

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3847	
GEF Agency project ID		4093	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning (ICCRIP) in the Maldives	
Country/Countries		Maldives	
Region		South Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPA); Least Developed Countries Fund for Climate Change (LDCF)	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment and Energy Partner agency: Ministry of Housing, Environment and Transport	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 3, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		February 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 28, 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding (LDCF)	0.06	0.06
	Co-financing	0.06	-
GEF Project Grant		4.485	4.485
Co-financing	IA own	0.877,875	0.21,096
	Government	3.738,336	2.3
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.235	-

	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	-	-
Total GEF funding		4.545	4.545,000
Total Co-financing		4.851,211	2.321,096
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		9.396,211	6.866,096
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 2016	
Author of TE		Ivica Trumbic	
TER completion date		January 13, 2017	
TER prepared by		Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	-	MU	-	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	-	MU
M&E Design		MS	-	MS
M&E Implementation		MS	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		-	-	MS
Quality of Execution		-	-	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective is "to increase the resilience of the Maldives in the face of climate change and improve country capacity to respond effectively to climate related hazards" (PD pg 27).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective is "to ensure that climate change risks are integrated into resilient island planning and that national, provincial, atoll and island authorities and communities are able to prioritize and implement climate change adaptation measures" (PD pg 27). The project planned to achieve its objective through four outcomes, namely (PD pgs 27-40):

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

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

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

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

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes to objectives or activities during implementation.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The project is consistent with GEF's Programming Paper for Funding the implementation of National Adaptation Programme for Action (NAPA) under the Least Developed Countries (LDCs). The programme plans to "integrate urgent and immediate adaptation measures into the development activities of each LDC" (GEF/C.28/18 pg 4). As per the project document, the project's "focus of expanding the resilience of natural and social systems against climate change hazards by integrating climate risk planning into the policy frameworks for land use planning and coastal development and protection at national, atoll and islands levels; developing institutional and individual capacity at national and local levels for adaptation planning; and increasing adaptation knowledge and experience, particularly on locally appropriate "soft" adaptation measures, are within the scope of expected interventions of LDCF-supported projects" (PD pg 21, TE pg 38).

The project is also relevant to Maldives Democratic Party's Alliance Manifesto of which the environmental policy goals are to formulate guidelines "on coastal modification that incorporate erosion reduction and climate change adaptation measures... mainstreaming of climate change adaptation into key sector development policies including land use" (PD pg 23). The project is also aligned to the many goals of the National Sustainable Development Strategy, such as making the inhabited islands resilient against the threats posed by global climate change (PD pg 23).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	------------------------

The TE gave a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to the effectiveness of the project as the "ICCRIP's Objective to integrate climate change risk into resilient island planning has not been fully achieved and the target values of respective indicators have not been reached" (TE pg 45). Three of the project's four outcomes, were rated moderately to highly unsatisfactory. The TER finds the results of the outcomes to be ineffective and gives an Unsatisfactory rating.

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

This outcome originally had four outputs with one additional output added during the inception phase. The first output related to an orientation survey and training plan to disseminate low cost, soft adaptation measures was partially implemented. The project developed a document on "Survey of Adaptation Measures" for an overview of adaptation measures, however, it was completed after a delay of six months and published only in 2015 (MTE pg 45, TE pg 33). For output 2, the project developed regional climate scenarios that help in making weather predictions, but it was prepared after a one-year delay. In regard to increasing local understanding of climate change related risks, the MTE states "there has been no awareness or training activity on climate change risk awareness rising in 4 islands. In the PIRs that were prepared after MTE, there was also no record of these activities being carried out" (TE pg 33, MTE pg 48). The project also aimed to develop guidelines on land reclamation and land use planning. According to the TE, the guidelines were never prepared, however the project conducted a one-day training session with technicians from the Land use planning department (MTE pg 49). In addition, there were disagreements between the project management unit and Maldives Meteorological Service (MMS) during the preparation of the climate risk information system and in the end, the project failed to complete the system (TE pg 34).

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

The TE states that this outcome was considered the most critical in achieving the project's objectives but the results were moderately unsatisfactory. The four outputs were partially delivered and the activities were implemented with substantial delays (TE pg 35). The main activities of this outcome were to develop guidelines for land-use planning that would minimize climate risks and also prepare technical guidelines that would propose practical interventions in the local context. Although conceptual approaches were developed, "instead of fully-fledged guidelines, only the review of land use planning and EIA regulations was prepared" (TE pg 34). The TE mentions that, as per PIR 2015, a draft regulation on coastal protection to streamline and incorporate climate change risks was prepared but it was not adopted (TE pg 34). The project managed to create guidelines on climate risk resilient coastal protection and also prepared the National Research Strategy (TE pg 35). Lastly, the project only marginally integrated the climate risk management into land use planning and other policies. The TE states that the activities necessary for integration never took place (TE pg 35).

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

The main aim of this outcome was to design climate change resilient land use plans and demonstrate them on four islands, but due to a lack of funds the number of sites were reduced to two. The TE notes that activities of outcome 3 were linked to successful achievement of outcome 2, which did not materialize. Based on the guidelines prepared for land use planning, demonstration of land use plans was to be implemented in the islands, however, the pre-condition of developing the guidelines was not fulfilled as stated above in Outcome 2 (TE pg 35). In regard to building soft measures for coastal protection that incorporate future climate risks such as redesigning the drainage system, the project prepared design reports for Kulhudhuffushi and Thinadhoo islands. However, there were issues during construction due to absence of proper supervision. For example, in Thinadhoo "the contractor (MTCC)

failed to properly maintain GPS co-ordinates resulting in pegs being moved, which resulted in too much sand being harvested. This issue came to PMU's attention much later because of not having a full time supervisor on site" (TE pg 36).

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

The outcome had three outputs: to generate information through web-based portal, increase awareness about climate change risks and adaptation measures among island communities, and share lessons learned to regional and international networks. The TE considered this output as the least successful component of the project as none of the outputs were delivered. The project developed neither a website to disseminate project information nor did it produce any public awareness materials. In regard to the last output, the TE states "nothing is known of the international collaboration of the project, except that PM participated in some workshops. This could not be considered as collaboration as described in the project document" (TE pg 37).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE gave a combined rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory to efficiency and effectiveness of the project because of numerous delays and poor project planning. The project's original executing agency was the Ministry of Housing, which was later split into two ministries namely, Ministry of Energy and Environment, and Ministry of Housing and Infrastructure. Due to the split, there were conflicting mandates between the two ministries which caused delays in implementation of the project (TE pg 24). The project also faced administrative delays due to complicated procurement procedures and lack of qualified experts in Maldives (TE pg 38). In terms of cost-efficiency, the TE states that the project built on existing knowledge and experience in technical topics in the country, especially the project benefitted from knowledge shared through other climate change risk related projects. However, in certain delivery of outputs, poor design and implementation had caused gross miscalculation of costs, for instance, under outcome 3, site specific demonstrations were reduced from 4 to 2 interventions (TE pgs 36 & 38). Also, the project manager worked on a part-time basis, and that reduced the efficiency of project's implementation (TE pg 38).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE gives an overall Moderately Likely rating to the sustainability of the project. However, the TER finds that, although the project attempted to achieve its outcomes, due to administrative issues and delays, the project could not deliver outputs and hence, there remain financial, sociopolitical,

institutional and governance, and environmental risks as hindrance to project sustainability. Considering the partial achievements and failures, the TER gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating.

Financial resources: The TE notes that as per PIR 2015, the government had provided financial contribution to the project which indicates that “the government, and especially MEE, sees these protective measures as a priority and worthy of investment...the government has the financial capacity to allocate such resources to implement these measures. The combination of these two factors points towards likelihood of financial sustainability of this investment” (TE pg 41). However, the outputs related to integrating adaptation and other protective measures into government plans had not been fully achieved which poses a risk to financial sustainability.

Sociopolitical: The project encountered sociopolitical changes at the national and local levels. In 2010, the full Cabinet of Ministers in President Nasheed’s government resigned and the executing agency was abolished and recreated (MTE pg 18). The TE reports “this type of change or uncertainty may continue to disrupt the work of agencies or organizations involved in climate adaptation-related actions and consequently delay onward progress” (TE pg 41). The TER finds that sociopolitical sustainability is Moderately Unlikely due to the delays the project already faced because of changes in ministerial level and lack of clarity in mandates (TE pg 24).

Institutional framework and governance: The project developed draft regulation on coastal protection, and also prepared conceptual approaches on land use planning, however no concrete guidelines had been drafted. Also, the “stakeholders’ participation at national level was confined mainly to the operation of the PB while the communication with local communities was not satisfactory” (TE pg 42). Hence, the institutional and governance sustainability seems weak and unlikely.

Environmental: The TE states the project had not fully controlled environmental risks. In fact, the project did not fully comply with environmental impact assessment during the construction work for the site demonstration interventions.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE does not provide any data on how the co-financing was actually utilized.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project faced delays because of conflicting mandates between the Ministry of Housing and Ministry of Environment, post the split of the Ministry of Housing. There were more delays because of lack of risk management strategy, procurement issues and absence of full-time project manager. Hence, the project was extended by 21 months at no-cost basis (TE pg 38). The lack of a permanent project manager did affect the project implementation, for example, in Thinadhoo "the contractor (MTCC) failed to properly maintain GPS co-ordinates resulting in pegs being moved, which resulted in too much sand being harvested. This issue came to PMU's attention much later because of not having a full time supervisor on site" (TE pg 36).

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE states that during project implementation, government representatives were involved but there was less participation from the civil society sector. The Project Board had members from ministerial and government agencies. However, the MTE rated the country ownership as moderately unsatisfactory as the participation of National Project Director and National Project Coordinator was very low in the project's implementation. The TE also notes that country ownership was reduced because "no respective legislation has been enacted during the course of the project's implementation... No additional financial resources were leveraged" (TE pg 40).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gave a combined rating to monitoring and evaluation design and implementation as Moderately Satisfactory. The project followed GEF's standard M&E procedures and the Results Framework, including "indicators to monitor and measure the effectiveness of project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification" (TE pg 28). The project document contained a detailed work plan, budget with description of cost item for each outcome. The M&E plan included baseline data and

provisions for an inception workshop, quarterly as well as annual progress monitoring. The plan requires submission of annual work plan, progress reports and annual audits (TE pg 28, PD pgs 68-69).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The M&E implementation of the project was Moderately Satisfactory. The TE states that the reporting of the project was done in a consistent manner and the project conducted a mid-term as well as terminal evaluation. But the quarterly progress reports contained repetitive information and the MTE notes that the “reports were generally poor in terms of analysis and contents, despite the slow progress made by the project. In the first quarter of 2010 ICCR reports were prepared jointly with other projects, and the report was comprised of a brief list of activities carried out during the period” (MTE pg 35, TE pg 28).

In terms of adaptive management, the project did not utilize feedback from M&E reports. The quarterly reports noted issues such as lack of government capacity for procurement that was hindering progress, but no action was taken to address the problem (TE pg 28, MTE pg 36-37).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

The project was implemented by UNDP and, as per the TE, its role “was mainly concentrated on administrative tasks and logistical issues mainly related to organisation of PB meetings. Very little support was given to effective management of the project” (TE pg 31). The MTE notes that the UNDP’s environmental unit was understaffed and thus, couldn’t provide technical support to the project especially in developing TORs (MTE pg 39). Although the UNDP proposed important management decisions within the Project Board, there were limitations in implementation setup, and the TE notes that “UNDP was less effective when trying to upgrade the project management” (TE pg 31). It is worthy to note that UNDP country office provided assistance in monitoring and preparing annual project implementation reports (TE pg 31). In regard to project design, the TE states that the goal and objectives were linked and outcomes were in line with the objectives. The project’s targets are also well defined for every indicator (TE pg 21).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE does not give a rating for the quality of execution of the project. The TER gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to project's execution by Ministry of Environment and Energy. The project did not have a full-time project manager which caused delays in implementation. Stakeholders complained that their communication with the project management unit was unsatisfactory and that their proposals were not taken into consideration (TE pg 25). Also the project was never able to fill the position of a technical specialist because of procurement issues. Importantly, the TE notes that the project management "was contracted to manage two complex GEF and AF projects, which negatively impacted implementation of the project in many aspects" (TE pg 31).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not report of any changes in environmental stress. Construction of ridge and drainage system in the two islands could have helped in increasing resilience, but as the work was not completed, there has been no environmental impact (TE pg 42).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not report of any socioeconomic changes.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring

systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

- a) Capacities: The project conducted a one-day training on land use planning and sessions on economics of climate change adaptation and measures for Land Use Planning Department (TE pg 33).
- b) Governance: the project prepared a draft regulation on coastal protection to streamline and incorporate climate change risks. It also developed guidelines on resilient coastal protection and National Research Strategy which aims to enhance Maldives' climate risk management capacities (TE pg 34-35).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

There are no unintended impacts reported.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Replication or adoption of GEF initiatives has not yet occurred.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The good and bad practices in the project were (TE pg 49):

- a) Building the knowledge base: the project managed to prepare valuable documents that could be used as a knowledge base in future projects such as the survey of soft adaptation measures guidelines for climate risk resilient coastal protection.
- b) Demonstration projects: These are good initiatives to attract attention local stakeholders but the financial planning and technical design should be improved as it could enhance local level ownership.

- c) Better project management: Projects should have “full-time permanent staff that will be relatively secure from impacts of political changes” (TE pg 49). Also, the project manager should possess technical and communication skills.
- d) Better monitoring and adaptive management: As the project faced extensive delays, better monitoring would have given notice of possible risks and the project could have utilized adaptive mechanism to mitigate any damage.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE gave recommendations on transition design, designing future projects, and the need for possible future GEF assistance (TE pgs 48-49):

- a) Close the project by December 31, 2015 and not sign any new contract while honoring the existing contracts with project personnel, consultants and executing agency;
- b) Establish procedures to finish ongoing activities such as construction works on two islands for the government of Maldives;
- c) Ensure adequate time is available for project implementation arrangements and preparation of activities when designing future projects;
- d) Ensure the project management unit is independent so as to avoid government policy changes affecting the projects and the project manager should be engaged full-time for better implementation;
- e) Start projects on time as planned by the work plan especially in regard to construction work or procurement process;
- f) Inform stakeholders of activities and ensure transparency between stakeholders at national and local levels; and
- g) Organize follow-up meetings with the Project Board and local stakeholders “to discuss this evaluation and reflect on experience at the national and local level and identify lessons learned that could inform the design and implementation for future national initiatives” (TE pg 49).

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains detailed assessment of the outcomes and activities and is consistent with project design. However, the report does not have a summary table for quick review.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is fairly consistent with evidence presented, however, the TER disagreed with few ratings, such as in assessment of outcomes.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report overrated the sustainability criteria, especially as none of the outcomes were achieved to assess sustainability in such an earlier stage. However, the report makes an effort to assess the sustainability given the information it was presented.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are fairly well supported with evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not contain costs per activity, but the report mentions that it was not given the information on costs and co-financings (TE pgs 9 & 30). Although it uses information from PIRs, the TE provides co-financing information.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assesses M&E systems moderately well.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional source of information was used to prepare this review.