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**Context, background and findings**

The Tuvalu Coastal Adaptation Project (TCAP), financed by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) was approved in June 2016 and the project implementation commenced in June 2017. The primary focus of the project is to put in place robust coastal protection measures along high value zones in the three islands of Funafuti, Nanumea and Nanumaga that will reduce the vulnerability of the local population to future impacts of climate change including tropical cyclones and storm wave actions.

While the construction of physical coastal defense is considered one of the urgent actions required to reduce Tuvalu’s extreme vulnerability, the Government of Tuvalu (GoT) is also aware that there is a considerable need to invest in long-term resilience of the country which can be achieved by strengthening the ability of each of the nine islands to identify, plan for, and execute locally-relevant adaptation actions.

Objectives

The project is implemented by UNDP using the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) with the Project Management Unit (PMU) based in Funafuti (Tuvalu) and UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji. The implementation phase started in June of 2017, after the appointment of the Project Manager, Deputy Project Manager, Finance Associate, Procurement Associate and Finance-Administration Assistant. Other project staffs based in country include the Communications Officer and the recently appointed Chief Technical Advisor (Operations). The Climate Change Department (CCD) of Tuvalu, under the Ministry of Finance, is the project’s Focal Point.

The project went through a restructuring process in the early years and which was ultimately approved by GCF in July 2019.

The findings and recommendations of the Interim Evaluation are valid and very important to help understand the status of the project and providing an opportunity to plan and re-strategize the project approach in light of the new normal, and importantly to achieve the objective of the project by thy end of the project period.

**Recommendations and Management Response**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 1:** Representatives (local residents) from each island be added to the PMU as officers, with the role of keeping local stakeholders up to date with TCAP’s plans and progress, managing expectations of local stakeholders and facilitating the implementation of project activities on the islands. | | | |
| **Management Response** | Agree. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[1]](#footnote-2)** | |
| **Comments** | **Status[[2]](#footnote-3)** |
| 1.1 Based on multiple recommendations related to current PMU structure and changes based on implementation experience at mid-project stage, a complete review of the current project implementation arrangements and a PMU restructure to be undertaken by CO management, RTA and COSQA team. The restructure will establish reporting lines, revisit existing TORs, develop new TORs, review HR and procurement modalities for all required project implementation support. This action is relevant to recommendations 1 to 7 | 31 August 2021 | CO management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |
| 1.2 Update SEP to accommodate the role of additional PMU members including Island Officers | 31 August 2021 | PMU |  |  |
| 1.3 Undertake induction training of Island Officers on project design, contractual timelines, safeguards reporting requirements, community consultations, monitoring requirements, etc. based on their TORs | November 2021 | PMU |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 2:** Review the best practices and lessons learned under the Global Environment Facility (GEF) National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) 1 and 2 projects, which had island officers that performed similar roles to inform similar positions under TCAP. However, the IE team does understand that once construction begins under Output 2, there will be dedicated monitoring officers on the islands. These individuals could also take on the role recommended by the IE team above. | | | |
| **Management Response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[3]](#footnote-4)** | |
| **Comments** | **Status[[4]](#footnote-5)** |
| 2.1 Based on multiple recommendations related to current PMU structure and changes based on implementation experience at mid-project stage, a complete review of the current project implementation arrangements and a PMU restructure to be undertaken by CO management, RTA and COSQA team. The restructure will establish reporting lines, revisit existing TORs, develop new TORs, review HR and procurement modalities for all required project implementation support. This action is relevant to recommendations 1 to 7 | 31 August 2021 | CO management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |
| 2.2 Review best practices and lessons learnt from NAPA 1&2 to aid in developing ToR’s for engagement and recruitment of 2 Island Officers – one each at Nanumaga & Nanumea, it will be ensured that the monitoring and gender roles will also be captured | 31 August 2021 | CO Management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 3:** Consideration is made to either add relevant staff gender and safeguards officers to the PMU, and/or build the capacity of current PMU staff to fulfil gender and safeguards roles. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 3.1 Based on multiple recommendations related to current PMU structure and changes based on implementation experience at mid-project stage, a complete review of the current project implementation arrangements and a PMU restructure to be undertaken by CO management, RTA and COSQA team. The restructure will establish reporting lines, revisit existing TORs, develop new TORs, review HR and procurement modalities for all required project implementation support. This action is relevant to recommendations 1 to 7. | 31 August 2021 | CO management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |
| 3.2 Provide training to relevant PMU staff on gender monitoring by the gender support to be embedded within PMU. | December 2021 | UNDP |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 4**: Clarify PMU reporting lines between Funafuti and Suva and ensure that the entire team is reporting to one individual (NPM) who then reports to the higher up structures | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 4.1 Based on multiple recommendations related to current PMU structure and changes based on implementation experience at mid-project stage, a complete review of the current project implementation arrangements and a PMU restructure to be undertaken by CO management, RTA and COSQA team. The restructure will establish reporting lines, revisit existing TORs, develop new TORs, review HR and procurement modalities for all required project implementation support. This action is relevant to recommendations 1 to 7. | 31 August 2021 | CO management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |
| 4.2 Use the findings from the Jan & Mar “PMU Roles and Responsibilities” workshops and lessons learnt | 31 August 2021 | CO Management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 5:** The PMU may need to meet with relevant staff from the UNDP Pacific Office in Suva, as well as the UNDP RTA, to flesh out issues in reporting lines and communication within the PMU and identify workable solutions which are agreed upon. It may be necessary that the operations CTA plays a key role in developing a model for this. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 5.1 Based on multiple recommendations related to current PMU structure and changes based on implementation experience at mid-project stage, a complete review of the current project implementation arrangements and a PMU restructure to be undertaken by CO management, RTA and COSQA team. The restructure will establish reporting lines, revisit existing TORs, develop new TORs, review HR and procurement modalities for all required project implementation support. This action is relevant to recommendations 1 to 7. | 31 August 2021 | CO management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 6:** The IE team recommends that more time is spent managing the expectations of local communities and providing them with more frequent updates on project progress and planning, which can include more information shared regarding the crucial detailed design and safeguards assessments that have been ongoing, this can be done through:   * Employing island community facilitators as part of the PMU on each of the islands (particularly the outer islands of Nanumaga and Nanumea). The facilitators can provide local communities with regular updates and plans on interventions (particularly details on construction works), and readily provide feedback to the PMU in Funafuti, ensuring that any issues are dealt with efficiently. Furthermore, the facilitators can ensure that local communities understand and have access to the project’s grievance redress mechanism (GRM).   Reviewing and revising the stakeholder engagement plan, highlighting the role of island community facilitators in engaging with island stakeholders, to ensure that their needs and concerns are prioritized by TCAP. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 6.1 Based on multiple recommendations related to current PMU structure and changes based on implementation experience at mid-project stage, a complete review of the current project implementation arrangements and a PMU restructure to be undertaken by CO management, RTA and COSQA team. The restructure will establish reporting lines, revisit existing TORs, develop new TORs, review HR and procurement modalities for all required project implementation support. This action is relevant to recommendations 1 to 7 | 31 August 2021 | CO management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |
| 6.2 Update Stakeholder engagement plan ensuring it highlights the role of island community facilitator(s) and other changes to the PMU structure in engaging island stakeholders (including clarity on grievance redress mechanism) | 15 Aug 2021 | PMU |  |  |
| 6.3 Undertake a community consultation at N&N to ascertain community needs as to the roles and responsibilities of the island community facilitator(s) | July 2021 | PMU  CO |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 7:** Fast track the acquirement of project cash on hand (PCH)/cash advances for the PMU in Tuvalu to ensure that there are no delays for the procurement of urgent items or services, such as office stationery and transport to the outer islands of Nanumaga and Nanumea.  In addition to the above, a more permanent solution to the project’s procurement delays needs to be identified and implemented. This could be in the form of providing more procurement support to the PMU through providing training to the project’s procurement officer (based in Suva), assessing his/her performance under the project and taking the necessary corrective measures, or bringing in an additional staff member on an ad hoc basis to reduce procurement delays. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 7.1 Based on multiple recommendations related to current PMU structure and changes based on implementation experience at mid-project stage, a complete review of the current project implementation arrangements and a PMU restructure to be undertaken by CO management, RTA and COSQA team. The restructure will establish reporting lines, revisit existing TORs, develop new TORs, review HR and procurement modalities for all required project implementation support. This action is relevant to recommendations 1 to 7 | 31 August 2021 | CO management  RTA  Desk Officer |  |  |
| 7.2 Obtain PCH (Project Cash Advance) for PMU Funafuti | July 2021 | PMU  CO |  |  |
| 7.3 Assist PMU Funafuti on PCH transactions including acquittals | July 2021 | CO |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 8:** Sustainability strategies should be developed for each of the project’s outputs. These may be in the form of “live” documents which are reviewed and updated annually to account for in changes in implementation or sustainability developments. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 8.1 Have a Team workshop with RTA/CO to develop and endorse sustainability strategies per output | January 2022 | CO  RTA  PMU |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 9:** The design of a project (or projects) to follow TCAP should be considered under its exit strategy. Reports, studies, designs of interventions, best practices and lessons learned from TCAP should be shared with GoT and development partners working both in Tuvalu, and across the Pacific region to ensure that knowledge sharing through the project promotes sustainability, as well as replication and upscaling. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 9.1 Project to develop an Exit Strategy that includes sharing of knowledge, lessons learnt, good practices with the GoT so that the information can be used for the GoT to potentially pursue a follow-up project. | June 2023 | PMU  CO  RTA |  |  |
| 9.2 As part of the project activities already planned, share lessons learnt from TCAP including convening 2 regional conferences and/or workshop for this purpose depending on when Covid19 restrictions will be lifted | December 2022 | PMU  CO |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 10:** Champions who can promote the sustainability of project outcomes need to be identified through a participatory process, including champions at the community level that represent vulnerable groups (such as women and youth). | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 10.1 PMU to work with Kaupules, DLG and CCD to identify ‘champions’ at community level and ensure clear roles for the champions. | December 2021 | PMU |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 11:** The IE team recommends that should the COVID-19-related travel restrictions in Tuvalu not be lifted in 2021 or significant progress be made on the delivery of Output 3 specifically by the end of 2021, that an extension of 6 months to a year be considered for TCAP. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 11.1 Obtain Board approval then GCF approval on extension at the appropriate point in time before the project end date | June 2022 | RTA  PMU  CO |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 12:** The IE team recommends that more detail on key milestones should be added to TCAP’s multiyear activity implementation plan, and that any significant changes should be highlighted and explained in APRs. This would include information on potential and expected delays, and any tolerance that has been added to specific activities as a result. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 12.1 Develop Multiyear activity-based Work Plan with clear milestones annually and revised on a needed basis | November 2021, 2022, and 2023 | PMU |  |  |
| 12.2 Information on significant and/or potential changes and delays continued to be reported in the APR | March 2022 | PMU  CO  RTA |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 13:** The IE team recommends that the ToC diagram is updated to:   * reflect changes that have been made to the logical/results framework since project inception, * include project assumptions presented in the logical/results framework, * clearly indicate how identified risks could impact project viability or sustainability, * include both GCF outcomes relevant to the project, and * include a goal statement for TCAP. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree, but if required after review | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 13.1 CO IRMU and PMU to review the important changes required to the ToC diagram while following the standard template for ToCs for UNDP/GCF projects. The changes to be made should reflect those that are important and relevant to future implementation of the project.CO | September 2021 | PMU  CO/IRMU |  |  |
| 13.2 If required, update project Theory of Change and have this tabled at the board | November 2021 | PMU  RTA |  |  |
| 13.3 Report updates in the APR | March 2022 | PMU  RTA |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 14:** The target of Indicator 1 should be revised to make it clearer that the project needs to measure the extent to which the updated ISPs address climate change threats. Furthermore, the mid-term and final project targets for Indicator 4: “Number of students that are supported at higher-level studies (tertiary level or higher) on disciplines related to coastal protection work” imply that all 24 students should obtain a CCA-related position in the country once qualified. However, details at the input level of the logical framework suggest that only six students will obtain a CCA-related position once qualified. Details under Indicator 4 in the logical framework need to be updated to reflect the correct mid-term and final project targets. Where possible, the wording of targets should be revised to improve their links to the gaps presented in the baseline. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree, but correction will only be made for final targets as mid-term targets cannot be changed retrospectively. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 14.1 Conduct an exercise to review the project’s log frame to identify any corrections/clarifications that need to be made based on the recommendations and experience of project implementation to date. No changes to the mid-term targets and no downgrading of final targets will be made. This action is relevant to recommendations 14, 15, 18 and 19. | July 2021 | PMU  CO – RSD team  RTA |  |  |
| 14.2 Get project board approval to the changes and communicate to the GCF Secretariat. | July 2021 | PMU  RTA |  |  |
| 14.3 Update project M&E framework accordingly | July 2021 | PMU |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 15:** Regarding the coastal protection measures under Output 2, more granular detail should be added to the targets. This includes: i) how the number of beneficiaries is disaggregated across the three islands; ii) more detail on how communities in Funafuti will be protected by the land reclamation interventions, for example, it is recommended that the target mention the area of land that will be reclaimed and what that reclamation will mean in terms of adaptation impact (i.e. reclaiming this land will reduce the impacts of sea level and soil erosion etc.); and iii) how the targeted 3,090 m of protected vulnerable coastlines is split across Nanumea and Nanumaga | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 15.1 Conduct an exercise to review the project’s log frame to identify any corrections/clarifications that need to be made based on the recommendations and experience of project implementation to date. No changes to the mid-term targets and no downgrading of final targets will be made. This action is relevant to recommendations 14, 15, 18 and 19. | July 2021 | PMU  CO – RSD team  RTA |  |  |
| 15.2 Get PB approval to the changes and communicate to the GCF Secretariat. | July 2021 | PMU  RTA |  |  |
| 15.3 Update project M&E framework accordingly | July 2021 | PMU |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 16:** There have been challenges in meeting several mid-term targets (such as those for Indicators 1, 4, 5 and 8). The targets will need to be reviewed and adjusted to what is more appropriate at mid-term. | | | |
| **Management response** | Disagree, because mid-term targets cannot be changed retrospectively. No action required because mid-term has passed. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 17:** Achieving a target of 50% of women trained under Output 1 (Indicator 3) — if more than 12 technical officers in total are trained — is likely to be challenging because of gender dynamics in government departments. The IE team recommends that this target is reviewed and adjusted to an achievable percentage. | | | |
| **Management response** | Disagree as targets cannot be downgraded without triggering a major change. The Project will try to achieve as close to the targets as possible. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 18:** For indicators 3, 4 and 7, the Means of Verification (MoV’s) need to be reviewed and revised so that impacts/results can be better measured. For Indicator 3, solely generating reports and sharing results from an assessment on a forum will not demonstrate any improved knowledge and awareness about climate change impacts on different genders. Likewise, for Indicator 4, reports are unlikely to show the true impacts on capacity. The IE team recommends that a capacity scorecard is developed to measure how capacity has increased through the training. For Indicator 7, solely generating a report and sharing results from an assessment on a forum will not demonstrate any improved knowledge and awareness about climate change impacts on different genders. It is consequently recommended that the MoV is revised to make it more results oriented. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 18.1 As part of the exercise to review the project’s log frame to identify any corrections/clarifications that need to be made based on the recommendations and experience of project implementation to date, MoVs will be updated. This action is relevant to recommendations 14, 15, 18 and 19. | July 2021 | PMU  CO – RSD team  RTA |  |  |
| 18.2 Get project board approval to the changes and communicate to the GCF Secretariat. | July 2021 | PMU  RTA |  |  |
| 18.3 Update project M&E framework accordingly | July 2021 | PMU |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 19:** The project team must assess which of the assumptions are still relevant at this stage of the project and update, remove and/or add assumptions as necessary. | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 19.1 As part of the exercise to review the project’s log frame to identify any corrections/clarifications that need to be made based on the recommendations and experience of project implementation to date, assumptions will be updated. This action is relevant to recommendations 14, 15, 18 and 19. | July 2021 | PMU  CO – RSD team  RTA |  |  |
| 19.2 Get project board approval to the changes and communicate to the GCF Secretariat. | July 2021 | PMU  RTA |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid Term Review Recommendation** | **Recommendation 20:** The IE team recommends that the PMU develop a reporting strategy/approach that allows them to feed information into the relevant reports on a weekly basis, resulting in less time being spent on developing the major project reports just before they are due. Quarterly reports should also be developed, with the findings discussed in the Annual Progress Reports (APRs), which are formally submitted to the GCF each year of project implementation as required by the Accreditation Master Agreement (AMA) and FAA | | | |
| **Management response** | Agree | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Completion date** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 20.1 Develop a structured reporting strategy to feed information into the relevant reports on a weekly basis | August 2021 | PMU |  |  |
| 20.2 Develop Quarterly Reports to tag in with the APR Report findings | September 2021 | PMU |  |  |

1. If the TR is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. If the TR is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)