermore, more regular (quarterly) capacity building trainings (i.e. adaptation activities planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, climate change and DRR risks assessments) among various national stakeholders are needed to support the achievement of Outcome 1, as well as contributing to Outcome 2 (development of climate change policy and development plans).

The programme design has recently begun streamlining activities results within responsible line ministries (LTA, Water division, tourism, MWCSD). The programme team has been providing government staff, councils members and beneficiaries training opportunities, and begun stimulating discussions on climate change adapation for Samoa livelihoods over the short and the medium term. However, such mechanisms are undermined by the insufficient integration of organizational development strategies within the funded project designs. Efforts to integrate and disseminate information and knowledge from the funded projects and about them have been self-managed by the programme team, but will require substantial communication and systematization scaling up once project results are achieved.

More programmatic guidance is needed for designing approach, particulary under Outcome 1 and 2, to ensure that a good balance between soft and hard measures is achieved. In particular, capacity building activities (Outcome 1, 3) are designed independently from any guiding parameters/ principles in realtion to applied adaptation activities (i.e. infrastructure construction, tourism development, IWRM- Outcome 2). Although this reflects the flexibility of working approaches within UNDP, it also highlights the limited uniformity in considering some of the basic developmental principles. Other parameters such as outreach, replicability, scaling, innovation and sustainability are also useful to consider as principles for designing capacity building and policy development activities, but yet not considered systematically within all activities under Outcome 1 and 2.

<u>Relevance</u>

The programme is relevant to the original PRODOC analysis in addressing the current and foreseen climate change threats in Samoa, particularly in relation to building resilient infrastructure, water and practices. The main programme objective correctly addresses the identified climate change issues in Samoa, and the associated social needs (improving livelihoods, building resilience in infrastructure, tourism and water sectors). The programme objective is also in line with country and global climate change adaptation priorities. Furthermore, the programme objective is in line with the local culture, indigenous knowledge and tradition and national development policies, strategies and priorities.

The appropriateness of the objectively-verifiable indicators of achievement in the programme logical framework require some review by the programme steering committee, to ensure a proper evaluation by the end of the programme (refer to Table 5). Some objective indicators are not SMART or GENDER, and proposed amendments have been proposed.

The monitoring and evaluation arrangements require strengthening in terms of frequency, overall quality information gathering and communication, particularly by UNDP M&E missions' frequency. The baseline information has been found to be accurate. Finally, the MTE confirms that appropriate contextual analysis was carried out to support programme design.

Effectiveness and Efficiency

The overall programme outputs and outcomes have been MS against results framework/logical framework targets, and with the collected monitoring data. The programme logic has been well thought and rationalized. However, the implementation effort has been mainly focusing on Outcome 3 (as it holds the majority of the budget). A more conceptual balance between hard and soft adaptation measures should be implemented, as capacity building and policy development.

The programme implementation shortcomings were not due to a failure to take account of issues such as gender, environment and other social issues, but rather to the initial learning by the programme staff of AF-UNDP administrative and procurement procedures. The overall cooperation and coordination between the PMS, government and other stakeholders has been contributing to the effectiveness of the project.

The programme activities have been carried out in a timely manner, once the operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs) had been agreed and approved by the PSC at the beginning of the programme. The programme outputs been obtained at a moderate-high financial cost mainly due to logistical constrains between island of Pa Enua. However, the programme organization approach had been adequate in attempting to deliver the best cost-effective outputs.

The programme management systems and execution processes functioned well, despite the initial implementation delay. The quality of day-to-day management, coordination and accountability with local authorities (islands councils, mayors), institutions, beneficiaries, has been up to AF standard. Technical and management contributions from local institutions, government and island beneficiaries have been moderate, but expected to increase as the programme implementation delivery progresses.

4.2 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements

The project has experienced significant delays in implementation mainly due to challenges in aligning with the WB-funded PPCR project, in order to ensure a whole of a country integrated process. While UNDP supported this through advising government and liaising with WB representatives at various levels, since early stages of the AF project in 2012, it did not bring satisfactory results, due to the following reasons:

1. Differing timeline of PPCR/WB project formulation and implementing procedures for the relevant investment component, as well as delays in PPCR mobilisation (including the consultancy on reviewing and updating the CIM-Plans and LiDAR and aerial photography acquisition). The Project Appraisal Document (basically the prodoc) for this initiative was finalized in late 2013.

2. Setting up of joint project implementation structure and arrangements. This is the first time for the Samoa Government to create a single Project Management Unit (PMS) for both projects, and to also utilize the same steering committee. PPCR is executed by the Ministry of Finance (MoF) and the AF programme by Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) and

its Planning and Urban Management Authority (PUMA).

Further to this initial delay, starting from 2014 the AF programme has successfully established a PMS within PUMA to deliver the programme outputs. Since March 2015, the PMS has been supporting PUMA with both projects implementation especially with planning, financial management operations, reporting and monitoring of the AF project. The programme team is satisfactorly performing management, implementation and strategic planning tasks. The programme coordination is performing as per AF standard and efficiently in. It could be further improved in terms of more regular reporting activities to key stakeholders at the community level, and with some key stakeholders as regards to technical discussion (Civil Society, SUNGO, Water Authority and LTA). This coordination should also aim at ensuring that lessons-learnt from all outcomes begins to be systemized in one programme document.

The programme management arrangements defined in the PRODOC have not significantly changed during the programme implementation. These management arrangements are overall effective and efficient. UNDP is providing technical backstopping, but could significantly improve its M&E role and reporting to further support the programme delivery and strategic planning (particularly for capacity building and policy development). The programme team has transparently consulted key stakeholders (3.3) for the decision-making process of programme activities planning, and has undertaken quarterly and annual reporting in a timely manner.

Work planning

The programme experienced significant implementation delays (approximately 18 months) during the initial start phase (2012-2013). These delays were due to (i) aligning administrative and management procedures between Samoa PPCR, (ii) delay in agreement on annual work-plan with key stakeholders, and (iii) coordinating Outcome activities with government processes in terms of climate change adaptation. Further to this initial delay, the programme team has successfully managed to progress satisfactorily with project implementation, to adjust the annual work-plan to be aligned with government ongoing processes and to engage key stakeholder in activities planning and management.

The programme work-planning processes are results-based oriented, and that the development of annual work-plans is revised following a RBM approach. The programme team has been using the project log-frame as a management tool. However, the programme team has not systematically and regularly reviewed key elements (indicators and end of project targets) of the log-frame. At the time of this MTE, the programe team is aware of this urgent revision, and it has begun to systematically analyze the programme performance vs. current indicators and end of the programme target. As discussed later in the report (Table 5), this MTE suggests that some (20%) of the end of programme targets to be revised considering the current and expected programme performance. This minor revision will not significantly influence the programme development impact as building resilience in Samoa.

Programme-level monitoring and evaluation systems

The M&E programme plan is adequate, and up to AF standard. The M&E plan has been sufficiently budgeted and funded during programme preparation. However, the M&E has been weakly implemented thus far, mainly due to slow implementation rate during the first project period (2012-2013). It is expected that the M&E plan will increase its delivery rate in the upcoming implementation phase (2016-2017). It should be highlighted that some programme outcome indicators is rather ambitious. For instance, *Component 2: By the end of the programme at least 80km of coastal roads and related infrastructure is improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress". The allocated budget of USD 6,024,360 which*

was considered unrealistic. Revision of some indicators is required to allow an efficient M&E analysis particularly for the final project evaluation.

The M&E systems are appropriate to the programme specific context at the national and provincial level. However, the actual M&E implementation at various activities sites has been irregular. UNDP's role in supporting programme M&E tasks should be strengthened for all ourcome activities to determine the current programme activities impact and adaptive management activities (e.g. In Savaii, no M&E evaluation by UNDP/MNRE mission have been conducted for the last 12 months). Furthermore, the programme M&E should evaluate the actual performance of climate change adaptation activities at demonstration sites by collecting key data (water availaibility during the dry period, increase in food production) in relation to the expected climate change impacts. In particular, perspectives of women and men involved in these demonstration activities should be also monitored and assessed. Furthermore, the M&E activities should strive to address the following questions regarding the CIM review and subsequent implentation:

1. Is the proposed development in general accordance with the objectives of the CIM Plan?
2. Is the development specifically recommended in the CIM Plan?
3. What is the number of people that will benefit from the development, i.e. population benefit?
4. Will the development provide life sustaining support for communities?
5. Are there likely to be significant adverse environmental effects?
6. Will the development complete works that have already started?
7. Will the development improve resilience?
8. Will the development achieve speedy recovery?
9. Will the development reduce risk?
10. Has the proposed development been identified in a Village Sustainable Development Plan?

Finally, the programme holds the appropriate AF monitoring tools to provide the necessary M&E information at outcome and output level. These tools include community-led M&E, project team monthly meeting minutes, quarterly M&E, councils' decisions, beneficiaries interview and log-frame indicators monitoring. The MTE found that key partners have been weakly involved in M&E activities, and the programme to align such activities with national M&E systems.

Some adaptive management measures have been implemented such as more regular information sharing meetings (i.e. 6 months cycle meetings to coordinate CIM, quarterly coordination meetings with various line ministries and government agencies to update on programme report), but other key measures are urgently required for all outcomes (in particular, strengthening the programme M&E between UNDP and MNRE/PUMA, and supporting a regular CC capacity building for various stakeholders).

<u>Log-frame analysis and amendements</u>

The MTE reviewed the original programme log-frame considering the current implementation rate, logistical constrains, planned activities and stakeholders' interviews. The programme logframe has not been regularly (quarterly) reviewed to adjust for local context and emerging issues, such as the low capacity baseline, slower implementation rate than predicted and sparse and limited information regarding climate change risk for various sectors. The programme team should review and update the logframe particularly as regards to (i) end of project target for each outputs, (ii) SMART indicators, and (iii) review some outputs information. Further to stakeholder consultations, the MTE has proposed a revised version of the current logframe (Table 5).

Programme Risks Review

The MTE finds that 5 out of 11 the risks identified at PRODOC development have remained unchanged, while 6 outof 11 have decreased their influences, showing clearly improvement in programme management, context and stakeholder involvement (Table 5). In particular, preliminary results from the demonstration sites have significantly contributed in showing the valuable cost-benefit of the proposed adaptation activties. Furthermore, the programme team has successfuly contribruted in decreasing the risk impact of inadequate coordination among keystakeholders by regular meetings and information sharing.

Table 6. MTE Review and Observation of Project Risks.

Risk	Level	Mitigation measures	Responsibility	**MTE Observations**
As this programme is designed to be complementary to the CRIP/PPCR programme, any delay in that would impact on achieving desired "whole of country" joint project outputs and outcomes and reduce scope to deliver programme as outlined in proposal	L	Develop close coordination between the two programmes with a joint PSC. CRIP/PPCR funding approval has been granted by the WB with the project now moving into the inception phase.	MNRE, MoF and UNDP	This risk has decreased to very low, and no evidence was found that risk will pose a conceptual or implementation limitation to the programme.
Extreme climatic events and geophysical hazards damage or eradicate programme results, or cause major disturbances resulting in delays due to needed emergency and recovery processes	M	Close monitoring of any developing climate events over the duration of the programme and ensuring responses are effected within the national DRM response framework.	MNRE	This risk level remains unchanged, as Samoa vulnerability to extreme climatic events has not changed.
Poor collaboration between project partners	M	Inception workshop to clarify roles and responsibilities and establish and implement project stakeholder collaboration and team building activities	NPC	This risk has decreased to very low, as key government partners are overall supportive of the programme objectives and target goals.
Weak cooperation by villages in proposed districts.	L	Previous CIM Plan experience would suggest low likelihood of this occurring but programme will seek and confirm community commitment during early stage of project and build ownership	MNRE and MWCSD	This risk has decreased to very low, as key villages and community association have shown interest and and being supportive of the programme activities.
Land disputes amongst village members adversely affecting	M	Use project technical team to encourage village to	MNRE, MWCSD and	This risk remains unchanged,

village relocation land use planning.		devise a community lead solution through consultation to secure commitment and minimize disputes	Village councils	highlighting potential conflicts for land ownership based on planned activities of the programme. Particular attention should be taken in ensuring previous and long-term land use agreement before activities implementation.
Limited human resources in Government ministries and agencies to contribute to the activities.	M	Secure participation of key Ministries and Agencies during programme inception phase and use positions to be recruited in the project to provide technical backstopping. Project monitoring process to identify any problems at an early stage and NPC to arrange for alternative measures including use of NGOs and community members	NPC and UNDP	This risk remains unchanged, as specialized government human resource are being utilized not exclusively for this programme, but other government priorities.
A series of unusually adverse climatic conditions damage adaptation measures being implemented, or weaken the interest of key stakeholders to addressing adaptation issues.	L	Schedule project activities to avoid and/or respond to such occurrences.	NPC	This risk has decreased to very low, as the programme has taken the proper precaution to implement activities during the no-cyclonic season.
The techniques and technologies developed are not gender sensitive – i.e. they increase inequity between men and women or change the social roles of men and women in a way that reduces self reliance.	M	Conduct training on gender analysis for project team and use guidelines during selection of technologies	NPC and MWCSD	This risk remains unchanged, as the gender dimension requires further consideration during the planning and implementation stage (see recommendation table).
The government is not supportive, politically and financially, to a cross-sectoral and integrated approach to the management of climate	L	Reinforce National CCA Policy mutual obligations for project implementation at programme outset	NPC	This risk level remains unchanged. However, partnerships with national and local partners should be

risks and opportunities.				strengthened further (Please see recommendation table).
Stakeholders are not able to perceive reductions in vulnerability over the time-scale determined by programme duration;	M	Maintain proactive outreach communications strategy for duration of programme.	NPC	This risk remain unchanged, as interviews with beneficiaries and various stakeholders clearly showed that their vulnerability reduction will be measured further the programme completion.
Stakeholders are not able to distinguish vulnerability to climate change from baseline weaknesses in land, coastal, and water resources management	M	Maintain proactive outreach communications strategy for duration of programme	NPC	This risk has decreased to low, as interviews with beneficiaries and various stakeholders clearly showed their understanding of increasing CC impacts on their livelihoods

Stakeholder engagement

The MTE team was able to confirm through interviews and communication exchanges that the majority of the programme stakeholders were consulted during the project preparation process, a broad range of national, provincial and local stakeholders were consulted, including both governmental and non-governmental organizations, through bilateral interviews, field surveys and workshops. These stakeholders were generally satisfied by their engagement level during this initial project phase, but felt a delay in the following-up communication and engagement during the first step of implementation.

The programme has engaged key government stakeholders in supporting the project objective. Various technical departments of line ministries (Water division, Infrastructure, Tourism) have been active towards the implementation of some programme activities, as demonstrated by participation in technical studies, workshops and field-activities. The programme continues to build the necessary and appropriate partnerships with government counterparts (such with the Tourism board, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Infrastructure, LTA, SUNGO). Key stakeholders (mainly PUMA, MNRE, and UNDP) have played an active role in project decision-making, contributing in efficient and effective programme implementation particularlystarting from 2015. This positive trend can be explained by the rising interest in the programme activities, and their potential impacts on government future climate change adaptation policy to key development sectors in Samoa.

Stakeholder involvement of the programme has yet to influence public awareness of climate change adaptation issues for rural infrastructure. However, the project is expected to build more public awareness during the remaining implementation period (2016-2017) when lesson learned and best practices will be

shared to a wider audience at the provincial and national level. Some limitations to stakeholder awareness of the programme outcomes can be identified as (i) the relative new concept of climate change adaptation in the Pa Enua (more awareness to deal with adaptation to water and agriculture sector) and (ii) technical level of some project outputs (risk assessment, studies, reports). The MTE suggests that this progamme should further support the already functioning community engagement mechanism, the Civil society support program (CSSP), to build community capacity regarding climate change resilience and adaptation planning, implementation and monitoring.

Finally, the MTE finds high and rising interest of various stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability. This notion is supported by (i) the willingness by authorities to replicate similar adaptation techniques in other sites and (ii) the overall understanding by PUMA to support policy development for climate change adaptation for key development sectors further to the project completion.

Reporting

To date, three annual work plans have been discussed and approved by the programme steering committee. As these annual work plans are not written in marble, they should be reviewed and adapted to the realities on the ground, particularly considering the logistical constrains faced by programme. On this basis, the Annual Reports are written every year. The quality of these Annual Reports is satisfactory although it is clear that they are not sufficiently critical of the results obtained. In other words, the annual reports could include a supplementary analysis and comments on the numerous proposals that would help improve the results obtained on the ground.

The programme team and relative partners have shown to fulfill reporting requirements satisfactory (Quarterly Reports, PPR, Steering Committee). The adaptive management response to PPRs , as indicated by work-plan review and adjustements, internal project meeting, additional stakeholder consultation, is overall moderately satisfactory, even though it appears to have been less effective for Outcome 1 and 2 than other Outcomes.

The MTE did not find evidence how lessons derived from the adaptive management process, as decribed in various PRRs, have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners and incorporated into project implementation. It is expected that such sharing process would start from the 2016 PPRs onwards.

Recognizing the importance of knowledge management (KM) to enhance impacts and facilitate replication, this initiative integrates various KM related actions. During and after the AF project, Samoans will know more about climate change and its likely impacts on the country, know about the range of measures to enhance resilience of coastal settlements and understand the importance of undertaking land use planning that integrates climate risks.

Communication

The overall programme communication is regular, but its effectiveness could be improved by follow-up communication actions (such as detailed comments on stakeholders questions, more details regarding programme activities). The MTE did not find evidence that key stakeholders are being overlooked and omitted by the programme communication.

The programme communication as regards to Outcome activities planning and coordination could be improved by convening quarterly stakeholders meetings. It appears that respective outcomes are

sometimes running a parallel implementation rather than as an integrated approach. The MTE finds that the programme communication with key stakeholders contributes to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and, in turn, it represents a positive development for long-term sustainability of project results.

The MTE finds that the programme has yet to implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns. However, these activities have been planned starting on Q2-2016. Finally, the programme should capitalize on the variety of key project stakeholders to produce a variety of communication materials to mainstream climate change adaptation for various sectors (infrastructure, tourism, coastal protection, water management, and local development).

Delivery rate

The project delivery rate at the MTE point is low, 18% (Table 3). Considering that implementation rate has significantly increased starting Q2-2105 (82%) and this trend appears to be sustained during 2016, the final delivery rate could be predicted to be satisfactory- (above 75%) by the end of the programme. All outcome delivery rates are unsatisfactory at MTE point (below 20%). Outcome 2 holds the majority of the total programme budget.

Table 3. Programme delivery rate (as per October 2015).

Outcome/Atlas Activity	Amount (USD) Year 1	Amount (USD) Year 2	Amount (USD) Year 3	Amount (USD) Year 4	Total (USD)
OUTCOME 1: Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages.	287,235	244,835	166,800	126,770	825,640
Expenditure (USD)	0	11,061.34	79,697.53	29,072.41	119,831.28
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	0	4.5	48	22	14
OUTCOME 2: Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate change in 25 Districts and 139 villages	740,053	2,311,052	2,045,631	927,624	6,024,360
Expenditure (USD)	31,734.00	0	115,798.28	1,021,036.83	1,168,569.11
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	4.2	0	5.6	110	19
OUTCOME 3: Strengthened institutional capacity of government sectors to integrate climate and disaster risk and resilience into coastal management-related policy frameworks, processes and responses	96,000	144,000	147,000	113,000	500,000
Expenditure (USD)	0	0	31,050.32	27,809.76	58,860.08
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	0	0	21	24	11
Project Management	189,250	173,000	152,000	184,000	698,250
Expenditure (USD)	0	19,353.27	67,018.70	21,393.38	107,765.35
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	0	11	44	11	15
Unrealized Loss/Gain	-367.84	994.30	2,626.57	14,878.33	18,131.36
Grand Total	1,312,538	2,872,887	2,511,431	1,351,394	8,048,250

Expenditure (USD)	31,366.16	31,408.91	296,191.40	1,114,190.71	1,473,157.18
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	2.4%	1.1%	12%	82%	**18%**

The MTE does not find significant variance between planned, as indicated by the PRODOC budget, and actual expenditures. Some minorvariance (in Outcome 1 and 2) is justified by adapting annual work-plans to existing project needs and local context particularly during the first two year of implementation (i.e. data collection in Outcome 1, planning for climate change adaptation activities in Outcome 2). The only variance referes to the temporal delay of expenditure due to the slow programme implementation start.

The programme management shows appropriate and up-to- AF/UNDP-standard management of financial resources, expenditures and following the procedure of annual audits. The programme management has undertaken budget revisions for Outcome 1 and 2. The MTE finds that such revisions have been appropriate and relevant to effectively implementing programme activities in a sequential and logical approach (i.e. policy review, capacity needs assessment, training development, supporting policy and code development). The relevance of such revision, particularly for capacity building activities in Outcome 2, shows also the project strategy to efficiently engaging key stakeholders in planning and management.

Co-financing

The MTE analyzed the programme co-finance (in-kind and cash) (Table 4). Considering that AF programme do not require specific co-financing, the MTE found that the programme was able to successfully engage the WB-PPCR programme in commiting financial and technical resources to support the programme activities. In particular, the MNRE, as implementing agency, and PUMA have benefited of cash co-financing by PPCR to support community engagement plan and coordination activities. Furthermore, the programme co-financing was present at the community level where the programme delivered climate change adaptation activities. For example, in Savaii, communities provided free labour and land access in the construction of the river embarkment protection wall. This successful and satisfactory co-finance represents a positive signal towards the overall programme stakeholder involvement, country ownership and long-term sustainability of the programme.

Table 4. Programme delivery rate (as per October 2015).

Co-financing	PPCR		AF
Activity	SAT	USD	USD
PMSU	4,186,403.00	1,674,561.20	
LIDAR		1,396,100.00	182,100.00
Community engagement plan		55,583.00	
Total co-financing		3,126,244.20	

4.3 Progress towards outcomes analysis

At the MTE point, the overall AF Programme Objective Rating is deemed Moderately Satisfactory (MS), meaning that the programme is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives with potentially shortcomings, if adaptaive management measures are not implemented during the second half of the project (2016-2017).

At the objective level, the programme is contributing in stimulating innovative approaches towards climate change adaptation in Samoa, and in building Samoa coastal communities resilience. Further to a slow implementation start and relative weak stakeholder engagement, the programme has gradually increased its performance starting from Q2-2015. When each outcome and outputs are screened versus rating scales, the following results are found:

Outocome 1- Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages (MU). The project has made some steps towards achieving the targets for this outcome. It is realistic that most of the outputs will be achieved in the second half of the project (2016-2017), at a moderately satisfactory (MS) rating. Finally, the outcome delivery rate is low (14%) at the MTE point, but expected to significantly increase in 2016. This outcome performance is moderately unsatisfactory, as key climate change mainstreaming and integration in into national and island planning process and policies (i.e. CIM plan) have weakly progressed. The PPCR has developed a methodology for the CIM Plan Review and government has agreed for AF to use the same methodology. The procurement of firms to review the CIM Plans is still at the approval process. This contributes much to the delay in getting the review of the CIM Plans for the AF 25 districts. The development of a relocation handbook that will guide relocation plans is slowly progressing. Training and awareness activities have been implemented at the community level, and aligned with the CIM Plan Review. These outcome activities have demonstrated opportunities to collaborate with other ongoing efforts on climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction in Samoa.

Outcome 2: Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate change in 25 Districts and 139 villages (MU). Progress is being made towards meeting the output- level targets for Outocome 3. Unfortunately, the progress has been slower than expected based on the original work-plan due to, among others, administrative, procurement and approval procedures during the initial programme phase. The programme has slowly, but steadily, advanced towards the achievement of this outcome. The CIM Plan Database has been progressively updated as the CIM Plan Review continues. Community water supply enhancement projects has commenced (and some completed in Ma'asina, Lona and Lele'a). Community stakeholders have clearly appreciated the Independent Water Scheme approach by the programme. A flood study for the Vaisigano Catchment was conducted in collaboration with the Water Resources Division of the Ministry and resourced under AFC, and it is expected that this study results will be translated in updated adaptation policies under Outcome 3. The outcome delivery rate is low (19%), but, as per other outcome, is expected to increase during 2016. This activity will be implemented considering the same approach as that for the PPCR districts and this has been under discussion since. There has been a revision on the approach since the last PPCR mission in November 2015 and both projects shall be securing the respective CIM Plan Review Team by end of Q2 2016. Despite that, AF has made review to the work plan and secure two key studies that will inform the CIM Plan Review. These are the (1) Review of the CIM Plan Implementation Status (2) Review of the CIM Strategy. We envisage positive progress for these components as was also approved by the MTR when the CIM Plan Review is underway.

Outcome 3- Strengthened institutional capacity of government sectors to integrate climate and disaster risk and resilience into coastal management-related policy frameworks, processes and responses (MS). Progress is being made towards meeting the output-level targets but with significant shortcomings as regards to the low delivery rate, and to activities delays for capacity building training considering the remaining project timeframe. Some outcome activities (i.e. training for policy makers) still remain at the planning stage. These outcome activities are contributing towards building capacity for climate change resilience in the infrastructure, water, agriculture and fisheries (to a lesser extent). CC awareness for

decision makers (trainings, workshops) have partially been implemented. The MTE strongly suggests designing a training program (consisting of 4-5 CCA and DRR modules) to be delivered during 2016. Strengthening programme stakeholders' capacity to assess CC impacts, select, design, implement and report on CCA and DRR solutions is still at initial implementation stage, but the overall stakeholder engagement provides suitable conditions to a successful implementation. The outcome delivery rate is low (11%).

However, encouraging implementation progress has been seen during the last 9 months including, for example, the construction of the river bank protection barrier (2.5 km) in Savaii,. The MTE finds that the programme team has the capacity, stakeholder engagement and financial resources to complete this crucial output by 2017. This outcome can perform HS if this urgent adaptative measure is implemented. The delivery rate is relatively low (18%) considering the official timeframe left, and this outcome holds the majority of the programme budget. Institutional capacity building in the communities under component 3 rellates much to the Review of CIM Plans under component 1.

Finally, this outcome M&E system, as per all the other outcomes, needs to be strengthened in terms of overall quality (information collected and analysis), frequency (regular, quarterly M&E reports) and communication to stakeholders.

Progress towards results

Progress towards results are presented in the table below.

Table 5. Programme Progress Towards Results

	Original Indicator / Proposed MTR amendment	**Baseline**	**Targets / Proposed MTR amendment**	**Achievements at MTR**	**Source of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**	**MTR Comments**
Objective Strengthened ability of coastal communities to make informed decisions about climate-change induced hazards and undertake concrete adaptation actions **MS**	Number of risk-exposed coastal communities protected through coastal adaptation measures based on climate-sensitive Coastal Infrastructure Management Plans (CIMP)	In the lack of systematic implementation of CIM Plans, the target villages and districts are highly exposed to climate-induced hazards	By the end of the programme 139 villages in 25 districts are protected from climate-induced risks as a result of coastal adaptation measures implemented guided by revised CIM Plans	Despite delays in the CIM Plan Review, the project has progressed to implement some of the no-regret interventions in the current version of the plans. Furthermore, the project has progressed to review the CIM strategy to reflect on the reef to ridge approach in addition to disaster management and risk reduction.	Project progress reports Technical reports Mid-term and Final Evaluations	Linkages between national institutional coordination and local development processes facilitate the timely review of CIM Plans and the implementation of community-level coastal adaptation measures	*There is only one bid responded to the joint CIM Plan Review for PPCR and AF. Negotiations was discontinued due to non-response to other bid requirements.*
Outcome 1 Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal	No. of Districts covered by reviewed and updated CIM Plans with climate change	The 6 CIM Plans prepared under IAMP1 have no DRM component. The 19 CIM	By the end of year one at least 8, year two 18 and by the completion of the programme	The CIM Plan Review has yet to commence.	Project progress reports. Annual workplans	Political stability is maintained Strong coordination amongst climate change	The review of CIM Plans will be the main activity for year 3 of

adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages through gender-sensitive processes **MU**	risks fully integrated	Plans prepared under SIAM2 require review.	at least 25 districts will have their CIM Plans reviewed and updated with climate change risks fully integrated, through balanced involvement of man, women and youth population.			stakeholders in the country Strong community leadership, cooperation and support for project activities.	the project given the efforts to align it with the similar review for the PPCR Districts.
	No. of Districts with village hazard zone relocation plans competed	There are currently no village relocation plans available to guide relocation activities for households to move out from coastal hazard zones.	By the end of year one 5, year two 10 and by the completion of the programme at least 15 districts will have at least one village hazard zone relocation plan completed through balanced involvement of man, women and youth population Observation: these targets might need some minor revisions (20 % reduction for each year) to guarantee quality control	This activity awaits the review of the CIM Plans and the availability of the Relocation Handbook that will be compiled under component 3.	Project progress reports. Annual workplans		This activity should be prioritized during Q2, Q3 2016.
	No. of community representatives trained on coastal risk assessment and adaptation and numbers of individuals engaged in those sessions. Revision: Please include the GENDER	Currently there has been no training for village leaders in coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes including village relocation planning.	By the end of the project at least 300 village representatives (including matais, women and youth groups) trained (year 1- 50, year 2- 100, year 3- 200), involving traditional leaders, women	The Community Engagement Plan prepared under PPCR will also be utilized for AF Districts. The CEP considers these trainings as part of the review. Therefore, the said trainings will be undertaken around year 3	*Sui o le Nuu* training session minutes and attendance registers		This activity should include/ review the gender dimension during the planned implementation (i.e. women participitation in

	dimension in this indicator.		and youth group representatives	when the CIM Plan Review is scheduled to start.			decision-making). Or just add disagregated by gender

Outcome 2 Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate change in 25 Districts and 139 villages **MU**	Km of coastal roads and related infrastructure improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress	There has been road reconstructions and upgrading undertaken in response to past hazards, such as the 2009 tsunami, but without integrating systematically climate change related risks in the process	By the end of the programme at least 80km of coastal roads and related infrastructure is improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress Observation: this target needs to be significantly revised based on financial considerations of road construction/ rehabilitation, and an achievable target proposed under this programme. In addition, the programme target should be also integrated into responsible line ministries. Suggested reduction of 40% of this programme target, and in current government projects.	A total length of 7.73 Km of coastal access roads were upgraded facilitating relocation of communities away from the coast.	Project progress reports. Annual workplans	Low staff turnover resulting in sustained capacity of government and partner institutions.	The unit cost ST 700 per meter for road construction is or about USD 280.00. To meet target of 80km of road will be impossible under the current project allocated resources.
	Km of coastline with climate resilient shoreline and flood protection measures introduced, including vegetation planting along the coast and riparian streams and beach	There are only a few villages, where shoreline adaptation measures have been introduced through the PACC and CBDAMPIC projects, but only in a pilot	By the completion of the programme climate resilient shoreline and flood protection measures are introduced in at least 140km coastline and riparian streams, including vegetation	The project has resourced a 700 meter long seawall; a river rock wall, and identified two sites for beach replenishment	Project progress reports. Annual workplans	Communities are willing and committed to actively participate in the project No political interference in selection of districts and village works sites	Ensure that the M&E acitivity are regularly (monthly visit) implemented during and futher the completion of physical construction to assess

	replenishment	fashion	planting in at least 60 km coast and 50 km of riparian streams, and beach replenishment techniques applied in at least 2 sites and 10 Km coastline. Observation: this target remains ambitious considering the current implementation status. These coastal protecion targets are suggested to urgently being aligned/ integrated in line minsitries/ departments targets OR to be reduced by 30%.				efficiency and effectivenes s of adaptation measures (and ideally a quantitative measure of community resilience).
	N. of population and communities accessing improved water sector services and infrastructure to manage impacts on water supply induced by climate change and variability Revision: Please include the GENDER dimension in this indicator.	The target villages lack robust water supply system to withstand climate-induced impacts in water supply	By the end of the programme at least 9,000 inhabitants in 15 villages have their water supply and associated infrastructure improved to manage climate-induced impacts on water supply	Three villages (Lona, Masina and Lelea) at total population of close to 700 were supported through systems to capture and distribute water. Two other sites are earmarked for 2016 in the island of Savaii	Project progress reports. Annual workplans		As previously, ensure that the M&E acitivity are regularly implmented during the all implementstion phases to measure (quantitevel y when possible) community involvement , improveme nt in water availaibility/ quality, and long-term water availaibility tredns vs. climate induced water cycle

							variability.
	Perception of coastal communities on changes in climate-induced risks as a result of interventions	Baseline to be set at the beginning of the project	By the end of the project at least 80% of the coastal communities involved perceive risk reduction to climate-induced hazards	This is expected at the end when CIM Plan for the selected districts are reviewed with some adaptation projects implemented.	Community consultations and surveys		Revise the questionnaire/ survey that will be eventually implemented to determine/ measure improved risk perception.

Outcome 3 Strengthened institutional capacity of government sectors to integrate climate and disaster risk and resilience into coastal management-related policy frameworks, processes and responses **MS**	Revised national organization and institutional structures to implement CIM Plans Revision: please quantify the No. Of structrures and clarify the 'revised' notion as regards to which thematic, management and strategic issues.	There is currently no organization specifically identified to co-ordinate the implementation of CIM Plan recommended works at the village and district level.	A revised CIM Plan management institutional structure is set up by end of year one of the project	With the CIM Plan Review now schedule for year 3, the institutional restructuring will be prepared The MNRE is going through a reform and review process. The project will implement the recommendation resulting to a revised institutional structure and possibly the legislative supporting act with the CIM Plans reflected as the template for Climate Adaptation and Disaster Risk management activities.	Project progress reports. Annual workplans	Government and NGOs provide on-going funding support to units responsible for information management and dissemination Strong strategic leadership and management within overnment and NGO agencies and national institutions.	This activity should be prioritized during Q2-Q3 2016 to support other capacity building activity in Outcome 1 and 3 (3.2, 3.3).
	A blueprint established and tested for Village relocation processes	There are currently no guidelines or procedures in place as to how to undertake village relocations in Samoa.	A completed and operationally tested village relocation handbook is developed by the end of the project to guide future relocation planning exercises	Preparation of the Relocation handbook awaits the CIM Plan Review where issues and affected areas will be identified.	Village relocation handbook completed and approved by the PSC by the end of the programme.	Senior officials and technical officers have the time to commit to planning and training activities.	Ensure that these activity outputs are systemized in one programme lesson/learnt document (and resources). Furthermore, evaluate the predicted

							and measured local livelihood impact further to this relocation (and the underlying variable controlling any variances between predicted vs. measured).
	Improved regulatory procedures for physical works implementation with climate change and disaster risk considerations incorporated. Revision: Please specifiy what 'improved' and considerations entails, i.e. quatitative information	Current regulatory procedures for physical works are incomplete and do not have consistent references to either climate change or disaster risk considerations .	Revised regulatory procedures for CIM Plan works is prepared by the end of year 3 of the programme	This will be looked at in 2016 which as implemented, the 3rd year of the project, to align with the prodoc.	Programme progress report	Government senior officials committed to incorporating climate change considerations in annual and strategic plans and budgeting processes	
	Number of policymakers and technical officers trained on climate risk assessment and planning processes for coastal adaptation.	Policymakers and technical officers have low to moderate levels of understanding of climate risk assessment and planning processes for coastal adaptation.	By the end of the programme at least 100 policymakers and technical officers exhibit improved levels of understanding of climate risk assessment and planning processes for coastal adaptation.	The activity ties with the institutional review, as it will broaden the knowledge of policy makers and technical officers on the CIM Plan, the risk assessment and planning processes that it is promoting	Records of training events and registers of attendees. Training notes prepared and delivered.		Revised the quantitative / qualitative training materials to be presented to policy makers in terms of key adaptive capacity categories (i.e. technical, predictive, management, reporting).
	Number of knowledge management	Absence of a communicatio n strategy and	By the end of the programme a communication	The project has prepared awareness	Web-sites Fact sheets Radio		As previously, ensure that

	products and South-South exchange events carried out	lack of information management system to support adaptation of coastal villages and districts to climate change risks.	strategy is developed and information and lessons learnt are compiled and disseminated to local, regional and international stakeholders through at least 4 different mediums By the end of Year 1 the project web site is operational and not fewer than 5 project communications have been published. By the end of Year 2 not fewer than 10 further project communications have been published	materials and briefs on the project. With new information now being gathered, it is time important to revisit the website and the supporting communication strategy and plan.	programs Television programs Project Technical reports Project monitoring and evaluation reports		these activity outputs are systemized in one programme lesson/learn t document (and resources).

Impact

The programme impact cannot be fully evaluated at the MTE point, as the most of the implementation will occur during 2016-2017. However, the MTE observed some significant, positive changes stimulated by the recent programme performance (from Q2-2015) as regards to addressing climate change risks at the community level, reviewing development plans to include climate change dimensions and capacity needs assessment at the individual and institutional level.

The programme has begun establishing a monitoring and evaluation system to determine the impact for the participating stakeholders regarding water security and DRR further to construction of access road, and community relocation. As noted in other report sections, this M&E system should be significantly strengthened to evaluate the programme actiites impact at various level (individual, institutional and strategic) during and after the programme implementation. The UNDP role in supporting regular M&E activities requires further strengthening in terms of human resources availaibility, and reporting evaluation.

The programme has, so far, a moderate impact in terms of as gender equality based on the gender questionnaire results with various stakeholders (including women beneficiaries, islands committees) highlighting the active and balanced involvement of both genders in programme activities, and decision-making process. The programme has also a moderate impace in terms of environment management and good governance in Samoa, as indicated by the regular village council meetings to discuss the programme activities and the relevant links with local environment and governance issues.

The programme has clear synergic technical and implementation opportunities (and impacts) with other government and international organisations (i.e. World Bank-PPCR), projects (GEF project- Ridge to reef approach) and programmes.

4.3 Sustainability

The overall programme sustainability is moderately likely (Table 1). The programme has shown potential to replicate demonstration adaptation techniques at different sites (i.e. village relocation, in-land access, community water schemes), mainly due to (i) stakeholders interest and engagement in programme activities, (ii) high potential to institutionalize project results into policies, regulation and manuals, and by integrating programme targets into line ministries targets (PUMA, MoF, LTA) particularly for targets of Outcome 2 and (iii) ownership of programme outputs by key stakeholders is slowly evolving towards more responsibility and appropriation by government line ministries (as indicated by the government ambition in align this program targets with line minisitries targets). A review of the main project risks does not reveal additional or more severe risks than previously estimated. The current sustainaibility state of the programme reflects the moderate likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Although delay in implementation start, various stakeholders (PUMA, MoF, Water Resource Division, LTA) have shown increasing interest and engagement in programme activities implementation.

The MTE estimates, via government interviews and national strategic policy documents on main Samoa development sector, that the Samoa Government can ensure the sustainability of the programme results by integrating climate resilience and adaptation-related activities in the work programming and budgetary planning processes of the relevant sectors, as part of the climate change mainstreaming aims under Outcome 3, supported through capacity building of policy makers and planners on climate risk assessments and adaptation planning processes. The MTE acknowledges that the sustained adaptation efforts at the national level has been pursued through the local level institutional strengthening and awareness raising activities in the process of reviewing the village level CIM Plans. These CIM Plans form the foundation for addressing priority adaptation measures in the selected villages, as well as the basis for further resource mobilization in the future.

<u>Financial risks to sustainability</u>

The likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the AF assistance ends, is moderate unlikely as various co-financing (in-kind and cash) options are potentially available among government and international partners (for example PPCR, EU-GGCA+, and GTZ). These stakeholders have shown some interest in mainstreaming climate change adaptation in large-scale infrastructure, agriculture and fisheries projects by including clmate change adaptation techniques and information towards policy development. Potential opportunities for long-term (5-7 years) co-financing (in-kind) exist in the current context.

Finally, the programme has yet to establish financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the AF assistance ends. However, at the community level, the replication potential of climate change adaptation activities is high and could be sustained with minimal financial investment and community engagement (already present during current programme demonstration activities). It is expected that the programme team will develop a roadmap regarding financial and management responsibilities further to project closure key government stakeholders (PUMA, MNRE) during early 2017.

Socio-economic to sustainability

The MTE did not find any significant political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of programme outcomes. The overall political context is conducive for the successful implementation and sustainability of the programme outcomes. The level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders), further to a slow start during the project initial phase, is considered sufficient to allow for the programme outcomes and benefits to be sustained. Some key commitments (i.e. financial and institutional support for M&E activities, leadership role towards policy and development plans' revision) still needs to be officially endorsed, but the MTE finds that these commitments are likely to occur before the project closure.

Key national stakeholders and islands communities are very interested in the programme activities, and they value the potential benefits of the programme successful outcomes towards their capacity building and policy development for climate change adaptation in their respective context. The public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the objectives of the programme is sufficient by regular communication of project progress and objective via line minsitries reports, TV discussions and community meetings. The programme team has started documenting lessons learned, and it is expected that such documentation would become more frequent starting Q2-2016. The MTE did not find evidence that such reporting has been undertaken on a regular basis.

The programme has yet to have transferred knowledge and successful results to key stakeholders, as key outcomes activities are still under implementation. The demonstration activities are already catalyzing the attention of local communities to potentially replicate such adaptation techniques in the future.

Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The legal framework and governance structures do not pose a significant risk to the programme sustainability. The standard government procedures for policy and code development would go beyond the project timeframe, and such methodical government processes can ensure long-term for climate change adaptation policy to rural infrastructure.

The programme has not yet put in place frameworks, policies and governance processes that can facilitate accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure. However, the MTE has found evidence that such processes would be implemented starting mid-2016, such the planned capacity building trainings for policy development, review of current policies and frameworks for climate change adaptation.

The MTE finds that the programme is progressing moderately satisfactory towards building technical and management capacity among key stakeholders for climate change adaptation in Samoa. It is expected that more and regular capacity building activities will be implemented starting in Q2- 2016 (the project team has been discussing the number, type and audience of technical workshops, trainings and seminars). If implemented correctly, such activities can provide a solid base for governance sustainability after the programme's closure.

Furthermore, the MTE did not find evidence that the programme identified and involved champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes. The project has not begun discussing the courses of action on programme activities after the project's closure date among key stakeholders, but this discussion is still in its infancy and expected to become more specific in early 2017. Finally, the MTE finds that the programme holds the appropriate leadership and ability to respond to potential changes in local and national political leaderships.

Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTE finds that no significant, additional environmental risks to those already identifitied during the project development (Table 5) are influencing the programme sustainability.

4.5 Gender Sensitive Review Analysis

The gender dimension appears to have been weakly considered in the designing of PRODOC as no specific Gender section is present in the final PRODOC version. The majority of programme indicators are also not GENDER sensitive, and some recommendations have been suggested to adjust current indicators to become more gender sensitive (Table 5). However, the programme team has made significant efforts to mainstream gender into the programme's activities design, monitoring framework, and implementation particualry by regulary involving and consulting the MWCSD.

Nonetheless, the programme has strived to address the gender dimension during the activities implementation in all outcomes by having a balanced gender team and beneficiaires. For example, the gender dimension has been taken into consideration during trainings, workshops and other project staffing. Women, men and youth groups have been engaged in the community consultations.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The AF Samoa programme design has proved to be relevant to the country context, and it is addressing key climate change adaptation needs in the short and long-term horizons. The programme design also is relevant to overcome structural barriers regarding the current low national and island capacity for climate change adaptation in Samoa. The programme is gradually addressing the issues of integrating climate changes effects into national and island decision-making, by providing and supporting while considering the long-term nature of climate change effects in Samoa. The programme is timely and fits well with UNDP organizational strengths and priorities – as well as with the current priorities of the Samoa Government. The three programme outcomes are appropriate to address climate change adaptation barriers, and the programme strategy is responding to key stakeholders needs.

The AF Samoa programme is considered to be progressing moderately satisfactory (MS) at the MTE mark, despite the low delivery rate, according to the activities implemented and stakeholder perception. Outcomes 1 and 2 are considered to be MU executed, and Outcomes 3 MS. The programme holds the potential to perform become S if adaptive management to the proposed recommendations are swiftly implemented during Q2-2016. The AF Samoa programme team is considered to have the necessary expertise on both technical issues and project management skills for the successful programme completion.

The realignment of the SAMOA AF and PPCR is critical in achieving results that is nation-wide beneficial i.e benefit all 41 districts of the country by having an up to date CIM Plans. At the MTE point, the programme is on-track to meet its overall objective, but still at risk to underperform in two outcomes (1 and 2). Further to a slow start due to administrative and planning issues (i.e. administrative and technical alignment with Samoa PCCR), the programme has significantly increased its performance and technical/ strategic impacts to advance in building Samoa resilience in coastal communities with key applied activities. The programme is underperforming in building adaptive capacity in coastal communities, as well as strengthening government institutional- adaptive capacity. The programme activities hold significant potential impacts beyond the

project implementation in building climate change resilience in Samoa coastal communities, particularly in terms of land zoning and use in relation to expected climate change impacts.

The programme implementation has mainly focused on outcome 2. The MTE strongly suggests focusing, from Q2-2016 onwards, on capacity building, CIM implementation and awareness raising on CC impacts and response. The MTE also finds that the programme could further capitalize on some implemented feasibility studies (water and tourism), under Outcome 2, to support the development of CCA policies and plans for water and tourism sectors in Outcome 3. Key stakeholder partners (government line ministries, village councils, appointed focal points, and beneficiaries) are increasing their engagement in the programme activities implementation and planning. This engagement represents a significant support towards the programme overall objective, and a clear signal for the long-term sustainability of the programme results. However, the programme M&E system for each outcome activities should be reviewed and strengthened (i.e. increase in M&E frequency by line ministries and UNDP, data systematization, evaluation and adaptive management response) as well as the subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the outcome activities progress (particularly in Savaii).

The programme results achieved at the MTE point can be estimated of moderate/low impact for CCA capacity building, support to CCA policy development, and applied climate change adaptation activities for coastal communities in Samoa. The overall interest and acceptance of the programme activities among various stakeholders is high, and it has been increasing further to a slow start at the project start. Key stakeholders at the central government level (Planning, Health, Women's affairs, LTA, Water management department, Tourism) are interested in further technical and management collaborations, and to develop updated climate change adaptation policies based on this programme results. At the community and district level, key stakeholders (village councils, communities) have been involved towards the planning implementation of climate change adaptation activities (seawall, water schemes, road and river bank construction). At the MTE point, the programme has shown moderate potential to replicate water management schemes of the outcome 3 activities due to cost-effective, environmental friendly, in situ techniques.

At the end of the programme in 2017, the potential programme impact at national, island and district level, while still not measurable, can be estimated to be moderate, if all adaptive management recommendations are swiftly implemented during Q2-2016. The programme could be play a pivotal role in supporting national institutions in implementing CIMs, and developing CCA for various economical sectors (infrastructure, tourism, and water management) and further building islands communities' resilience to CC impacts. The programme has high potential to catalyze technical and financial interests (i.e. GCF, EU-GCCA+) further its completion in 2017, if an effective, detailed and well-advertised communication strategy about lessons learnt is shared among key government and private stakeholders. Finally, the ownership of programme outputs by key stakeholders is positively evolving towards more responsibility and appropriation, but requires a more robust monitoring and evaluation approach.

5.2 Strategic and Outcome Recommendations

The list of priority recommendations is given in Table 2. The MTE recommends, as per standard *modus operandi* in AF-UNDP programmes, that the Samoa Programme team convenes a Steering Committee to prepare the adaptative management response to these MTE recommendations.

The MTE higlights the following 3 strategic recommendations to be implemented urgently during Q2-2016:

1 Revise, based on budget and human resource availability, the partitioning of CIMS revisions between PPCR and AF to advance towards CIMS priorities implementation during 2016;
2 Revise Outcome 2 work-plan and targets (particularly in relation to km of road and coastal protection) to determine achievable targets/ activities by the programme end in November 2017 (suggestions are given in Table 5);
3 Align the programme targets (i.e. particularly Outcome 2 targets) into respective line ministries targets, to ensure the country ownership and potential replication of climate change adaptation activities further to the programme end in 2017.

Furthermore, the MTE also highlights the following outcome at a strategic level:

Outcome 1. Coordinate and align, between AF and PPCR, the CIMS Plan Review with various line ministries priorities and targets.
Outcome 2. Integrate the results of the Vaisigano catchment flood study into local and district planning, and integrate the results of Manase feasibility study into local tourism planning.
Outcome 3. Support the already functioning community engagement mechanism, the Civil society support program (CSSP), to build community capacity regarding climate change resilience and adaptation planning, implementation and monitoring.

As regards to programme implementation and sustainaibility, the MTE recommends the following:

1 Convene more regular coordination meetings among various programme partners (MoF, MNRE, LTA, Department of Water, Women's Affairs) to strengthen technical partnerships, review programme activities progress / targets and agree on quarterly work-plans.
2 Review the financial delivery rate in June 2016 to determine the expected final programme delivery rate in November 2017, and perform a budget review accordingly to ensure at least a final 80% delivery rate by the end of the programme.
3 Develop and provide user- friendly, simple and technical manuals/ methodology for communities, local representatives at demonstration sites to monitor current activities and replicate wherever possible similar adaptation techniques.

Table 2. List of MTR recommendations

Rec #	Recommendation
A	**OUTCOME 1: Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages through gender-sensitive processes**
A.1	**Key recommendation: Revise, based on budget and human resource availability, the partitioning of CIMS revisions between PPCR and AF to advance towards CIMS priorities implementation during 2016.**
A.2	Coordinate and align, between AF and PPCR, the CIMS Plan Review with various line ministries priorities and targets.
A.3	Mainstream the gender dimension into the CIMS revision and planned implementation priorities.
B	**OUTCOME 2: Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate change in 25 Districts and 139 villages**
B.1	**Key recommendation: Revise Outcome 2 work-plan and targets (particularly in relation to road and coastal protection Km) to determine achievable targets/ activities by the programme end in November 2017.**
B.2	Integrate the results of the Vaisigano catchment flood study into local and district planning, and integrate the results of Manase feasibility study into local tourism planning.
B.3	Increase information sharing and monitoring with targeted communities (at least quarterly missions) during and upon completion of implementation.
C	**OUTCOME 3: Strengthened institutional capacity of government sectors to integrate climate and disaster risk and resilience into coastal management-related policy frameworks, processes and responses**
C.1	**Key recommendation: Provide more regular trainings (i.e. modules, curricula/ every quarter) to various government, district and community stakeholders in relation to CC vulnerability assessments, adaptation measures and planning (by selecting a core target and trusted groups of individuals).**
C.2	Support the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation in key development sectors' frameworks (Agriculture, Water, Infrastructure and Tourism) in coordination with ongoing government projects for DRR, IWRM and Tourism development.
C.3	Support the already functioning community engagement mechanism, the Civil society support program (CSSP), to build community capacity regarding climate change resilience and adaptation planning, implementation and monitoring.
E	**Project Implementation & Adaptive Management**
E.1	**Key recommendation: Increase technical and planning exchanges and partnerships with current and planned projects addressing climate change in Samoa (i.e. Ridge to Reef project, PPCR,…).**
E.2	Convene more regular coordination meetings among various programme partners (MoF, MNRE, LTA, Department of Water, Women's Affairs) to strengthen technical partnerships, review programme activities progress / targets and agree on quarterly work-plans.
E.3	Review the financial delivery rate in June 2016 to determine the expected final programme delivery rate in November 2017, and perform a budget review accordingly to ensure at least a final 80% delivery rate by the end of the programme.
F	**Sustainability**
F.1	**Key recommendation: Align the programme targets (i.e particularly Outocome 2 targets) into respective line ministries targets, to ensure the country ownership and potential replication of climate change adaptation activities further to the programme end in 2017.**
F.2	Develop and agree on roles and responsibilities on hand-over M&E activities of programme activities among various department and line ministries (i.e. LTA, Water department, PUMA, MoF) further to programme end in 2017.
F.3	Develop and provide user-friendly, simple and technical manuals/ methodology for communities, local representatives at demonstration sites to monitor current activities and replicate wherever possible similar adaptation techniques.

5.3 Corrective and adaptive actions for programme implementation

Some urgent, corrective and adaptive actions required urgent implementation staring Q2-2016:

1. **Project Logframe**. Review (PUMA/MNRE/UNDP) the proposed updated logframe to agree on (i) end of project targets, (ii) indicators, and (iii) proposed amendements. **Adaptive Action 1:** Convene Programme Steering Committee in Q2-2016.

2. **Stakeholder involvement**. The district and community level's stakeholders' involvement should be strengthened starting Q2-2016 to ensure the potential replication of demonstration activities beyond the project closure, in particular for independent water schemes and coastal protection by adpative land use. **Adapative action 2:** Convene district and community level consultations (1/ quarter) regarding the AWP-2016 in selected communities using CISP as the preferred platform.

3. **Capacity building through workshops and seminars.** A significant number of specific climate change trainings have been (or will be) planned under Outcome 3. The beneficiaries of these training opportunities are a range of stakeholders, including national and island officials, district and community leaders, etc. Feedback from the interviews conducted by MTE has been very positive with respect to increased climate change capacity building. However, considering the complex task of building capacity in climate change adaptation in the Samoa context, the programme team should ensure focusing capacity building activities on specific thematic areas (Integrated Water Management, Ridge to Reef approach, Climate proof infrastructure planning and building, CC policy development, M&E, reporting) with a core audience group to gradually and efficiently building the required technical skills. **Adapative action 3:** Determine a core group of 10 individuals for each selected community among island community leaders, farmers, fishermen, etc. to be trained during 2016.

4. **Documentation and Lessons Learnt.** Starting Q2-2016, additional information and communication material should be prepared and disseminated to supplement material available on the web. **Adapative action 4:** Develop an integrated programme communication strategy during Q1 and Q2-2016.

The AF Samoa programme has being building public and institutional awareness in Samoa regarding climate change risks and threats to the islands' livelihoods and sustainable development. This AF programme is clearly contributing in building climate resilience in Samoa by current and the planned adaptation strategies in the infrastructure, tourism and water sectors. This MTE finds extreme valuable the current and envisaged AF contribution in building institutional, community and environmental resilience to climate change in Samoa. Such efforts should be further capitalized beyond this programme closure in 2017, by engaging potential financial partners (i.e. GCF, EU-GCCA+) interested in addressing climate change adaptation in Samoa.

5.4 MTE Ratings

Further to programme documents revision, stakeholder interviews, and field visits, the MTR finds the programme is performing moderately satisfactory, MS (Table 1). Outcome 1 and 2 are moderately unsatisfactory, but the MTR finds that these outcomes could be satisfactory by the end of project closure, if adaptative management measures are implemented during Q-2016 (ref to 4.2). The MTE also finds that the programme's sustainability is moderately likely due to (i) stakeholder engagement, (ii) government development priorities in relation to climate change adaptation, and (iii) potential for replication of some programme activities (i.e. water scheme, village relocation but land access).

Table 1: Summary or Ratings[2]

Measure	MTE Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	**Objective** **MS**	1. The programme has significantly been delayed at the beginning, but it has increased its performance starting Q2-2015 (hence the marginal satisfactory). 2. The programme has strived to align key common activities of PPCR and AF, demonstrating a coordinated and organised approach to greater sustainable benefits for all stakeholders. 3. The programme is on-track to meet its overall objective, but still at risk to underperform in two components (1 and 2). 4. The programme is contributing in stimulating innovative approaches towards climate change adaptation in Samoa. 5. The delivery rate remains low (18%), but it is expected to steadily increase.
	Outcome 1 **MU** Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages through gender-sensitive processes.	1. This outcome performance is moderately unsatisfactory, as key climate change mainstreaming and integration into national and island planning process and policies (i.e. CIM Plans have weakly progressed. 2. The PPCR has developed a methodology for the CIM Plan Review and government has agreed for AF to use the same methodology. The procurement of firms to review the CIM Plans is still at the approval process; 3. The development of a relocation handbook that will guide relocation plans is slowly progressing. 4. Training and awareness activities have been implemented at the community level, and aligned with the CIM Plan Review. 5. These outcome activities have demonstrated opportunities to collaborate with other ongoing efforts on climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction in Samoa. 6. Low delivery rate (14%)
	Outcome 2 **MU** Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate	1. The programme has slowly, but steadily, advanced towards the achievement of this outcome. 2. The CIM Plan Database has been progressively updated as the CIM Plan Review continues. 3. Community water supply enhancement projects has commenced (and some completed in Ma'asina, Lona and Lele'a). Community stakeholders have clearly appreciated the funding assistance to the Independent Water Scheme by the project.

[2] The evaluation criteria and scale are based on GEF standards, and explained as a reference in Annex 2

	change in 25 Districts and 139 villages	4. A flood study for the Vaisigano Catchment was conducted in collaboration with the Water Resources Division of the Ministry and resourced under AFC, and it is expected that this study results will be translated in updated adaptation policies under Outcome 3. 5. Low delivery rate (19%).
	Outcome 3 **MS** Strengthened institutional capacity of government sectors to integrate climate and disaster risk and resilience into coastal management-related policy frameworks, processes and responses	1. The programme has advanced in the overall achievement of this outcome. However, some activities (i.e. training for policy makers) still remain at the planning stage. 2. These outcome activities are contributing towards building capacity for climate change resilience in the infrastructure, water, agriculture and fisheries (to a lesser extent). 3. CC awareness for decision makers (trainings, workshops) have partially been implemented. The MTE strongly suggests designing a training program (consisting of 4-5 CCA and DRR modules) to be delivered during 2016. 4. Strengthening programme stakeholders' capacity to assess CC impacts, select, design, implement and report on CCA and DRR solutions is still at initial implementation stage, but the overall stakeholder engagement provides suitable conditions to a successful implementation. 5. Low delivery rate (11%).
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	**MU**	1. Significant implementation delays occurred at project start due to administrative and procurement procedures. However, the project performance (i.e. disbursement, activities implementation, stakeholder involvement) has significantly improved starting from Q2-2015. 2. Low delivery rate at MTE point (18%). The delivery rate has been steadily increasing starting Q2-2015, and it is expected to reach 40% by June 2016. 3. The M&E system for each outcome activities should be reviewed and strengthened (i.e. increase in M&E frequency by line ministries and UNDP, data systematization, evaluation and adaptive management response as well as the subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the outcome activities progress (particularly in Savaii). 4. Project team is highly professional, motivated and committed to ensure high standard quality outputs, and successfully project outcomes. 5. The log-frame targets require some minor amendments (i.e. Km of coastal roads and related infrastructure to be improved), considering the remaining timeframe (November 2017- end of programme) and logistical constrains. Some outcome indicators are not SMART, and also require further

		revision/ adjustment.
Sustainability	**ML**	1. Although delay in implementation start, various stakeholders (PUMA, MoF, Water Resource Division, LTA) have shown increasing interest and engagement in programme activities implementation. 2. The programme has shown potential to replicate demonstration adaptation techniques at different sites (i.e. village relocation, in-land access, community water schemes). 3. High potential to institutionalize project results into policies, regulation and manuals, and by integrating programme targets into line ministries targets (PUMA, MoF, LTA) particularly for targets of Outcome 2. 4. The ownership of programme outputs by key stakeholders is slowly evolving towards more responsibility and appropriation by government line ministries (as indicated by the government commitment in aligning and integrating this program targets with line minisitries targets).

6. ANNEXES

Annex 1. MTE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)

Adaptation Fund Midterm Evaluation
Terms of Reference
UNDP-GEF Midterm Evaluation

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Samoa
Application Deadline: March 20, 2015
Category: Energy and Environment
Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Assignment Type: International Consultant
Languages Required: English
Starting Date: April 01, 2015
Duration of Initial Contract: 21 days
Expected Duration of Assignment: 2.5 months, final report expected to be ready by June 15, 2015

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title

Enhancing the resilience of coastal communities in Samoa to climate change

B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Evaluation (MTE) of the full sized project titled *Enhancing Resilience of coastal communities in Samoa to climate change* (PIMS# 4667), implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment/PUMA, which is to be undertaken in 2015. The project started on 19 November 2012, and is in its third year of implementation.).
The project was designed to:

have a holistic and countrywide approach to climate change adaptation in the coastal zones in Samoa and provides the vehicle to revise and implement the approved Coastal Infrastructure Management (CIM) Plans on the ground as a practical community based response to adaptation. The program will result in nationwide adaptation response for coastal management. The implementation of appropriate responses is supported by the programme through site-specific design of adaptation interventions and active community engagement in the process. The program has close links with the World Bank project Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR), and it was intended in the beginning that the projects would have a common project management unit. However, this proposal may be modified due to the challenges of joint management of two such large projects supported by different donors.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

C. Scope of Work and Key Tasks

One independent consultant will do the evaluation.

The consultant will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PPRs, Finalized AF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Appraisal Committee meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. Then they will participate in a MTE inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTE, producing the MTE inception report thereafter. The MTE mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to the following proposed sites:

1. Water supply enhancement - Lelea, Maasina and Lona
2. Beach replenishment site-Manase;
3. Coastal protection – Vaiala;
4. Access road- Fusi Saoluafata.

The MTE consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTE report. No overall rating is required.

1. Project Strategy

Project Design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities
- Review decision-making processes

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Evaluation.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.

- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Assess the following categories of project progress:

- Management Arrangements
- Work Planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4. Sustainability

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic risks to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTE consultant will include a section in the MTE report setting out the MTE's evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTE consultant is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTE consultant shall prepare and submit:

- MTE Inception Report: MTE consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Evaluation no later than 1 week before the MTE mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: (April 7, 2015)
- Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTE mission. Approximate due date: 25 April, 2015
- Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTE mission. Approximate due date: May 20, 2015
- Final Report*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTE report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: June 15th, 2015

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

E. Institutional Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing this MTE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTE is *the UNDP Country Office.*

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements in Samoa for the MTE consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTE consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

F. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTE will be approximately *(10 weeks)* starting *April 1,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTE timeframe is as follows:

- *March 20:* Application closes
- *March 25:* Selection of consultant
- *March 30:* Prep the consultant (handover of project documents)
- *April 01: 2 days:* Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report
- *April 7: 2 days:* Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTE mission
- *April 18-26: 9 days:* MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (2 days travel incl)
- *April 24:* Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTE mission
- *May 20: 6 days:* Preparing draft report
- *May 30: 2 day:* Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTE report
- *June 10th:* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *June 15:* Expected date of full MTE completion

G. Duty Station

Travel:

- International travel will be required to Samoa during the MTE mission;
- The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under https://dss.un.org/dssweb/
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

H. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

The selected consultant should have the following qualities:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation
- Experience working with the AF, GEF or GEF-evaluations, AF evaluations;
- Experience working in the Pacific region
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master's degree in environmental science or climate change, engineer/science degree in water management, geography , or other closely related field.

Consultant Independence:

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

Annex 2. MTE evaluative matrix + Ratings Scales

Rating assessment key:

Green = Achieved	Yellow = On target to be	Red = Not on target to be

Example table. Summary of MTE rating and achievement

Evaluation items	Projects results	MTE rating	Achievement description
Progress towards results	Objective achievement	Rate 6pt. scale	
	Outcome 1 Achievement	Rate 6pt. scale	
	Ourcome 2 achievement	Rate 6pt. scale	
	Etc.	Rate 6pt. scale	
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management		Rate 6pt. scale	
Sustainability		Rate 4pt. scale	

Notes:

6-point (pt.) scale includes:

- **HS**: Highly satisfactory
- **S**: Satisfactory
- **MS**: Moderately satisfactory
- **MU:** Moderately unsatisfactory
- **U**: Unsatisfactory
- **HU**: Highly unsatisfactory

4 point (pt.) scale includes:

- **L**: Likely
- **ML**: Moderately likely
- **MU**: Moderately unlikely
- **U**: Unlikely

Annex 3. Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection + Gender Sensitive Analysis.

Qualitative and perception questionnaire for MTE " Akamatutu‟anga i te iti tangata no te tuatau manakokore ia e te taui‟anga reva -Strengthening the Resilience of our Islands and our Communities to Climate Change (SRIC -CC)"

Name **(to be kept confidential):**
Project Responsibility/Role **(to be kept confidential):**
Date: Place:

1. What is your job function and in what way are you involved in the project?
2. What is your expectation from this project?
3. Please give your views of this project' effects and contribution (if any) from a local/national/international perspective (based on your involvement in the project).
4. Are the objectives/component and output of the project reasonable and will they lead to the expected environmental benefits? If not, why?
5. From your perception, is the Project meeting your anticipated needs? If not, in what way is it failing?
6. Do you have contact with other stakeholders involved in the project? If yes who and for what purpose?
7. Are the longer-term aspects (i.e. beyond the completion of this project) of this project clear? Do you think the results of this project will be sustainable? Can you suggest how this sustainability will be achieved?
8. Do you have sufficient contact with the project team and does this meet your needs? If not, please indicate how often you have contact with project team?
9. Is the information coming from the project team of sufficient clarity to enable you to monitor the progress of the project? If not how could this be improved?
10. Do you think this project is interacting satisfactorily with other national/international projects? If not please explain.
11. Is the information provided by the project to the general public of benefit? If not how could this be improved?
12. Please provide any suggestions that would enhance the benefit of this project to you or other stakeholders?
13. Any other comments?

Gender Sensitive Analysis

1. Are there any legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project?
2. How does the project impact gender equality in the local context?
3. Why are the issues/objective addressed by the project particularly relevant to or important for women and girls?
4. How are women and girls benefiting from project activities (even if these are unplanned/unintended results)?

Annex 4. MTE mission schedule

AF Samoa MTR - Proposed Field Mission Schedule

Duration: Samoa Field Mission (12 WD) from 9 to 20 November 2015
Evaluator: Mr Guido Corno

Day	Activities	Location
Day 1 10 Nov 2015	Briefing with UNDP-CO Project team; Meeting Executing Agency (Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE); PUMA ACEO and Project Staff	**Apia**
Day 2 11 Nov 2015	Meeting with Key Stakeholders 1. SUNGO including Red Cross – 10:30AM 2. Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSD); - 3. Ministry of Works, Transport and Infrastructure (MWTI); -	**Apia**
Day 3 12 Nov 2015	Meeting with Key Stakeholders 1. Ministry of Finance (MoF); 2. Samoa Tourism Authority; - 10AM 3. Institution of Professional Engineers of Samoa; President 4. Land Transport Authority (LTA); 2PM Water Resources – DMO – 3PM	**Apia**
Day 4 16 Nov 2015 9AM pick up Leiataua and straight to UNDP for Quido	Visit project site- Meeting with village mayor, village reps, IWSA Rep mayor, village reps, IWSA Rep - Water Supply enhancement- Lona Visit project site- Meeting with village mayor, village reps, IWSA Rep - Water Supply enhancement- Maasina	**Lona & Maasina (Upolu)**
Day 5 17 Nov 2015	Visit project site- Meeting with village mayor, village reps, IWSA Rep Water Supply enhancement- Lelea Visit project - Meeting with beneficiaries, village reps, community leaders Access Road for Fusi village Visit project - Meeting with beneficiaries, community leaders coastal protection Vaiala village	**Fusi/ Vaiala (Upolu)**
Day 7 18 Nov 2015	Visit project - Meeting with village mayor and village reps Community Protection • Saleia River Embankment • Visit project site- Meeting major, women rep, beach fale operators Beach Replenishment site at Manase	**Saleia & Manase (Savaii)**
Day 9 20 Nov 2015	Presentation of initial MTR findings with key stakeholders; Presentation of initial key recommendations.	**Apia**

Annex 5. List of persons interviewed

1. Pou Onesmo, Associate Chief Executive Officer for PUMA)
2. Ulu Bismarck Crawley, Chief Technical Advisor for WB/ AF
3. Anne Trevor, UNDP Programme Officer
4. Catherine Jone, Ex-UNDP officer
5. Faafetai Alisi, CEO Sungo
6. Litara Taulealo, ACEO, Climate Resilience Invesgment Coordinator, MOF
7. AmintanaiLeavai-Duseigneur, Principal Water Programme Officer
8. Amiaufolau Afaasega, ICCRITS Project Manager
9. Isamaaeli Tine, ICCRITS Principal Technical Officer
10. Malaki Iakopo, ACEO Water Resources Division
11. Pauline Pogi, Principal Policy & Regulatory Officer
12. Elisaua Junior Kolia, Principal Traffci/ drainage engineer, LTA
13. Ruseta Taaloga, LTA Programme officer
14. Leratauna Tofae, Project manager IWSA
15. Epa Tuioti, Project Manager, WB – PMS
16. Pisaina Leila- Lei Sam, WB-PMS, Financial Management Specialist
17. Rachel Vaai, WB-PMS, Assistant Procurement Specialist
18. Elizabeth Cully, UN Resident Coordinator

Annex 6. List of documents reviewed

1. AF- PRODOC;
2. Inception reports;
3. Quarterly progress report;
4. Project Performance Reports (PPRs) to the Adaptation Fund
5. Consultant's Inception reports (if any);
6. All AWPs (annual work plans);
7. All annual and quarterly financial project reports;
8. Consultancy products (report, technical studies, etc.)
9. Financial auditing, if any;
10. Budgeting documents by various stakeholders;
11. Community Meetings minutes, if available;
12. Project relevant documents.

Annex 7. UNEG Code of Conduct for Midterm Review Consultants

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: _____Guido Corno_____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *New York City (Place)* on 02/*02/2016 (Date)*

