



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

## Midterm Evaluation Report

Akamatutu'anga i te iti tangata no te tuatau manakokore ia e te tau'anga reva  
Strengthening the Resilience of our Islands and our Communities to Climate Change (SRIC - CC)

PIMS #4569

**Evaluation Mission:** 27/10-07/11/2015

**Report Date:** 04/01/2016

**TYPE OF IMPLEMENTING ENTITY:** MIE Implementing- Cook Islands  
**IMPLEMENTING ENTITY:** United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)  
**EXECUTING ENTITY/IES:** Climate Change Cook Islands Division, Office of the Prime Minister

**Prepared by** Guido Corno, [guidocorno@gmail.com](mailto:guidocorno@gmail.com)

## Table of contents

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
1.1.	Programme Information.....	4
1.2.	Programme Description and Objective.....	4
1.3.	Programme Progress towards results.....	6
1.4.	MTE Ratings.....	7
1.5.	Concise summary of conclusions .....	10
1.6.	Recommendation Summary Table.....	11
2.	INTRODUCTION.....	13
2.1	Purpose of the MTE and objectives.....	13
2.2	Scope & Methodology.....	14
2.3	Structure of the MTE report.....	16
3.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION & BACKGROUND CONTEXT.....	16
3.1	Background Context.....	16
3.2	Project Description and Objective.....	18
3.3	Stakeholder Analysis.....	19
4.	FINDINGS.....	20
4.1	Programme strategy.....	20
4.2	Programme Implementation.....	22
4.3	Delivery Rate.....	29
4.4	Log-frame analysis and amendments.....	30
4.5	Programme Barriers review.....	40
4.6	Programme Risks Review.....	41
4.7	Relevance.....	44
4.8	Effectiveness and Efficiency.....	44
4.9	Impact.....	45
4.10	Sustainability.....	46
4.11	Gender review.....	49
5.	CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION.....	50
5.1	Conclusions.....	50
5.2	Strategic and Outcome Recommendations.....	51
5.3	Corrective and adaptive actions for programme implementation.....	52
6.	ANNEX.....	55
6.1	Terms of Reference for this MTE.....	55
6.2	MTE Required Ratings + Ratings Scales.....	60
6.3	Example Questionnaire.....	61
6.4	MTE mission schedule.....	62
6.5	List of persons interviewed.....	63
6.6	List of documents reviewed.....	63
6.7	Climate Change 2014: Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability..	64
6.8	Programme co-financing estimates.....	65
6.9	Detailed recommendations for various programme outcomes.....	66
6.10	UNEG Code of Conduct for Midterm Review Consultants.....	68

### **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 progress towards results.

Table 5. MTE review of project barriers.

Table 6. MTE Review and Observation of Project Risks.

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1. Programme Information

Project/Programme Category:	Regular Programme
Country/ies:	Cook Islands
Title of Project/Programme:	Akamatutu'anga i te iti tangata no te tuatau manakokore ia e te tau'i'anga reva Strengthening the Resilience of our Islands and our Communities to Climate Change (SRIC - CC) (UNDP ID 4569)
Type of Implementing Entity:	MIE Implementing
Implementing Entity:	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Executing Entity/ies:	Climate Change Coordination Unit and Emergency Management Cook Islands (both in the Central Policy and Planning Unit, Office of the Prime Minister)
START DATE:	1 MAY 2012
END DATE:	1 May 2017
Amount of Financing Requested:	USD 5,381,600 (IN U.S Dollars Equivalent)

### 1.2. Programme Description and Objective

The Cook Islands is subject to highly destructive cyclones, intense rainfall events, and devastating droughts. The isolated populations in the Pa Enea (sister islands to the capital island of Rarotonga) are especially vulnerable to the anticipated changes in climate, including increased frequency and intensity of rainfall and tropical storms; rising and extreme sea levels and changing wind patterns; and hotter, drier weather. The aim of the SRIC programme is to strengthen the ability of all Cook Island communities, and the public service, to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures (including extreme events) in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner. The Cook Islands' new Joint National Action Plan for Disaster Risk and Climate Change Adaptation aims to guide the activities in this programme. A new plan was delivered in 2015 and provided guidance to the programme.

The proposed programme aims to contribute 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 national, island and community levels will combine with the integration of both Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) in national, island and community policies, plans and work programmes, and with training of key players at national, island and community levels, to ensure the success of interventions designed to enhance island 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 disaster risk reduction measures at island and community levels, integrated with sustainable island development processes and supported through enhanced national institutional and knowledge management capacities and initiatives. The four components of the Programme are strongly integrated.

The programme is implementing those aspects of the JNAP (expired in 2015) for CCA and DRM that are consistent with the Island Development Plans of the Pa Enea, and supporting the development of the new JNAP. Particularly, it will support the integration of climate change considerations into national and sectoral policies and related instruments. These will, in turn, guide preparation and implementation of island level climate-change adaptation and disaster risk management action plans.

The Programme is being implemented through UNDP's National Execution Modality (NEX), with the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) and its recently established Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCI) serving as the designated national executing agency ("Implementing Partner") of the project. OPM has the technical and administrative responsibility for applying AF inputs in order to reach the expected Outcomes/Outputs as defined in this project document. OPM 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, local government authorities and civil society organizations.

### 1.3. Programme Progress towards results

The programme is progressing **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** towards the achievement of its objective. 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 during last 9 months.

The programme activities, implemented through the MTE point, have been logically and sequentially addressing the core issues of climate change adaptation in the Cook Islands, with specific focus on the Pa Enua. The programme has progressed in implementing low-cost and replicable climate change adaptation activities in the agriculture, fisheries and water sectors, and has begun planning adaptation activities in the infrastructure and tourism sectors. However, the programme has been delaying (i) supporting climate change mainstreaming of technical standards/codes, policy and plans for key development sectors (i.e. agriculture, infrastructure, tourism, water) and (ii) capacity needs assessments for various government and island 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.

The programme delivery rate is low (34%) at the MTE point, but could increase to a satisfactory level (i.e.>70%) by the programme closure in 2017 if some key recommendations are swiftly implemented (i.e. especially for Outcome 1 and 2). Some technical and management concerns remain for Outcome 1 and 2 planning and impact. Urgent adaptive management measures are required (Table 2), and the MTE finds that the project team is capable to implement them in collaboration with key stakeholders during Quarter 1 (Q1) and Q2-2016.

The programme log-frame remains general in terms of some key outcome indicators, and ambitious in the majority of the programme targets, considering the remaining programme timeframe and logistical constraints to deliver adaptation activities in the Pa Enua (i.e. lack of regular flights, shipping service to the Northern Islands). 50% of indicators are not SMART (i.e. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Bound) nor GENDER (i.e. indicators for gender inclusion- % of male/female beneficiaries, gender mainstreaming activity) sensitive, requiring amendments to be validated urgently by the programme steering committee. Some adaptive management measures have been implemented such as more regular

information sharing meetings, but other key measures are urgently required for all outcomes (in particular, strengthening the programme M&E and supporting a regular CC capacity building for various stakeholders).

#### 1.4. MTE Ratings

Further to programme documents revision, stakeholder interviews, and field visits, the MTE finds the programme is performing moderately satisfactory (Table 1). Outcome 1 and 2 are moderately unsatisfactory, but the MTE finds that these outcomes could be satisfactory, by the end of project closure, if adaptive management measures are implemented during Q1-2016 (ref to 4.2). The MTE also finds that the programme sustainability is moderately likely due to (i) stakeholder engagement, (ii) government development priorities and (iii) high-potential for replication of the applied programme activities.

**Table 1: Summary or Ratings & Achievement**<sup>1</sup>

Measure	MTE Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective MS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project is on-track to meet its overall objective, but still at low risk to underperform in two components (1 and 2).</li> <li>2. The project is contributing in stimulating innovative approaches towards climate change adaptation for the Pa Enea.</li> <li>3. Further to a slow implementation start and relative weak stakeholder engagement, the project has gradually increased its performance.</li> <li>4. Assessment methodology to approve project proposal should be improved by following CCA criteria as indicated in the last IPCC report (i.e. magnitude of impacts, timing of impacts, persistence and reversibility of impacts, likelihood (estimates of uncertainty) of impacts and vulnerabilities, and confidence in those estimates, potential for adaptation, distributional aspects of impacts and vulnerabilities, importance of the system(s) at risk). (Annex 7 for further details).</li> </ol>
	Outcome 1 MU Capacity developed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This outcome performance is moderately unsatisfactory, as climate change mainstreaming and integration into national and island planning process and policies have weakly progressed.</li> <li>2. Systematic climate change review and analysis of key</li> </ol>

<sup>1</sup>The evaluation criteria and scale are based on GEF standards, and explained as a reference in Annex 2

<p><b>for efficient and effective support at national level for disaster risk reduction and adaptation initiatives in the Pa Enea</b></p>	<p>development policies (i.e. agriculture, water, tourism, infrastructure) to determine ‘entry-points’ for climate change policy development have not been performed;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. A preparatory assessment to the National CC-DRM Policy a systematic gap analysis has been carried out on 11 sectoral and related national policies, with the results captured in recommendation reports.</li> <li>4. Technical discussion papers on CCA’s implication in policies, codes and standards are yet to be developed and planned.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Outcome 2</b></p> <p><b>MU</b></p> <p><b>Key players in Pa Enea development have the capacity to reflect disaster risk management and adaptation considerations when planning, making decisions and during operations</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The programme has not significantly advanced towards the achievement of this outcome. Considering the remaining programme timeframe, the MTE strongly suggests engaging a team of 1 national and 1 international consultant to develop the conceptual framework of 5 action plans at island level to climate proofing all main development sectors (water, agriculture, tourism, infrastructure) during Q1-2016.</li> <li>2. Capacity needs assessments for CCA and DRR issues should be further implemented for various government stakeholders and islands institutions.</li> <li>3. CC awareness for decision makers (trainings, workshops) has partially been implemented. The MTE strongly suggests designing a training program (consisting of 4-5 CCA and DRR modules) to be delivered for each Pa Enea during 2016 (4 days/ Pa Enea).</li> <li>4. The programme is successfully collaborating with the SGP to fund selected project proposal addressing climate change adaptation issues in the Pa Enea. However, current assessment and review methodology should further be developed based on CCA guidelines under the UNFCCC and IPCC (Annex 9).</li> </ol>
<p><b>Outcome 3</b></p> <p><b>MS</b></p> <p><b>Enhanced resilience to climate change, including weather- and climate-related disasters, for all 11 inhabited Pa Enea</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The programme has significantly advanced in the overall achievement of this outcome. However, some activities (i.e. coastal protection, climate-resilient health and fisheries activities) still remain at the planning stage.</li> <li>2. The M&amp;E system for each outcome activities should be reviewed and strengthened (i.e. increase in M&amp;E frequency, data systematization, evaluation and adaptive management) as well as the subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the outcome activities progress.</li> <li>3. These outcome activities are contributing towards building climate change resilience in the water, agriculture and fisheries (to a lesser extent). Adaptation activities in the tourism and infrastructure sectors are in the planning stages.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>



	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcome 4</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MS</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lessons learned and best practices improve the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Pa Enea and other vulnerable communities</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project information database is being developed, and some initial studies, data are being systematized in this database, such as the video explaining climate change impacts in the Pa Enea.</li> <li>2. Majority of Outcome 4 activities will be implemented during 2016 and 2017.</li> <li>3. Some initial lessons-learnt have been shared via television and radio channels, but should also be shared in due time on the UNDP ALM.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MS</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 during last 9 months.</li> <li>2. Project team is highly professional, motivated and committed to ensure high standard quality outputs, and successfully project outcomes.</li> <li>3. The log-frame targets require some significant amendments, considering the remaining timeframe and logistical constrains. Some outcome indicators are not SMART, and also require further revision/ adjustment.</li> <li>4. Some adaptive management measures have been implemented such as more regular information sharing meetings, but key measures are urgently required for outcome 1 and 2 (ref. to Recommendation Table).</li> <li>5. The programme M&amp;E framework should be strengthened by conducting higher frequency M&amp;E for the already implemented activities</li> </ol>
<p><b>Sustainability</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ML</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although delay in implementation start, various stakeholders have shown increasing interest and engagement in project activities.</li> <li>2. The project has shown high potential to replicate demonstration adaptation techniques (low-cost adaptation farming, water recycling) at different sites due to cost-effective, environmental friendly, <i>in situ</i> techniques.</li> <li>3. High possibilities to institutionalize project results into policies, regulation and manuals</li> <li>4. The ownership of project outputs by key stakeholders is positively (although slowly) evolving towards more responsibility and appropriation.</li> </ol>

### **1.5. Concise summary of conclusions**

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 procedures, the programme is contributing in stimulating innovative approaches towards climate change adaptation for all Cook Islands, but underachieving in mainstreaming climate change adaptation into government priorities, island and district planning. The programme activities hold significant potential impacts beyond the project implementation in building climate change resilience in the Cook Islands.

The programme implementation has mainly focused on outcome 3. The MTE strongly suggests focusing, from Q1-2016 onwards, on prioritizing CCA and DRR mainstreaming efforts for two selected national development policies (i.e. agriculture and infrastructure/water) in selected Pa Enua. The MTE also suggests that selected technical standards/codes, policy and plans concerning agriculture, water and tourism to be reviewed, and 'entry-points' for CCA and DRR policy development and for CCA and DRR mainstreaming of the climate change to be identified.

The programme faces, among others, two significant challenges: (i) logistically, as it has to deliver and implement activities across a large geographical area with limited transportation options (few flights to Northern Cook Islands, limited cargo ship option to deliver materials), and (ii) socially, as the population composition of the Pa Enua mainly consists of elderlies and youngs, restricting the labor force potential for the programme activities.

Key stakeholder partners (government line ministries, island 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.

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 the Pa Enua. 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, Marine Resources, Agriculture and Water) are interested in further technical and management collaborations, and to develop updated climate change adaptation policies based on this programme results. At the island and district level, key stakeholders (island councils, communities)

have been involved towards the implementation of climate change adaptation activities. At the MTE point, the programme has shown moderate potential to replicate some 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 moderatemoderatemoderate, if all adaptive management recommendations are swiftly implemented during Q1 and Q2-2016. The programme could play a pivotal role in supporting national and Pa Enea institutions in developing CCA and DRR policies for various economic sectors, and further building islands communities' resilience to CC impacts. The programme has high potential to catalyse technical and financial interests 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. However, this MTE suggests a 12-month extension of the programme to allow achieving the majority of programme targets, and ensuring the accomplishment of main programme development impact goals. 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.

#### **1.6. Recommendation Summary Table**

Based on the Summary of Ratings & Achievement table (Table1), stakeholder interviews and project documents revision, this MTE has developed a set of recommendations for each Outcome, as well as for the Project Implementation and Sustainability (Table 2). Recommendations and relative adaptive response are discussed in more detail in the conclusion section of this report. However, the MTE team highlights the following 4 key recommendations in this summary section:

1. Support/Lead the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation in key development sectors policy of the Cook Islands (Agriculture, Water, Infrastructure and Tourism);
2. 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, planning and reporting in all Pa Enea (by selecting a core target and trusted groups of individuals);
3. Review and strengthen the programme M&E procedures (i.e. increase in M&E frequency, data collection and analysis, evaluation of current and planned adaptation measures) as well as the

subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the progress of programme activities based on each M&E results.

4. Send a formal request to the AF requesting the programme extension of additional 12 months in order to meet the initial programme targets (and those revised here), and to achieve the programme development impact goals in terms of climate change

**Table 2. Complete list of MTE recommendations.**

Rec #	Recommendation
<b>A</b>	<b>OUTCOME 1: Efficient and effective support at national level for disaster risk reduction and adaptation initiatives in the Pa Enea</b>
A.1	<b>Key recommendation: Support/Lead the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation in key development frameworks of the Cook Islands (Agriculture, Water, Infrastructure and Tourism).</b>
A.2	Support/Lead the development of at least 2 islands climate change adaptation policy for the water and agriculture sectors. – suggested islands are Mangaia and Atiu.
A.3	Support/ Lead the integration of the climate change dimension into current DRR policies at national and island level.
<b>B</b>	<b>OUTCOME 2: Key players in Pa Enea development have the capacity to reflect disaster risk management and adaptation considerations when planning, making decisions and during operations.</b>
B.1	<b>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 in all Pa Enea (by selecting a core target and trusted groups of individuals).</b>
B.2	Provide regular technical trainings (2/year for each Pa Enea) for CCA agriculture and water management activities in relation to planned activities under Outcome 3, including monitoring, evaluation, and reporting training for such activities.
B.3	Conduct at least 1 workshop/ each Pa Enea before June 2017 regarding (i) CC vulnerability mapping and training at national and provincial level under component 2, and (ii) the vulnerability assessment method for local communities.
<b>C</b>	<b>OUTCOME 3: Enhanced resilience to climate change, including weather- and climate-related disasters, for all 11 inhabited Pa Enea</b>
C.1	<b>Key recommendation: Review and strengthen the programme M&amp;E procedures (i.e. increase in M&amp;E frequency, data systematization, evaluation) as well as the subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the progress of programme activities based on each M&amp;E results.</b>
C.2	Conduct field assessment to determine the impact of the proposed climate change adaptation activities (i.e. quantity of water available/ household during drought period, predicted changes in vegetable production, changes in fishing catchment) on community resilience and livelihoods.
C.3	Increase visibility of project demonstration sites (sign, brief explanation kits, boards at implementation sites), strengthening stakeholder involvement in current activities (for example, the farming project in Mangaia which are at a risk of suffering from poor stakeholder involvement during the initial critical phase, the water project in Aitu to ensure good maintenance of equipment),
<b>D</b>	<b>OUTCOME 4: Lessons learned and best practices improve the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Pa Enea and other vulnerable communities</b>
D.1	<b>Key recommendation: Develop a communication plan for various project components and stakeholders to be implemented starting in Q3-2016.</b>

D.2	Ensure integration of ALL outcomes lessons-learnt in ONE project best practice document to be presented and discussed with key stakeholders at the central level, during island councils in the Pa Enea and published on the website.
D.3	If budget allows and in coordination with local authorities, establish at least 2 educational site OR centers (1 in the southern and 1 in the northern group) regarding various CCA techniques, vulnerability risks and adaptation management.
<b>E</b>	<b>Programme Design, Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>
E.1	<b>Key recommendation: Send a formal request to the AF requesting the programme extension of additional 12 months in order to meet the intial programme targets (and those revised here), and to achieve the programme development impact goals in terms of climate change.</b>
E.2	Develop a more detailed climate change adaptation criteria for reviewing and approving project proposals, to ensure that the proposed activities are aligned to the IPCC definition (and associated operationalization) of CCA and resilience.
E.3	Increase technical exchanges and partnerships with current and planned projects addressing climate change in CI (i.e. Ridge to Reef GEF project, Reinstitution of PSC).
<b>F</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>
F.1	<b>Key recommendation: Develop and agree on roles and responsibilities on hand-over M &amp; E activities to support current and future CCA in the Pa Enea from 2017 onwards.</b>
F.2	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 CCA.
F.3	For sustainability, develop an Exist Strategy that consists of: (i) ensuring that the Prime Minister office would be the main responsible to continue mainstreaming climate change in key development policies at national and island level, (ii) regular budgeting (even if relatively a small percentage of the national budget) for national climate change adaptation activities in the Pa Enea, particularly for climate SMART agriculture, and (iii) use the limited revenues/ surplus from small farming and fishing pilot project activities as equipment maintenance and upgrading.

## 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.

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

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 AWP (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 in 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 site visit (Atiu and Mangai Islands), meetings and stakeholder interviews including: programme team, executing agencies, task team/ component leaders, key experts in the subject area, programme stakeholders, local government, island councils and beneficiaries.

Two field visits (3 days/ each) were conducted on Atiu and Mangaia 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 major project stakeholders;
4. Site visits to Atiu and Mangaia Islands;
5. Presentation of preliminary results to key stakeholders Rarotonga.

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 GEF/UNDP evaluation criteria (i.e. effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability, and impact). The major limitation of the MTE was related to the relative limited time (12 days) to assess all relevant data sources during the field mission.

The potential limitations of this MTE include:

1. Limited field time to visit other programme activities being implemented in Pa Enea 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 Required Ratings and Rating 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;
8. Programme co-financing elements;
9. Detailed recommendations for various programme outcomes.

## **3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT**

### **3.1 Background Context**

#### *Climate Change Vulnerability of the Cook Islands*

Geographically, the Cook Islands faces major challenges: the habitable islands are widely scattered over a vast ocean space and simply maintaining contact with the communities that live in them, to say nothing of supplying them with essential services and integrating them closely into the national economy, is difficult and expensive. To avoid obliteration of many of these communities altogether, either in a sudden disaster or by slow attrition due to out-migration, strenuous efforts are required to provide basic sustenance and physical protection.

In common with many other Pacific island countries, the Cook Islands are still working out an affordable, yet effective Community Service Obligation strategy that will ensure that all Cook Islands residents enjoy a basic standard of living wherever they reside in the country. In the meantime, the climate is changing and the difficulty of meeting this challenge is growing. As discussed below, there is much that is being done, albeit in a piecemeal and somewhat uncoordinated fashion, to contain the extra costs to the communities as a result of living and remaining in their land in the face of climate change. Even with an improved and much more closely integrated national effort, the expense involved in keeping the islands



productive and habitable will be high, notwithstanding that the populations that live in many of the islands are quite small, particularly in the Northern Group.

As is the case for other countries that are influenced by the SPCZ, the Cook Islands are subject to highly destructive cyclones, intense rainfall events, and devastating droughts. The isolated populations in the Pa Enua are especially vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, including:

- Increased frequency and intensity of rainfall and tropical storms;
- Higher risk of coastal erosion and flooding as a result of rising and extreme sea levels and changing wind patterns;
- Loss of water resources from hotter, drier weather and/or contamination of groundwater due to saltwater intrusion;
- Resurgence of dengue fever and other tropical and water-borne diseases;
- Reduced productivity of food crops due to soil degradation and increased salinity; and
- Loss of local biodiversity from habitat changes, extreme events, sea level rise, and ocean warming.

*Current barriers to climate change adaptation, needs and gaps in adaptive capacity*

Though many projects and policy frameworks have introduced participatory planning processes, mobilized communities, and have supported improved resource management and policy development at local and national government levels, they do not adequately integrate climate change risk considerations and adaptation responses. Adaptation implementation at the island level throughout the country is severely constrained by the pursuit of distinct, as opposed to an integrated national strategy for climate change, land degradation, disaster prevention, preparedness and management; shortage in resource and key national assets to systematically monitor changes from various actions that are taking place over time; limited understanding and monitoring of environment in health issues such as vector-borne, water quality, skin and respiratory problems; limited capacity to assess the impact of both technological and policy measures for climate-related concerns; and lack of adequate legislation covering key areas such as resource management, water supply, hazardous waste disposal, and sanitation (treatment and disposal of liquid and solid wastes).

The Second National Communication, currently in draft form, identifies several key gaps and constraints to successful adaptation to climate change in the Cook Islands. These have been identified as a result of

numerous consultations with local stakeholders over a significant period of time, in particular since the Initial National Communication was prepared. The key gaps and constraints are:

- Comprehensive vulnerability and adaptation assessments need to be completed for all Islands; this will improve understanding of the extent of island vulnerability and hazards and provide a basis for systemic action to manage climate change risks; increased awareness of the risks will occur if the assessments are undertaken using local systems and with engagement of local stakeholders and systems;
- Capacity building around the implementation of climate change risks on renewable energy technologies is needed to ensure long-term operational effectiveness;
- The national response to climate change should be better integrated into development processes, especially in terms of mainstreaming current and emerging climate issues into existing socio-economic projects, and into programmes and governance frameworks for future initiatives;
- The financing of climate change risk management related activities and budget constraints are closely linked, and requires continued international assistance at the national level, with national participation;
- Enforcement of climate policy and regulations in place to facilitate and promote behavioural adjustments towards risk management practices in the Cook Islands needs substantial improvement, within the capacity and capability of national human resources; and
- Land tenure issues which impede sustainable development require addressing at national and local levels.

### **3.2 Project description and objective**

The objective of the programme is to strengthen the ability of all Cook Island communities, and the public service, to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures (including extreme events) in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner. In achieving this objective, the programme will support, at the national, sectoral, and island levels, implementation of the Cook Islands' new National Adaptation Plan (NAP) for DRM and CCA.

The programme consists of the 4 components with specific outputs/ outcome as per following:

#### Component 1. Strengthening and implementing climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction at national level

*Output 1.1 Staff of national agencies and organisations on the NCCCT trained and working in ways that improve coordination and delivery of CCA and DRM initiatives on the ground in the Pa Enua.*

*Output 1.2 National and sector policies, related instruments, and work programmes enhanced in ways that support CCA and DRM in the Pa Enea, consistent with island development plans.*

*Output 1.3 Fully operational climate early warning and information systems.*

#### Component 2. Strengthening capacities for climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in the Pa Enea

*Output 2.1. Integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans for each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enea, including harmonization with island development plans.*

*Output 2.2. In each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enea, island councils, administrators, technical officers, farmers, fishers, households and business owners trained in planning and undertaking integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction initiatives, consistent with the island development plans.*

#### Component 3. Implementing climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures in the Pa Enea

*Output 3.1. Small grants to the 11 Pa Enea and their communities, to implement CCA and DRR within the framework of integrated island- and community-level DRR and CCA action plans and the island strategic development plans.*

*Output 3.2. Climate-resilient agricultural and fisheries practices implemented in at least 5 Pa Enea, including Manihiki, Aitutaki, Mangaia, Atiu, and Mauke.*

*Output 3.3. Water capture, storage and groundwater management capacities are enhanced in at least 7 islands, including Pukapuka, Nassau, Mitiaro, Palmerston, Aitutaki, Atiu, Mangaia and Rarotonga, through community-based actions and infrastructure climate-proofing projects*

*Output 3.4. Coastal protection enhanced in at least 3 Pa Enea, including, Rakahanga, Aitutaki, and Palmerston.*

*Output 3.5. Resilience of tourism enterprises to climate change enhanced in at least 3 Pa Enea, including Manihiki, Aitutaki, and Atiu.*

*Output 3.6. Health support and vector-borne disease control techniques introduced in at least 5 Pa Enea to address climate-induced health risks, including Pukapuka, Mangaia, Mauke, Mitiaro and Palmerston.*

#### Component 4. Climate change adaptation knowledge management

*Output 4.1 Lessons learned and best practices improve the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Pa Enea and other vulnerable communities.*

*Output 4.2 raining materials incorporating climate change issues developed and used for training of field staff, students and other key players.*

### **3.3 Stakeholder analysis**

The programme builds on and serves to strengthen existing institutions and inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms. The key stakeholders and their role in this programme are:

- National Environment Service – advocacy, community training, technical information sharing;
- Office of the Prime Minister, Central Policy and Planning Division – leadership and advocacy, staff time;
- Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning, including Water Supply and Energy Divisions- advocacy, community training, technical information sharing;

- Cook Islands Meteorological Service- technical information sharing;
- Ministry of Agriculture- leadership and advocacy, training, staff time;
- Ministry of Health- technical information sharing;
- Ministry of Education- advocacy and technical information sharing;
- Ministry of Marine Resources- training, staff time;
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs- advocacy;
- Ministry of Internal Affairs- advocacy;
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Management, including Aid & Statistics Divisions;
- Emergency Management Unit- advocacy, training, staff time;
- Traditional Leaders (Koutu Nui & House of Ariki)- leadership and advocacy, staff time;
- Civil society organisations including Red Cross, Environmental NGOs, Climate Action Network, & Tourism Industry and Chamber of Commerce representatives; and
- Island Councils and Administrations- leadership and advocacy, staff time.

Many of the above are mandated to represent the interests and concerns of vulnerable community groups targeted in SRIC and were therefore directly involved in the consultations for the proposal formulation. These include the Traditional Leaders (Koutu Nui & House of Ariki), members of Island Councils and Island Administrations, and members of civil society organisations, notably the Red Cross, environmental NGOs, and Climate Action Network. Tourism industry and Chamber of Commerce representatives are also critical to reducing the vulnerability of community members through private sector initiatives that provide economic opportunities for vulnerable individuals and community groups.

#### **4. FINDINGS**

##### **4.1. Programme Strategy**

The programme is estimated to meet the key objective moderately satisfactorily (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 knowledgeable. This rating also reflects the relative technical and strategic implementation delays of Outcome 1,2 and 3, i.e. policy development, capacity building and applied 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 Q1 and 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 team 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 the Pa Enua. 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 and Pa Enua 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 (agriculture, fisheries, tourism water has generated capacity building strategies across organizations. The programme team has been providing government staff, island councils members and beneficiaries training opportunities, and begun stimulating discussions on climate change adaptation for the Pa Enua 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, particular under Outcome 1 and 2, to ensure that reasonable hard and soft measures are In particular, capacity building activities (Outcome 1) are designed independently from any guiding parameters/ principles in relation to policy development (Outcome 2). As a result, they all have their unique implementation approach. 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 (noted in all Pa Enua) 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.

## **4.2. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

### Management Arrangements

The programme team is satisfactorily performing management, implementation and strategic planning tasks. The programme coordination should be improved in terms of more regular reporting activities to key stakeholders in all Pa Enea and at the national level. This coordination should also aim at ensuring that lessons-learnt from all outcomes are efficiently integrated 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, as demonstrated by increasing communication channels between various stakeholders, information sharing regarding project activities, and adaptive management measures. UNDP is providing technical backstopping, but could improve its M&E role and reporting to further support the programme delivery and strategic planning (particularly for capacity building and policy development in all Pa Enea). The overall programme responsibilities are clear to stakeholders, as well as the programme reporting lines for each outcome.

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 identified as delays in TORs publications, programme team recruitment, agreement on annual work-plan with key stakeholders due to the novelty of subject, and 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. It should be observed that Outcome 1 and 2 have experienced conceptual implementation delays due to programme implementation focusing on Outcome 3.

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 programme 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, 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 the Pa Enuu.

#### 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 have not been clearly defined and they are not fully SMART nor GENDER. Revision of some indicators is required to allow an efficient M&E analysis particularly for the final project evaluation (Please refer to Table 4).

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 outcome activities to determine the current programme activities impact and adaptive management activities. Furthermore, the programme M&E should evaluate the actual performance of climate change adaptation activities at demonstration sites by collecting key data (water availability 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. 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, islands 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.

Finally, the programme has not been screened through the UNDP Environmental and Social screening procedure, probably due to the project approval year (2009) when screening was not yet a routine

procedure. Even though the programme is entering the second half it is recommended to undergo this screening by 2016, so to determine the environmental and social impact

### 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 (Agriculture, fisheries, health, water) 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, NES, island authorities). Further to a relatively weak stakeholder engagement at the project start due mainly to novelty of project objective and history of a multitude aid projects, stakeholders (mainly Ministry of Planning, and island councils) have played an active role in project decision-making, contributing in efficient and effective programme implementation particularly during the last 9 months. This positive trend can be explained by the rising interest in the programme activities, and their potential impacts on government future policy and code for climate change adaptation to key development sectors in the Pa Enea.

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 learnt and best practices will be shared to a wider audience at the provincial and national level through Outcome 4. 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 Enea (more awareness to deal with adaptation to water and agriculture sector) and (ii) technical level of some project outputs (risk assessment, studies, reports).



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 island authorities to replicate similar adaptation techniques in other sites and (ii) the overall understanding by the Ministry of Planning 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 stone, they should be reviewed and adapted to the realities on the ground, particularly considering the logistical constraints 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 adjustments, 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 described in various PPRs, 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.

### 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 programme feedback mechanism is not yet effective when communication is received. The MTE did not find evidence that key stakeholders are being overlooked and omitted by the programme communication. On the contrary, key stakeholders are kept well informed of project results and activities.

The programme communication as regards to Outcome activities planning and coordination could be improved by convening quarterly stakeholder 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 (agriculture, local development, natural resource management, infrastructure, tourism, water). The programme should not consider the risk of over-dependency on web-based information over more conventional methods.

#### Progress towards outcomes analysis

At the MTE point, the overall AF Programme Objective Rating is deemed Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), meaning that the programme is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives with potentially shortcomings, if adaptive 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 for the Pa Enua. Further to a slow implementation start and relative weak stakeholder engagement, the programme has gradually increased its performance starting from Q1-2015. Assessment methodology to approve project proposals should be improved by adopting latest IPCC CCA criteria as main evaluation indicators. Currently, project proposals are being reviewed including agriculture and water resilience initiatives. When each outcome and outputs are screened versus rating scales, the following results are found:

Outcome 1- Efficient and effective support at national level for disaster risk reduction and adaptation initiatives in the Pa Enua (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. However, the methodological approach to mainstreaming

CC risks in the planning process is yet not clear, and in the development phase. The programme should strengthen its partnership with the Ministry of Planning to perform this mainstreaming task for selected development policies (agriculture, DRR, water, and tourism). This outcome has not focused on determine the most practical (and culturally appropriate) approach to design such methodological approach considering the national and island context. Finally, progress has been made towards developing a preparatory assessment to the National CC-DRM policy on 11 sectoral and related national policies, with the results captured in recommendation reports. Such positive and crucial output should be by developing detailed climate change policy or development plan for 2-3 key sectors (agriculture, water and tourism). For example, the Cook Islands Tourism Board is supportive of incorporating DRR and CCA into the national tourism accreditation criteria, and this accreditation process will support the adoption of climate resilient business practices covering the targeted 50 local tourism enterprises in the 3 Pa Enea. The programme should further develop such partnership in Q1-Q2 2016, by implementing this mainstreaming activity. Finally, the outcome delivery rate is S (43%) at the MTE point, even though its impact is still difficult to evaluate.

**Outcome 2- Key players in Pa Enea development have the capacity to reflect disaster risk management and adaptation considerations when planning, making decisions and during operations (MU).** 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. These capacity building activities should be fully integrated across all programme outcomes, and eventually under Outcome 4. Introductory training sessions/workshops regarding climate change adaptation to rural infrastructure have been successfully carried out. Unfortunately, a systematic training strategy at the individual and institutional level has yet to be developed by the programme. The delivery rate remains low (35%) at the MTE mark, mainly due to slow strategic and implementation progress in the first two years. This outcome needs to focus their relative annual work-plan to implement at least 50% of their total budget within the next 12 months, particularly in terms of capacity needs assessments for various government stakeholders and islands institutions. CC awareness for decision makers (trainings, workshops) has partially been implemented. The MTE strongly suggests designing a training program (consisting of 4-5 CCA and DRR modules) to be delivered for each Pa Enea during 2016.

**Outcome 3- Enhanced resilience to climate change, including weather- and climate-related disasters, for all 11 inhabited Pa Enea (MS).** Progress is being made towards meeting the Output- level targets for Outcome 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 (2012-2013). Furthermore, this outcome faces, more than other outcome, two significant challenges: (i) logistically, as it has to deliver and implement activities across a large geographical areas with limited transportation options (few flights to Northern Cook Islands, limited cargo ship option to deliver materials), and (ii) socially, as the population composition of the Pa Enea mainly consists of elderly and young, restricting the labor force potential for the programme activities.

However, encouraging implementation progress has been seen during the last 9 months including, for example, the beginning of agriculture adaptation activities in Managia, coconut oil preparation sites and water collection systems in Atiu. 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 adaptive measure is implemented. The delivery rate is relatively low (34%) considering the official timeframe left, and this outcome holds the majority of the programme budget.

This outcome has successfully collaborated with the SGP in terms of evaluating project proposal for various climate change adaptation's thematic areas in the Pa Enea. However, the assessment methodology for project proposals should be further detailed to define clearer climate change adaptation criteria to be followed (IPCC as a methodological guide) during project review (and approval).

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.

**Outcome 4- Lessons learnt and best practices from Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 are disseminated to stakeholders and development partners (MS).** Work under Outcome 4 has recently began, and it is progressing MS. The production of a video showing current climate change threats and risks is a positive result achieved thus far, and should be disseminated across the Pa Enea. The programme has yet to develop an integrated communication plan, and this activity should be the priority in Q1, Q2 -2016. This outcome will be starting full implementation from Q2-2016. This outcome performance could be estimated as satisfactorily (S) by the programme closure, when all lessons learnt from all other outcomes will be integrated in one key communication document.

### 4.3 Delivery rate

The project delivery rate at the MTE point is fair, 34% (Table 3). Considering that implementation rate is expected to significantly increase from Q1-2016, the final delivery rate could be predicted to be satisfactory- (above 75%) by the end of the programme. Outcome 1 delivery rate is satisfactory, 41%, while Outcome 2 delivery rate remains low, 35%, at MTE point, and Outcome 3 delivery rate, 32%, remains of concern as Outcome 3 holds the majority of the total programme budget. The majority of Outcome 4 implementation will occur from Q3-2015 through 2016, and the delivery rate is fair at the MTE point.

**Table 3. Programme delivery rate (as per September 2015).**

Outcome/Atlas Activity	Amount (USD) Year 1	Amount (USD) Year 2	Amount (USD) Year3	Amount (USD) Year 4	Amount (USD) Year 5	Total (USD)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
<b>OUTCOME 1: Efficient and effective support at national level for disaster risk reduction and adaptation initiatives in the Pa Enua</b>	213,000	133,000	30,000	14,000	10,000	400,000
Expenditure (USD) (September 2015)	6,391.62	96,724.90	45,031.62	16,101.62	-	164,249.76
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	3%	73%	150%	115%	-	41%
<b>OUTCOME 2: Key players in Pa Enua development have the capacity to reflect disaster risk management and adaptation considerations when planning, making decisions and during operations</b>	153,000	176,000	173,000	168,000	115,000	785,000
Expenditure (USD) (September 2015)	1,811.21	99,899.16	95,566.71	84,712.46	-	281,989.54
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	1.2%	57%	55%	50%	-	36%
<b>OUTCOME 3: Enhanced resilience to climate change, including weather- and climate-related disasters, for all 11 inhabited Pa Enua</b>	207,000	710,000	953,000	820,000	525,000	3,215,000
Expenditure (USD) (September 2015)	11,875.15	122,891.07	796,510.64	96,351.69	-	1,027,628.50
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	6%	17%	84%	12%	-	32%
<b>OUTCOME 4: Lessons learned and best practices improve the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Pa Enua and other vulnerable communities</b>	15,000	-	44,000	9,000	32,000	100,000
Expenditure (USD) (September 2015)	0.00	0.00	11,192.19	1,920.56	-	13,112.75
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	0.00%	0.00%	25%	21%	-	13%
<b>Project Management</b>	99,700	79,700	99,700	77,700	103,200	460,000
Expenditure (USD) (September 2015)	27,422.34	69,450.11	68,490.53	59,859.82		225,222.80
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	28%	87%	69%	77%		49%
<b>Grand Total</b>	687,700	1,098,700	1,299,700	1,088,700	785,200	4,960,000
Expenditure (USD) (September 2015)	47,500.32	388,965.24	1,016,791.70	258,946.15		1,712,203.41
Delivery Rate (Expenditure/Budget * 100%)	7%	35%	78%	24%		35%

The MTE does not find significant variance between planned, as indicated by the PRODOC budget, and actual expenditures. Some minor (9%) variance (in Outcome 1 and 3) 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 3).

The programme management shows appropriate and up-to- AF/UNDP-standard management of financial resources, expenditures and following the procedure of annual audits.

#### Co-financing

The MTE analyzed the programme co-finance (in-kind and cash) (Annex 8). Considering that AF programme do not require specific co-financing, the MTE found that the programme was able to engage various stakeholders in committing financial resources to support the programme activities. For example, the Mangaia Island government has provided free labour and land access to begin the climate change adaptation farming activities; the Atiu local government has also provided free labour to install water tanks for all beneficiaries. Furthermore, the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) has provided a 400,000 EUR co-finance to install water tanks in the Northern Islands. 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.

#### **4.4 Log-frame analysis and amendments**

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 the baseline information. Further to stakeholder consultations, the MTE has proposed a revised version of the current logframe (Table 4).

**Table 4. Progress towards results matrix.**

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	End of Project Target	Key Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
------------------	-----------	----------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------	--------------

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	End of Project Target	Key Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
<b>Objective</b> <b>To strengthen the ability of all Cook Island communities and the public service to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures (including extreme events) in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner</b>	Number of households in the Pa Enea and Rarotonga target villages (Ruaau and Akaoa) and the number of public officers dealing with Pa Enea sustainable development who have enhanced adaptive capacity to respond to climate-induced risks. SMART. NO GENDER. Amendment: include gender disregarded data (number of women dealing with Pa Enea sustainable ...)	Past climate change assessments and planning processes (principally attached to the National Communications process and a few projects) have raised awareness amongst community members and public officers on climate change, but responses are limited to a few projects and ad-hoc coping measures by communities. As a result communities lack adequate capacity to adapt to climate-induced impacts affecting food and water supply, coastal ecosystems, tourism and related livelihood	MS	By the end of the programme at least 1600 households and 100 public officers in the Pa Enea have increased their adaptive capacity	<p><b>1.</b> Focal points have been appointed and fully assumed planning and coordination of SRIC CC activities on all 11 inhabited Pa Enea.</p> <p><b>2.</b> Water storage tanks were installed at 300 households, providing 6000 L additional water storage capacity per household (total 1.8 M litres) in 3 Pa Enea (Atiu, Aitutaki and Palmerston).</p> <p><b>3.</b> Community Sustainable Development Plans (Island level) with CCA and DRR aspects integrated have been completed for 8 Pa Enea (Penryhn, Pukapuka, Nassau, Rakahanga, Atiu, Mitiaro, Mauke and Palmerston). CSDP in Mangaia has been completed and also publicly launched. CSDP for Aitutaki is under development.</p>	<p>Availability of necessary expertise and experience to undertake activities required to integrate climate risk management in relevant policies and other instruments. Still valid, and the risk remain moderate due to the limited (in term of available human resources) national expertise. Political will and commitment by senior government officials to integrate climate risk management. Low risk as political engagement was recorded to be present. Strong coordination amongst climate change and disaster risk reduction stakeholders in country. This assumption remains moderate as coordination is still being developed. Strong community leadership and support for, and engagement in project activities in the Pa Enea. Low risk as community leaders and members are showing high engagement in programme activities.</p>	The programme is on-track to meet its overall objective, but still at low risk to underperform in two components (1 and 1). Further to a slow start, the project is contributing in stimulating innovative approaches towards climate change adaptation for all Cook Islands, and in mainstreaming climate change adaptation into government priorities.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	End of Project Target	Key Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
		activities.					

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	Target	Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
<b>Outcome 1 Efficient and effective support at national level for disaster risk reduction and adaptation initiatives in the Pa Enua</b>	<p>Number of national policies and related instruments enhanced in ways that support CCA and DRR. SMART. Amendment: please change/specify 'enhanced' i.e. including specific CCA and DRR.</p> <p>Number of government staff with job descriptions that make reference to climate and disaster risk management and who have received relevant training. SMART.</p>	<p>Relevant national policy instruments, coordination mechanisms and institutions do not address climate risks in an adequate manner</p> <p>Climate and disaster risk management are seen as the sole responsibility of the National Environment Service and Emergency Management Cook Islands</p>	MU	<p>1. At least four relevant national level policy instruments, and coordination mechanisms addressing have integrated climate risk management.</p> <p>2. At least 75 government staff with responsibilities for sustainable development in the Pa Enua have job descriptions that make reference to climate and disaster risk management. Amendment: at least 50 government staff.</p> <p>3. At least 100 government staff with responsibilities for sustainable development in the Pa Enua will have received formal training in climate and</p>	<p>1. Preparatory assessments to the National CC-DRM Policy a systematic gap analysis has been carried out on 11 sectoral and related national policies, with the results captured in recommendation reports.</p> <p>2. Over 40 officers of Island Administrations were involved in CSDP related trainings and consultations, 30 gov. staff received initial training on user aspects of a Teachers' Resource Kit on CC and DRM launched, and round 30 health officers were involved in initial trainings related to the vector-borne disease control actions being rolled out in the Pa Enua</p> <p>3. Implementation plan is developed for the sourcing and installation of Automated Weather Stations (AWS) and related info system. A web portal is under development to disseminate climate early warning information.</p>	<p>Political will and commitment, and availability of necessary expertise and experience, to undertake activities required to integrate climate risk management in relevant policies and other instruments. This assumption is still valid, and the risk is still moderate as national expertise is scarce. Appropriate staff members are selected for training by their host agencies. The MTE suggests identifying via interviews and discussion with senior government staff, core staff willing to be trained during the 2 years. Very low staff turnover resulting in sustained</p>	<p>This outcome performance is moderately unsatisfactory, as the programme has mainly focused on outcome 3. This MTE strongly suggests focusing starting on Q1-2016 on CCA and DRR mainstreaming efforts for two selected national development policy (i.e. agriculture and infrastructure/water). The MTE also suggests that selected technical standards/codes, policy and plans concerning agriculture, water and tourism to be reviewed, and 'entry-points' for policy development and for CCA and DRR mainstreaming of the climate change (CC) to be identified. The MTE also suggests identifying core government staff willing to be trained over the next two years (2016-17).</p>



Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	Target	Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
				disaster risk management		capacity of government and partner institutions This assumption is still valid, and it poses a moderate risk.	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	Target	Key Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
Outcome 2 Key players in Pa Enua development have the capacity to reflect disaster risk management and adaptation considerations when planning, making decisions and during operations	SRIC Focal Points for each inhabited Pa Enua appointed and funded. SMART. NO GENDER. Please add No of women as focal points.	There are no individuals in the Pa Enua who have formal responsibilities for, and oversight of, climate risk assessment and management in the context of sustainable island development.	MU	By the end of year 1 of the programme SRIC Focal Points appointed and fully operational in 11 inhabited Pa Enua.	1. Focal points have been appointed and fully assumed planning and coordination of SRIC CC activities on all 11 inhabited Pa Enua.	Suitably qualified personnel available in each inhabited Pa Enua. This assumption is still valid, even though current focal points are motivated, and possess some key skills for agriculture and water SRC Focal Points establish effective working relationships with island administrations, councils and community leaders. The MTE suggests further training	This output activity is progressing moderately unsatisfactory. The MTE suggests further supporting the appointed focal points by regular training activities for M&E, and reporting.
	Prepare integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans for each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enua. SMART. NO GENDER. Amendment. Please add 'plans that include gender dimension'.	No Pa Enua has a climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plan or any other formal mechanism for addressing climate and		By the end of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans approved for each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enua, and harmonized with island	1. Community Sustainable Development Plans (Island level) with CCA and DRR aspects integrated have been completed for 8 Pa Enua (Penryhn, Pukapuka, Nassau, Rakahanga, Atiu, Mitiaro, Mauke and Palmerston). CSDP in Mangaia has been completed	Political will and commitment to ensure plans are prepared in a fully participatory manner. Considering the overall interest and attention to the programme objectives, this assumption poses a low risk. Strong	The programme has not significantly advanced towards the achievement of this output. Considering the remaining programme timeframe, the MTE strongly suggests engaging a team of 1 national and 1 international consultant to develop the conceptual framework of 5 action plans during Q1-2016. This team should be focus on setting up the conceptual framework of document

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	Target	Key Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
		disaster risks in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner		development plans. Amendment: this target is very ambitious considering the current programme performance and logistical constrains. The MTE suggests adjusting the target to 7 Pa Enu.	and also publicly launched. CSDP for Aitutaki is under development.	community leadership and support for, and engagement in project activities in the Pa Enu. The community leadership is present, but requires constant support by the programme to guarantee further engagement in programme activities. Availability of necessary expertise and experience to undertake activities required to prepare integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans. This assumption is still valid. The programme should consider hiring a short-term international expert to begin the action plan development.	selection and revision at the provincial and national level for each action plan. The methodological approach to mainstreaming CC risks in the planning process should also be considered.
	Island stakeholders and key players trained in climate and disaster risk assessment and their management NO SMART. Amendment. Please specify the island stakeholders. For example: No of islands councils,	Island stakeholders and key players have little practical understanding of climate and disaster risk assessment, and how this understanding	By the end of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> year at least 500 island stakeholders and key players have been trained in climate and disaster risk assessment and management involving both men and women in an equitable manner.		1. A series of community meetings and presentations attached to the CSDP consultation and formulation process covering 10 Pa Enu (Penryhn, Pukapuka, Nassau, Rakahanga, Atiu, Mitiaro, Mauke Palmerston, Mangaia, Aitutaki	Political will and commitment to ensure effective use of climate information, and undertake monitoring of climate impacts on terrestrial, marine, and coastal ecosystems. This assumption remains very	This output activity is progressing unsatisfactory. The MTE strongly suggests designing a training program (consisting of 4-5 CCA and DRR modules) to be delivered for each Pa Enu during 2016 (4 days/ Pa Enu).

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	Target	Key Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
	island chiefs, religious leaders, teachers, farmer and fishing associations. NO GENDER. Please add No of women trained.	ng can contribute to sustainable island development			and involving around 500 households.	valid, particularly in terms of monitoring efforts.	
	Number of successfully completed capacity building projects funded by the SRIC Small Grants Programme. SMART. <u>Amendment.</u> Please specify what 'successfully' entails. For example, a minimum of 80% financial delivery rate, a minimum scoring of 80% vs. the projects indicators, interviews and questionnaire to determine the level of capacity acquired (built) towards CCA and DRR planning.	It is exceedingly difficult for stakeholders in the Pa Enea to access the UNDP/GEF SGP; that programme no longer funds capacity building initiatives	By the end of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, at least 50 initiatives to build capacity in climate and disaster risk assessment and management are funded by the small grants programme, and are completed successfully, involving both men and women in an equitable manner. <u>Amendment:</u> at least 40 initiatives.		To date the SRIC CC Programme Management Unit has received 7 applications for support under the SGP, which are currently being evaluated. In the 2nd reporting year, 2 projects (valued at 25k each) are in implementation and 4 projects are ready for procurement. There are discussions between SRIC CC and GEF to merge SRIC CC & GEF SGP. This merger will bring more funding opportunities for the Pa Enea communities.	Efforts to build capacity for grant application and execution are successful. This assumption should be further analysed in terms of support provided to applicants by the programme team. The Steering Committee is independent of political and other influences. This assumption is still valid, and requires further attention in terms of capacity building of the steering committee. Strong community interest in, support for, and engagement in capacity building activities in the Pa Enea. The MTE finds a general interests in these activities, therefore this assumption can be considered at low risk/influence.	The programme is satisfactory progressing towards the achievement of this output. However, the assessment methodology to determine successful project application and implementation should further be developed based on CCA guidelines under the UNFCCC and IPPC. The MTE strongly suggests strengthening the current M&E programme to provide further support to on-going project. Finally, the MTE also suggests further technical and management training for the steering committee members, supporting them in their decision-making role.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
Outcome 3 Enhanced resilience to climate change, including weather-related and climate-related disasters, for all 11 inhabited Pa Enea	Increase in the volume (Litres) of water storage capacity in communities affected by climate-induced water shortages. SMART <u>Amendment:</u> increase in storage (as measured in litre/person or household) during the dry season from a baseline pre-water tanks introduction.	The current estimated total water storage capacity in the 11 Pa Enea is about 7 M L. The current open reservoir of 10 M L in Ruaau, and Akaoa (Rarotonga), is completely dysfunctional and needs to be repaired or replaced by another type of storage facility. The infrastructure (e.g. pumps, pipes, guttering) supplying the storage facilities are in poor status reducing efficiency of supply, needing upgrade and maintenance, to satisfy demand and to face climate-induced disturbances in water supply.	By the end of the programme the water storage capacity is increased by at least 14 M L in affected communities as a result of the water infrastructure adaptation projects implemented in at least 7 islands (Aitutaki, Atiu, Mangaia, Mitiaro, Palmerston, Pukapuka and Nassau and Rarotonga). Comment: this target should be carefully monitored and eventually reviewed during the Q1-Q2-2016, as 14 M L is ambitious given the current implementation rate and logistic constrains in delivering some of the equipment.	1. Water storage tanks were installed at 300 households, providing 6000 L additional water storage capacity per household (total 1.8 M litres) in 3 Pa Enea (Atiu, Aitutaki and Palmerston). 2. A number of community-led and sector-coordinated concepts and proposal have been received at the PMU to address agricultural and marine related challenges in the Pa enua, which are being assessed and finalized. These initial proposals are expected to involve directly round 150 households in 7 Pa Enea. 3. A recent vulnerability assessment has indicated a particular Pa Enea (Penrhyn) that will require assistance to strengthen their coastal area as storm surge is affecting their road that is approximately 5 meters from the lagoon. PMU is engaged in discussions with the authors of the V&A to identify how this can be addressed. This refers to approximately 2 km of affected coastline for two village communities on Penrhyn.	Strong island and community interest in, support for, and engagement in capacity building activities in the Pa Enea Island and community interest remain high, and willing to receive various climate change adaptation trainings (planning, techniques, evaluating). Island councils and secretaries can identify the need for, and oversee implementation of interventions that address climate and disaster risks in a proactive, integrated and strategic manner. Island councils and secretaries require more planning and V&A trainings to identify current and emerging CC risks and needs for their respective communities. Strong island and community interest in, support for, and engagement in the design and construction of infrastructure that will not only enhance island and community resilience, but is designed with attention to future climate risks. Community interest remains moderate, but could increase to high if further technical support and targeted trainings regarding infrastructure construction are delivered by the programme Island councils and	The programme has significantly advanced in the overall achievement of this outcome. However, some activities (i.e. coastal protection, climate-resilient health and fisheries activities) still remain at the planning stage. The MTE also finds that the M&E system for each outcome activities should be reviewed and strengthened (i.e. increase in M&E frequency, data systematization, evaluation and adaptive management) as well as the subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the outcome activities progress. Finally, MTE finds that this outcome's activities have been able to engage various stakeholders throughout the various stages of activities implementation, and the programme should capitalize more on such engagement to develop local CC adaptation plans and policies.
	Km of coastline with climate resilient shoreline protection measures introduced SMART	Currently coastal protection measures applied by communities are ad-hoc	By the completion of the programme climate resilient shoreline protection measures are introduced in at			

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
	<p><u>Amendment:</u> Specify/add what climate resilient measures are e.g. Retention walls, plant (palm) planting, sandbags.</p>	<p>and piecemeal, limited to some vegetation planting along the shore, but lacking the capacity to introduce shoreline protection measures in a planned and systematic way</p>	<p>least 20 Km of coastline in at least 3 islands (Aitutaki, Palmerston and Rakahanga) <u>Amendment:</u> Ambitious target considering that coastal protection activities have not yet started. The MTE suggests revising to 15 km.</p>		<p>secretaries can oversee implementation of infrastructure projects that will enhance island and community resilience. Island councils and secretaries are willing to perform such tasks, but require initial technical guidance and monitoring by the programme team.</p>	
	<p>N.of households with enhanced Capacity to reduce climate-induce disturbances in food supply through applying climate resilient agriculture and fisheries technique SMART. <u>Amendment:</u> Specify/add what enhanced capacity refers to. e.g. management, planning, monitoring and evaluation capacity of food security trends.</p>	<p>Currently the estimated 920 households engaged principally in subsistence agriculture or fishing activities in the 5 islands are ill-prepared to adapt to climate change impacts. They lack the capacity to apply adequate land management , crop cultivation and fisheries techniques, and food storage methods, consequentl y being affected by climate-induced disturbances of food supply, such as droughts</p>	<p>By the end of the programme at least 750 households have increased capacity in applying climate resilient agriculture and fisheries practices in at least 5 islands (Aitutaki, Atiu, Manihiki, Mangaia and Mauke). Achievable, considering the current implementation of agriculture activities in Mangaia As for the fisheries sector, the target should be revised at the end of Q1-2016 further to actual implemented fisheries activities in selected Pa Enu.</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
		or cyclones				
	N.of households with access to enhanced health services and practices adapting to climate-induced health risks SMART. <u>Amendment:</u> Specify/add what practices e.g. filter cleaning, water tank maintenance, water testing, beneficiaries interview (women vs. men), etc.	The total number of households in these 5 islands is 460. Current prevention activities are limited to occasional cleanup programmes (tutaka) to control areas of stagnant water, while there is inadequate capacity of health staff to diagnose and respond to climate-related illnesses.	By the end of the programme at least 400 households have access to enhanced health services and practices in at least 5 islands (Mangaia, Mauke, Mitiaro, Palmerston and Pukapuka).			
	N.of local tourism enterprises applying climate resilient management techniques SMART. <u>Amendment:</u> Specify/add climate resilient management techniques e.g. water rationing policy, beach protection activities.	The total number of tourism enterprises in these 3 islands is 67, 54 of these are located in Aitutaki. Currently tourism operators cope with climate-induced impacts (like water shortage, coastal erosion) in an ad-hoc fashion, lack capacity to undertake integrated adaptation measures.	By the end of the programme at least 50 local tourism enterprises apply climate resilient adaptation techniques in at least 3 islands (Aitutaki, Atiu and Manihiki) <u>Amendment:</u> Considering the actual, local tourism enterprise present and the remaining timeframe, please amend to at least 30 local tourism enterprise.			

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Achievement Rating	Target	Key Progress Achievement at MTE level	Assumptions	MTE Comments
Outcome 4 Lessons learned and best practices improve the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Pa Enua and other vulnerable communities	Number of knowledge materials generated on lessons learned and best practices. SMART. NO GENDER. Amendment. Please add "No of best practices based on gender prospective".	There is no systematic programme in the Cook Islands to capture lessons learned and best practices in adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and related projects, and disseminate them for wider use	MSMSMS	At least 5 knowledge materials (experience notes, case studies, photo stories, videos, etc.) are generated per year starting from year 1 of the programme Amendment: four (4) knowledge materials	1. 2 case studies were prepared on the programme: One published in a UNDP-GEF publication: ISLAND INNOVATIONS - Leveraging the Environment for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. Another case study has been drafted for a UNDP publication on adaptation and local livelihood support (to be published	Locally available printing, video and audio production firms have the ability to engage with the SRIC programme	These outcome's activities have been implemented (e.g. production and showing of a programme educational video). It is expected that from mid-2016 till the end of the programme. The MTE finds that the programme should develop a communications strategy ensuring that all lesson learnt are efficiently shared at various level nationally and locally.
	Training materials prepared and evaluated SMART. Amendment: Add Number of training material for climate adaptation techniques in agriculture and fisheries. NO GENDER. Amendment please add "training material including the gender dimension".	There is a critical lack of training materials for enhancing the capacity of island stakeholders and key players in climate and disaster risk assessment and their management, in adaptation planning, in the use sector-tailored climate information and in implementation of climate-resilient practices		By the end of the programme at least four training packages receive positive evaluations in independent assessments.	1. The Learning Needs Assessment completed under the SRIC CC Programme in 2013 is been used plan for and provide tailored training.	Local capacity exists to produce training materials that are of a high standard  Island stakeholders and key players have a high interest in, support for, and engagement in capacity building activities in the Pa Enua.	This output implementation will be starting from Q3-2016. Some limited activities have been implemented, and it has expected that this output would be satisfactorily completed by the end of programme closure.

#### 4.5 Programme barriers review

The programme has been successfully contributing in overcoming the main barriers, as identified during the PRODOC development phase (Table 5), to achieving the programme objective. Barriers related to local, provincial and national capacities still apply across the various outcome activities at the time of this review. However, Outcome 1 and 2 would be addressing the barrier of building capacity, especially at the national level, where the baseline for climate change adaptation is very limited. Notwithstanding the relative implementation delay, adaptation activities of Outcome 3 at the demonstration sites are proving to significantly overcome.

**Table 5. MTE review of project barriers.**

Barrier	National Component 1	Pa Enua Component 2	MTE Comments/ Recommendations
Absence of information and capacity to assess climate risks and implement climate change adaptation measures	H	HH	This barrier remains unchanged as national climate change capacity is still limited, in terms of human resources availability, to implement climate change adaptation measures.
Lack of comprehensive vulnerability and adaptation assessments	H	HH	This barrier remains unchanged as climate change impacts are still being identified at small spatial (1-5 km) and temporal (weeks-months, if possible). However, the project will build capacity to analyse and produce vulnerability maps/information at the considered scale.
National response to climate change not well integrated into development processes - lack of integration of climate change risk and resilience into island level and sectoral development processes	H	HH	This barrier has decreased as regular, formal and informal meetings between various stakeholders are guaranteeing effective coordination of project implementation, and hopefully, in turn, influencing the development of national processes, policies and plans.
The close link between the financing of climate change risk management related activities and budget constraints, requiring continued international assistance at the national level, with national participation	HH	H	This barrier remains unchanged, as climate change financing mechanisms are not yet established nationally. The MTEE suggests exploring the establishment a CI Climate Change Adaptation Fund, based on airport revenues from visitors/tourists.
Lack of enforcement of climate policy and regulations, to facilitate and promote behavioral adjustments towards risk management practices	H	HH	This barrier remains unchanged, and beyond the programme scope of work and responsibility.
Land tenure issues impede sustainable development	H	HH	This barrier is unchanged, but not a responsibility of this programme to solve current land tenure issues.
Limited technical resources and human capacities to provide tailored information on climate change trends and associated risks, as well as monitoring of climate impacts on the natural resource base	H	HH	This risk remains unchanged as, even though key stakeholders and partners have nominated climate change focal points, climate change information and trends are yet to be regularly collected, analyzed and presented (particularly for the marine environment).
Lack of systematic capturing and disseminating cross-sectoral adaptation experience	H	HH	This barrier remains unchanged. The programme should focus from 2016 onwards in developing a communication strategy, and an information platform for climate change knowledge sharing.



#### 4.6 Programme Risks Review

The MTE finds that the 50% of the risks identified at PRODOC development have remained unchanged, while 50% have decreased their influence, showing clearly improvement in programme management, context and stakeholder involvement (Table 6). In particular, preliminary results from the demonstration site have significantly contributed in showing the valuable cost-benefit of the proposed adaptation activities. Furthermore, the programme team has successfully contributed in decreasing the risk impact of inadequate coordination among key stakeholders by regular meetings and information sharing.

**Table 6. MTE Review and Observation of Project Risks.**

Risk	Level	Mitigation measures	Responsibility	MTE Review
Extreme climatic events and geophysical hazards damage or negate 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.	CIMS, OPM, MFEM, NES and NPC	This risk level remains unchanged, as the Cook Islands vulnerability to extreme climatic events has not changed.
Poor collaboration between programme partners	M	Inception workshop to clarify roles and responsibilities and establish and implement programme stakeholder collaboration and team building approaches	NPC	This risk level remains unchanged. However, partnerships with national and local partners should be strengthened further (Please see recommendation table).
Finalization and implementation of the NAP for DRM and CCA loses its momentum, and a national consensus on the institutional management of different sectors and related priorities within the Plan and the needed collaboration of key government agencies in the programme is hindered by unforeseen influences.	L	There is strong commitment from Government, civil society and development partners to ensure successful finalization and implementation of the NAP. Ongoing and effective relationships will be maintained between the NPC and stakeholders in Government, civil society and development partners, to ensure there is good understanding of how SRIC is implementing the NAP.	NPC, OPM, MFEM	This element should just marginally considered a risk for the programme implementation, as a general the NAP finalization has not hindered any programme implementation, and it is not foreseen any future, negative influence.
Land disputes amongst community members adversely affect implementation of CCA and DRR intervention.	L	Programme technical team members will inform and encourage communities, and devise community lead solutions through participatory consultations to secure commitment and minimize disputes. Programme activities will be delivered with the active engagement of local institutional mechanisms (Island Councils, Climate Change Community Teams, local associations, Water Committees,	NPC, Island Councils and Administrations	This risk has increased to medium based on this MTE assessment that highlighted 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.

Risk	Level	Mitigation measures	Responsibility	MTE Review
		etc.) as well as NGOs present in the islands to prevent and resolve any land-disputes.		
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 OPM	This risk has remained unchanged, as this MTE assessment confirmed the limited HR available in CI to contribute to the implementation of CCA and DRR activities.
There is sufficient coordination between Island Councils and national authorities to scale up the island-based integrated CCA and DRR actions in an effective manner	L	Schedule project activities to avoid and/or respond to such occurrences. Use of existing coordination mechanisms, linking island level and national institutions (e.g. the National Infrastructure Committee responding to requests made by Island Councils and Administrations), extension officers and representatives of national institutions based on the islands, to strengthen coordination. Active involvement of Island Council representatives in the Programme Board's work, as well as in the process of devising and implementing the Joint CCA-DRM action plan at the national and island levels. The experience during the National Adaptation Planning Week that was held in late February 2011 resulted in active collaboration and dialogue between Pa Enea leaders and national authorities.	NPC	This risk has increased to medium based on this MTE assessment that found a systematic communication limitation and coordination with National Authorities as regards to CCA and DRR actions (still relatively new concepts in the CI). The programme should further support various Islands Councils (i) in integrating CCA and DRR in their respective development plans, and (ii) in liaising with National Authorities.
The methods, tools and technologies developed are not gender aware – 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 partners, and use guidelines during selection of methods, tools and technologies	NPC and MIA	This risk level remains unchanged. The programme should further develop specific gender training and tools to review and assessment the proposed implementation activities.
The government is no longer supportive, politically and financially, of a cross-sectoral and integrated approach to the management of climate risks and opportunities.	L	Reinforce mutual obligations for project implementation at programme outset and during annual and mid-term reviews	NPC, OPM	This risk has decreased to very low, as key government partners are overall supportive of the programme objectives and target goals.
Stakeholders are not able to perceive reductions in vulnerability over the time-scale determined by programme duration.	M	Focus on priorities of Pa Enea communities linked with the Island Development Plans, providing combined benefits of immediate and perceivable livelihood support, while building long-term resilience	NPC	This risk level remains unchanged, and would require some data collection, analysis and presentation to the beneficiaries during the last 3-6 months of the programme

Risk	Level	Mitigation measures	Responsibility	MTE Review
		to climate change. Maintain awareness raising and tailored communication activities targeting specific community groups and intervention areas.		implementation. Data should mainly be collected from on-the-ground activities (water tanks, agriculture and fishing) showing a time and spatial analysis (water storage availability, water –time buffer for each households, agriculture production change, fishing yield,...).
Stakeholders are not able to distinguish vulnerability to climate change from baseline weaknesses in land, coastal, and water resources management.	M	Conduct detailed and in-depth assessments specifying climate-driven impacts and impacts due to unsustainable use of natural resources, coupled with the application of sector-tailored climate information services, monitoring programmes, and continuous awareness raising and education activities.	NPC	This risks has decreased to low, as interviews with beneficiaries and various stakeholders clearly showed their understanding of increasing CC impacts on their livelihoods.
Communication, access and community coordination difficulties delay timely implementation of the planned programme activities at the target community level.	L	Active engagement of Island Climate Change Community Teams, Technical Working Groups, extension officers, programme field coordinators and NGOs present in the field to support communication and coordination with communities. Establishment of community-level coordination mechanisms (such as local water committees). Devise a multi-level communication strategy and outreach programme targeted to island-specific conditions in each Pa Enea.	NPC, OPM	This risk has increased to medium, as this MTE found that community-level coordination is still weak (or not in place) for the visited project sites. The MTE strongly recommends supporting Islands Community coordination by establishing water, agriculture and fishing committee responsible to implement and monitor the programme activities
Political or security complications in programme sites limits implementation of programme activities.	L	Project monitoring process to identify any problems at an early stage and NPC to arrange for alternative measures.	NPC, Island Councils and Administrations, OPM, Cabinet	This risk level remains low and unlikely.
Selection and implementation of adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures in the Pa Enea do not form part of the integrated island development plans, do not allow for vulnerability considerations, do not follow established criteria and are derailed due to political processes and influence.	M	Address adaptation planning and actions through a sectoral and integrated manner, adjusted to the procedures and status of Island Development Plans and focusing on priority needs of each Pa Enea community. As part of the adaptation planning process, maintain proactive outreach communications strategy and capacity building activities for duration of programme, involving Island Councils, community leaders and local NGOs.	NPC, Island Councils and Administrations, OPM, Cabinet	This risk level remains unchanged. The MTE recommends (see Recommendation Table) to support the mainstreaming of CC in key development sectors' policy (i.e. agriculture, infrastructure, marine resources, tourism, water) at the national and island level.

#### **4.7 Relevance**

The programme is relevant to the original PRODOC analysis in addressing the current and foreseen climate change threats in the Cook Islands, particularly in relation to building resilient agriculture, water and fisheries practices. The main programme objective correctly addresses the identified climate change issues in the Pa Enea, and the associated social needs (improving livelihoods, building resilience in the agriculture, fisheries, 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 urgent review by the programme steering committee, to ensure a proper evaluation by the end of the programme (refer to Table 4). Some objective indicators are not SMART nor GENDER, and proposed amendments have been proposed.

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

#### **4.8 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 MTE estimated that the programme has spent 70% of the budget on hard measures, and 30% on soft measures.

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 PMU, government and other stakeholders has been contributing to the effectiveness of the project. For example, technical inputs for water and agriculture activities have been sufficient for of quality and timely outputs.

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 Enea. 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.

#### **4.9 Impact**

The programme impact cannot be fully evaluated at the MTE point, as the most of the implementation will occur starting 2016. However, the MTE observed some significant, positive changes stimulated by the programme performance 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 food and water security and poverty reduction. As noted in other report sections, this M&E system should be significantly strengthened to evaluate the programme activities impact at various level (individual, institutional and strategic) during and after the programme implementation.

The programme has, so far, a moderate impact in terms of 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 impact in terms of environment management and good governance in the Pa Enea, as indicated by the regular island council meetings to discuss the programme activities and the relevant links with local environment and governance issues. The programme interventions have yet had a significant impact on islands communities' livelihoods, but the current

interventions could be predicted to improve climate change vulnerable groups as identified in the programme design.

The programme has clear synergic technical and implementation opportunities (and impacts) with other government and international organisations (Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture, Health, SREP, NIWA), projects (GEF project- Ridge to reef approach) and programmes. The connectedness of this programme with other current initiatives in the agriculture (Chinese bilateral aid) and water sectors (JICA, Australian Aid) require further partnership building to improve this programme impact in all Pa Enea.

#### **4.10 Sustainability**

The overall programme sustainability is moderately likely (Table 111) mainly due to (i) stakeholders interest and engagement in programme activities, (ii) moderate potential to replicate climate change adaptation techniques at different sites due to cost-effective, environmental friendly, *in situ* techniques, and (iii) high possibilities to institutionalize programme results into policies, regulation and development plans. The ownership of programme outputs by key stakeholders is positively evolving towards more responsibility and appropriation. A review of the main project risks (Table 6) does not reveal additional or more severe risks than previously estimated. The current sustainability state of the programme reflects the moderate likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Considering these current sustainability conditions, the potential exit strategy would consist of (i) ensuring that the Prime Minister office would be the main responsible to continue mainstreaming climate change in key development policies at national and island level, (ii) regular budgeting (even if relatively a small percentage of the national budget) for national climate change adaptation activities in the Pa Enea, particularly for climate SMART agriculture, and (iii) use the limited revenues/ surplus from small farming and fishing pilot project activities as equipment maintenance and upgrading.

##### Financial risks to sustainability

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 New Zealand Aid, JICA, Australia Aid and potentially the Chinese bilateral aid). These stakeholders have shown some interest in mainstreaming climate change adaptation in large-scale infrastructure, agriculture and fisheries projects by including climate change adaptation techniques and information towards policy development. Potential opportunities for long-term

(5-7 years) co-financing (in-kind) do not yet exist in the current context, but the programme should proactively approach these international stakeholders.

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 (Ministry of Planning, Agriculture and Water resources) 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.

The population composition of Pa Enea (i.e. majority represented by elderlies and young) is the main social risk for programme sustainability in the long-term, and beyond the programme closure. In order to overcome such limitation, the programme is trying to engage the relative young adults in the Pa Enea as responsible for the planned climate change adaptation activities.

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 to the public via TV, radio shows and by sharing quarterly reports to key stakeholders. 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. In addition, and more significantly, the programme will be developing climate change policy in key development sectors for each Pa Enea in 2016, a crucial programme result increasing the long-term programme sustainability.

The MTE finds that the programme is progressing moderately satisfactory towards building technical and management capacity among key stakeholders for climate change adaptation in the Pa Enea. 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 identified during the project development (Table 5) are influencing the programme sustainability. The sustainability risk for the Northern island group given their physical distance from the capital, and logistical constraints to ensure regular shipment of equipment, and M&E activities, is being addressed by the programme team by trying concentrating programme activities.

#### **4.11 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 4). However, the programme team has made significant efforts to mainstream gender into the programme's activities design, monitoring framework, and implementation.

The programme has also addressed the gender dimension during the activities implementation in all outcomes by having a balanced gender team and beneficiaries. The gender dimension has been also taken into consideration during key project activities such as trainings, workshops and other project staffing.

Women, men and youth groups have been engaged in the community consultations. For example, the Virgin Coconut Oil projects for Mauke, Manihiki and Atiu has been planned with the goal in creating economic opportunities for all, and in particular women. Furthermore, the programme will support training for women to acquire the knowledge needed to manage a small business and the policy development support needed to operate as a community based organisation. The food preservation proposal for Atiu will engage the services of "Mama's" to share their food preserving methods with the wider community. This will be managed and run by the Mama's on Atiu. The Mangaia home gardens project is in implementation now and provides support for the elderly and youth within the community that are not engaged in mainstream agriculture but have the potential to one day. Finally, interviews to various stakeholders revealed that the programme has significantly considered gender equality in delivering climate change information, along with traditional practices.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **5.1. Conclusions**

The SRIC 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 the Cook Islands. The programme is timely and fits well with UNDP organizational strengths and priorities – as well as with the current priorities of the Government of the Cook Islands. The four programme outcomes are appropriate to address climate change adaptation barriers, and the programme strategy is responding to key stakeholders needs.

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 the Cook Islands. *In situ* climate change adaptation activities in the agriculture and water sectors have also been successfully implemented in neighboring countries (Tuvalu, Fiji and Samoa) in comparable circumstances, indicating the high potential for the SRIC success reliability of these climate change adaptation activities in other sites in the Pa Enua. Furthermore, the SRIC programme is clearly devoting significant attention to informing key stakeholders on technical and management issues surrounding the programme, and to gather their immediate and long-terms capacity needs in relation to climate change adaptation in the Cook Islands. This communication effort has resulted in an increasing positive engagement of these stakeholders.

The SRIC programme is considered to be progressing moderately satisfactory (MS) at the MTE mark according to the activities implemented, delivery rate and stakeholder perception. Outcomes 1 and 2 are considered to be MU executed, and Outcomes 3 and 4 are currently MS. The programme holds the potential to perform become S if adaptive management to the proposed recommendations are swiftly implemented during Q1-2016. The SRIC programme team is considered to have the necessary expertise on both technical issues and project management skills for the successful programme completion.

The SRIC Programme has established many key national and island partnerships to improve various outcome implementations. One key partnership is with the Small Grants Programme. This collaboration has been fundamental for the development of an application procedure, establishment of a subcommittee and the

training of the Pa Enea focal points in these processes. There are discussions between SRIC CC and GEF to merge SRIC CC & GEF SGP. This merger will bring more funding opportunities for the Pa Enea communities, and it should further pursue during Q1-2016. However, this MTE urges the SRIC programme to clearly define climate change criteria that that projects proposal are being currently assessed and approved. The programme should narrow the scope of climate change adaptation activities based on more transparent and defined parameters/ criteria for climate change adaptation (based on latest IPCC report).

The SRIC programme sustainability has been evaluated as moderately likely, particularly due to (i) high possibilities to institutionalize project results into policies, regulation and manuals, and (ii) the evolving ownership of project outputs by key stakeholders showing more responsibility and appropriation. The long-term financial sustainability of the SRIC programme is difficult to fully evaluate at the MTE point. One potential solution to guarantee long-term financial sustainability further the programme closure, is to establish a national climate change fund aimed at supporting climate change adaptation activities in the Pa Enea. Considering that approximately 100,000 tourists visit yearly the Cook Islands, if a climate change tax or on time payment on arrival (e.g. 5 USD/tourist), 500,000 USD could be become available yearly for climate change adaptation activities. The SRIC programme could support the initial feasibility studies for the establishment of this fund, and the relative management arrangements. Informal interviews with a range of tourists encountered during this MTE (from resort to eco-tourist) revealed a significant positive response and acceptance.

## **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 SRIC Programme team convenes a Steering Committee to prepare the adaptive management response to these MTE recommendations.

The MTE highlights the following 4 strategic recommendations to be implemented urgently during Q2-2016:

1. Support/Lead the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation in key development frameworks of the Cook Islands (Agriculture, Water, Infrastructure and Tourism);
2. 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, planning and reporting in all Pa Enea (by selecting a core target and trusted groups of individuals);

3. Review and strengthen the programme M&E procedures (i.e. increase in M&E frequency, data collection and analysis, evaluation of current and planned adaptation measures) as well as the subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the progress of programme activities based on each M&E results.
4. Send a formal request to the AF requesting the programme extension of additional 12 months in order to meet the initial programme targets (and those revised here), and to achieve the programme development impact goals in terms of building Pa Enea's climate change resilience.

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

Outcome 1. Support/Lead the development of at least 2 islands climate change adaptation policy for the water and agriculture sectors.

Outcome 2. Provide regular technical trainings (2/year for each Pa Enea) for CCA agriculture and water management activities in relation to planned activities under Outcome 3, including monitoring, evaluation, and reporting training for such activities.

Outcome 3. Conduct field assessment to determine the impact of the proposed climate change adaptation activities (i.e. quantity of water available/ household during drought period, predicted changes in vegetable production, changes in fishing catchment) on community resilience and livelihoods.

Outcome 4. Ensure integration of ALL outcome lessons-learnt in ONE project best practice document.

Finally, this MTE suggests more outcome specific recommendations further to review of stakeholders' interviews, programme document revision and contextual analysis (Annex 9).

### **5.3 Corrective and adaptive actions for programme implementation**

Some urgent, corrective and adaptive actions required urgent implementation starting Q1-2016:

1. **Project Logframe.** Review (PMU) the proposed updated logframe to agree on (i) end of project targets, (ii) indicators, and (iii) proposed amendments of this MTE. **Adaptive Action 1:** Convene Programme Steering Committee in January 2016.
2. **Stakeholder involvement.** The district and community level's stakeholders' involvement should be strengthened starting 1<sup>st</sup> Q1-2016 to ensure the potential replication of demonstration activities beyond

the project closure. **Adaptive action 2:** Convene district and community level consultations (1/ quarter) regarding the AWP-2016 in each Pa Enuu.

3. **Capacity building through workshops and seminars.** A significant number of specific climate change trainings have been (or will be) planned under Outcome 2. 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 programme capacity building activities. However, considering the complex task of building capacity in climate change adaptation in the Cook Islands context, the programme team should ensure focusing capacity building activities on specific thematic areas (Integrated Water Management, Resilient Agriculture and Fisheries, CC policy development, M&E, reporting) with a core audience group to gradually and efficiently building the required technical skills. **Adaptive action 3:** Determine a core group of 10 individuals for each Pa Enuu among island community leaders, farmers, fishermen, mamas, 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. Whilst the programme website can be considered to be very successful in most areas, an over-dependency on web-based information, more conventional (and culturally appropriate) methods should be implemented to ensure strengthening the stakeholders' engagement at the local level. **Adaptive action 4:** Develop an integrated programme communication strategy during Q1 and Q2-2016.
5. **Support for programme implementation by island and national government.** Island and national government officials have clearly indicated their support and engagement for the successful outcome of various programme outcomes. However, the programme support needs to be translated into better co-operation and agreement on establishing regular M&E activities, capacity building programmes and sustainability planning in all Pa Enuu. **Adaptive action 5:** During the next Steering Committee planned stakeholders', stakeholders' role and responsibilities for 2016 and the overall programme implementation should be reviewed and agreed.

The SRIC programme has been building public and institutional awareness in the Cook Islands regarding climate change risks and threats to the islands' livelihoods and sustainable development. The SRIC programme is clearly contributing in building climate resilience in the Pa Enuu by current and the planned

adaptation strategies in the agriculture, fisheries, tourism and water sectors. This MTE finds extreme valuable the current and envisaged SRIC contribution in building institutional, community and environmental resilience to climate change in the Cook Islands. Such efforts should be further capitalized beyond the SRIC programme closure in 2017, if programme extension is granted as this MTE strongly suggests.

## 6. ANNEXES

### 6.1 *Terms of Reference for this MTE*

#### A. Project Title – Contract Information

**Location:** Cook Islands (3 Islands: Rarotonga, Aitutaki, Atiu)

**Application Deadline:** 20 March 2015

**Category:** Energy & Environment

**Assignment Type:** International Consultant

**Starting Date:** 5<sup>th</sup> April 2015

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 24 days

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 2.5 months, final report to be finalized by June 2015

#### B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Evaluation (MTE) of the full-sized project titled “Strengthening the Resilience of our Islands and our Communities to Climate Change project in the Cook Islands” 4569 implemented through the Office of the Prime Minister, which is to be undertaken in 2015. The project started in 2012 and is in its third year of implementation.

The Project was designed to:

- The objective of the programme is to strengthen the ability of all Cook Island communities, and the public service, to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures (including extreme events) in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner. In achieving this objective, the programme supports, at the national, sectoral, and island levels, implementation of the Cook Islands’ new NAP for DRM and CCA.

#### C. Scope of Work

One independent consultant will conduct the MTE.

The MTE team 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 & 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, producing the MTE inception report thereafter. The MTE mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to (Aitutaki & Atiu).

The MTE team will assess the following four categories of project progress & 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 underlying assumptions. Review the effects 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, color 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 analyze 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 & Adaptive Management**

Assess the following categories of project progress:

- Management arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance & co-finance
- Project-level monitoring & 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/team 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/team 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 MTE consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

#### **D. Expected Outcomes & Deliverables:**

The MTE consultant/team shall prepare & submit:

- MTE Inception Report: The expert should clarify objectives and methods of the Midterm Evaluation no later than 2 weeks before the MTE mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit & Project management. Approximate due date: April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015
- Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the end of the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTE mission. Approximate due date: April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015
- Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTE mission. Approximate due date: May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015
- Final Report\*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the MTE report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015

\*The final MTE 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 UNCP Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation. The Project team will be responsible for liaising with the MTE team 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 5<sup>th</sup>, 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
- April 1: Prep the consultant (handover of project documents)
- April 5-7, 2 Days: Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report
- April 15, 2 days: Finalization & Validation of MTE Inception Report- latest start of MTE mission
- April 14-26, 12 days: MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (2 days travel incl)
- April 25: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTE mission
- May 20, 6 days: Preparing draft report

- May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2 day: Incorporating audit train on draft report/finalization of MTE report
- June 10<sup>th</sup>: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- June 15<sup>th</sup>: Expected date of full MTE completion

The date start of contract is April 5, 2015.

#### **G. Duty Station**

Travel:

- International travel will be required to Cook Islands, the Islands of Rarotonga, Aitutaki and Atiu
- 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/innoculations 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.

#### **H. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

The selected consultants should have the following qualities:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validation baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation
- Experience working with AF, GEF or GEF-evaluations, AF evaluations:
- Experience working in the Pacific Region, or SIDS countries:
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrated analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations systems will be considered an asset;
- A masters degree in environmental science or climate change, engineer/science degree in water management, geography or other closely related field.

*Consultant Independence:*

The consultants 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 the project's related activities.

#### **I. Scope of Price Proposal & Schedule of Payments**

***Financial Proposal:***

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are USD276 in Rarotonga, USD180 elsewhere, which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination (Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount).
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

**Schedule of Payments:**

10% of payments upon approval of MTE Inception Report  
 30% upon submission of the draft MTE Report  
 60% upon finalization of the MTE Report

**J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

- Completed Letter of Confirmation of Interest & Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- Personal CV or a P11 Personal History form, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- Brief description of approach or work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant who has obtained the highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions. Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. The offers will be evaluated using the “Combined Scoring Method” where:

- The educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted a max. of 70%;
- The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

**L. Further Information about the MTE ToR**

Candidates that wish to have more information or background documents about how to conduct the evaluation, UN guidelines and codes of conduct, can contact the UNDP Samoa Multi-country office, [mina.weydahl@undp.org](mailto:mina.weydahl@undp.org)

6.2. *MTE Required Ratings + 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

6.3 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 tau”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)?

6.4 MTE mission schedule.

Item – Working days (WD) –Dates 27/10/15-07/11/15	Item description	Location
Day 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Briefing with PMU team;</li> <li>2. Meeting Executing Agency (Climate Change Cook Islands and Emergency Management Cook Islands).</li> </ol>	<b>Rarotonga</b>
Day 2	Meeting with Key Stakeholders <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National Environment Service;</li> <li>2. Office of the Prime Minister, Central Policy and Planning Division;</li> <li>3. Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning, including Water Supply and Energy Divisions;</li> <li>4. Ministry of Health;</li> <li>5. Emergency Management Unit;</li> </ol>	<b>Rarotonga</b>
Day 3	Meeting with Key Stakeholders <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ministry of Marine Resources;</li> <li>2. Ministry of Internal Affairs;</li> <li>3. Ministry of Finance and Economic Management, including Aid &amp; Statistics Divisions</li> <li>4. Civil society organizations including Red Cross, Environmental NGOs;</li> </ol>	<b>Rarotonga</b>
Day 4	Visit project 05 (Water management) – Meeting with beneficiaries, island councils, community leaders	<b>Atiu</b>
Day 5	Visit project 05- Meeting with beneficiaries, island councils, community leaders	<b>Atiu</b>
Day 6	Visit project 05 - Meeting with beneficiaries, island councils, community leaders	<b>Atiu</b>
Day 7	Visit project 05 - Meeting with beneficiaries, island councils, community leaders	<b>Atiu</b>
Day 8	Visit project 06 (Water management) - Meeting with beneficiaries, island councils, community leaders	<b>Mangaia</b>
Day 9	Visit project 07 (Agriculture) - Meeting with beneficiaries, island councils, community leaders	<b>Mangaia</b>
Day 10	Visit project 08 (Fisheries) - Meeting with beneficiaries, island councils, community leaders	<b>Mangaia</b>
Day 11	Meeting with Key Stakeholders <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Ministry of Finance and Economic Management, including Aid &amp; Statistics Divisions;</li> <li>6. Cook Islands Meteorological Service; § Ministry of Agriculture;</li> <li>7. Climate Action Network, &amp; Tourism Industry and Chamber of Commerce representatives.</li> </ol>	<b>Rarotonga</b>
Day 12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presentation of initial MTE findings with key stakeholders;</li> <li>2. Presentation of initial key recommendations.</li> </ol>	<b>Rarotonga</b>

#### 6.5 List of persons interviewed.

1. William Tuivaga, SRIC Programme Director
2. Otheniel Tangianan, Director- Pa Enea Governance Unit
3. Teina Rongo, Climate Change Advisor, SRIC Programme
4. Celine Dyer, Climate Change Coordinator, SRIC Programme
5. Tia , SRIC Managaia focal point
6. Ngametua Pokino, Former Executive Officer, Mangaia Island Gvt.
7. Te Tuhi Kelly, Cook Island Red Cross and Small Grant Program
8. Ben Ponia, Secretary, Ministry of Marine Resources
9. Petero Okotai, Director of Central Policy and Planning
10. Representative from The Cook Islands Tourism Board
11. Lavinia M., Secretary, Development Coordination Division
12. Joe Brider, National Environment Service
13. Matt Praia, Secretary of Agriculture
14. Tou Unmia, Advisor Minister of Health
15. Chief leaders, Atiu Island
16. Atiu Island Council
17. Water tank beneficiaries, Atiu Island
18. Mangaia mayor
19. Mangaia fishing association representatives
20. Water tank and Agriculture beneficiaries, Mangaia Island
21. Tourists visiting Mangaia, Atiu, and Rarotonga.

#### 6.6 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 AWP (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.

## 6.7 Climate Change 2014: Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability

### Climate Change 2014: Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability

#### 19.2 Criteria for selecting 'key' vulnerabilities

As previously discussed, determining which impacts of climate change are potentially 'key' and what is 'dangerous' is a dynamic process involving, inter alia, combining scientific knowledge with factual and normative elements (Patwardhan et al., 2003; Dessai et al., 2004; Pittini and Rahman, 2004). Largely factual or objective criteria include the scale, magnitude, timing and persistence of the harmful impact (Parry et al., 1996; Kenny et al., 2000; Moss and Schneider, 2000; Goklany, 2002; Corfee-Morlot and Höhne, 2003; Schneider, 2004; Oppenheimer, 2005). Normative and subjective elements are embedded in assessing the uniqueness and importance of the threatened system, equity considerations regarding the distribution of impacts, the degree of risk aversion, and assumptions regarding the feasibility and effectiveness of potential adaptations (IPCC, 2001a; OECD, 2003; Pearce, 2003; Tol et al., 2004). Normative criteria are influenced by the perception of risk, which depends on the cultural and social context (e.g., Slovic, 2000; Oppenheimer and Todorov, 2006). Some aspects of confidence in the climate change–impact relationship are factual, while others are subjective (Berger and Berry, 1988). In addition, the choice of which factual criteria to employ in assessing impacts has a normative component.

This chapter identifies seven criteria from the literature that may be used to identify key vulnerabilities, and then describes some potential key vulnerabilities identified using these criteria. The criteria are listed and explained in detail below:

- magnitude of impacts,
- timing of impacts,
- persistence and reversibility of impacts,
- likelihood (estimates of uncertainty) of impacts and vulnerabilities, and confidence in those estimates,
- potential for adaptation,
- distributional aspects of impacts and vulnerabilities,
- importance of the system(s) at risk.

#### **Magnitude**

Impacts of large magnitude are more likely to be evaluated as 'key' than impacts with more limited effects. The magnitude of an impact is determined by its scale (e.g., the area or number of people affected) and its intensity (e.g., the degree of damage caused). Therefore, many studies have associated key vulnerabilities or dangerous anthropogenic interference primarily with large-scale geophysical changes in the climate system.

Various aggregate metrics are used to describe the magnitude of climate impacts. The most widely used quantitative measures for climate impacts (see [Chapter 20](#)[Chapter 20](#)[Chapter 20](#) and WGIII AR4 [Chapter 3](#)[Chapter 3](#)[Chapter 3](#) (Fisher et al., 2007)) are monetary units such as welfare, income or revenue losses (e.g., Nordhaus and Boyer, 2000), costs of anticipating and adapting to certain biophysical impacts such as a large sea-level rise (e.g., Nicholls et al., 2005), and estimates of people's willingness to pay to avoid (or accept as compensation for) certain climate impacts (see, e.g., Li et al., 2004). Another aggregate, non-monetary indicator is the number of people affected by certain impacts such as food and water shortages, morbidity and mortality from diseases, and forced migration (Barnett, 2003; Arnell, 2004; Parry et al., 2004; van Lieshout et al., 2004; Schär and Jendritzky, 2004; Stott et al., 2004). Climate impacts are also quantified in terms of the biophysical end-points, such as agricultural yield changes (see [Chapter 5](#)[Chapter 5](#)[Chapter 5](#); Füssel et al., 2003; Parry et al., 2004) and species extinction numbers or rates (see [Chapter 4](#); Thomas et al., [Chapter 4](#)[Chapter 4](#); Thomas et al., 2004). For some impacts, qualitative rankings of magnitude are more appropriate than quantitative ones. Qualitative methods have been applied to reflect social preferences related to the potential loss of cultural or national identity, loss of cultural heritage sites, and loss of biodiversity (Schneider et al., 2000).

#### **Timing**

A harmful impact is more likely to be considered 'key' if it is expected to happen soon rather than in the distant future (Bazermann, 2005; Weber, 2005). Climate change in the 20th century has already led to numerous impacts on natural and social systems (see [Chapter 1](#)[Chapter 1](#)[Chapter 1](#)), some of which may be considered 'key'. Impacts occurring in the distant future which are caused by nearer-term events or forcings (i.e., 'commitment'), may also be considered 'key'. An often-cited example of such 'delayed irreversibility' is the disintegration of the West Antarctic ice sheet: it has been proposed that melting of ice shelves in the next 100 to 200 years may lead to gradual but irreversible deglaciation and a large sea-level rise over a much longer time-scale (see [Section 19.3.5.2](#)[Section 19.3.5.2](#)[Section 19.3.5.2](#); Meehl et al., 2007). Debates over an 'appropriate' rate of time preference for such events (i.e., discounting) are widespread in the integrated assessment literature (WGIII AR4 [Chapter 2](#)[Chapter 2](#)[Chapter 2](#); Halsnaes et al., 2007), and can influence the extent to which a decision-maker might label such possibilities as 'key'.

Another important aspect of timing is the rate at which impacts occur. In general, adverse impacts occurring suddenly (and surprisingly) would be perceived as more significant than the same impacts occurring gradually, as the potential for adaptation for both human and natural systems would be much more limited in the former case. Finally, very rapid change in a non-linear system can exacerbate other vulnerabilities (e.g., impacts on agriculture and nutrition can aggravate human vulnerability to disease), particularly where such rapid change curtails the ability of systems to prevent and prepare for particular kinds of impacts (Niemeyer et al., 2005).

#### **Persistence and reversibility**

A harmful impact is more likely to be considered 'key' if it is persistent or irreversible. Examples of impacts that could become key due to persistence include the emergence of near-permanent drought conditions (e.g., in semi-arid and arid regions in Africa – Nyong, 2005; see [Chapter 9](#)[Chapter 9](#)[Chapter 9](#)) and intensified cycles of extreme flooding that were previously regarded as 'one-off' events (e.g., in parts of the Indian subcontinent; see [Chapter 10](#)[Chapter 10](#)[Chapter 10](#)).

Examples of climate impacts that are irreversible, at least on time-scales of many generations, include changes in regional or global biogeochemical cycles and land cover (Denman et al., 2007; see [Section 19.3.5.1](#)[Section 19.3.5.1](#)[Section 19.3.5.1](#)), the loss of major ice sheets (Meehl et al., 2007; see [Section 19.3.5.2](#)[Section 19.3.5.2](#)[Section 19.3.5.2](#)); the shutdown of the meridional overturning circulation (Randall et al., 2007; Meehl et al., 2007; see [Section 19.3.5.3](#)[Section 19.3.5.3](#)[Section 19.3.5.3](#)), the extinction of species (Thomas et al., 2004; Lovejoy and



Hannah, 2005), and the loss of unique cultures (Barnett and Adger, 2003). The latter is illustrated by Small Island Nations at risk of submergence through sea-level rise (see [Chapter 16](#)[Chapter 16](#)[Chapter 16](#)) and the necessity for the Inuit of the North American Arctic (see [Chapter 15](#)[Chapter 15](#)[Chapter 15](#)) to cope with recession of the sea ice that is central to their socio-cultural environment.

**Likelihood and confidence**

Likelihood of impacts and our confidence in their assessment are two properties often used to characterise uncertainty of climate change and its impacts (Moss and Schneider, 2000; IPCC, 2007b). Likelihood is the probability of an outcome having occurred or occurring in the future; confidence is the subjective assessment that any statement about an outcome will prove correct. Uncertainty may be characterised by these properties individually or in combination. For example, in expert elicitations of subjective probabilities (Nordhaus, 1994; Morgan and Keith, 1995; Arnell et al., 2005; Morgan et al., 2006), likelihood of an outcome has been framed as the central value of a probability distribution, whereas confidence is reflected primarily by its spread (the lesser the spread, the higher the confidence). An impact characterised by high likelihood is more apt to be seen as ‘key’ than the same impact with a lower likelihood of occurrence. Since risk is defined as consequence (impact) multiplied by its likelihood (probability), the higher the probability of occurrence of an impact the higher its risk, and the more likely it would be considered ‘key’.

**Potential for adaptation**

To assess the potential harm caused by climate change, the ability of individuals, groups, societies and nature to adapt to or ameliorate adverse impacts must be considered (see [Section 19.3.1](#); [Chapter 17](#).[Section 19.3.1](#)[Section 19.3.1](#); [Chapter 17](#)).[Chapter 17](#)). The lower the availability and feasibility of effective adaptations, the more likely such impacts would be characterised as ‘key vulnerabilities’. The potential for adaptation to ameliorate the impacts of climate change differs between and within regions and sectors (e.g., O’Brien et al., 2004). There is often considerable scope for adaptation in agriculture and in some other highly managed sectors. There is much less scope for adaptation to some impacts of sea-level rise such as land loss in low-lying river deltas, and there are no realistic options for preserving many endemic species in areas that become climatically unsuitable (see [Chapter 17](#)).[Chapter 17](#)).[Chapter 17](#)). Adaptation assessments need to consider not only the technical feasibility of certain adaptations but also the availability of required resources (which is often reduced in circumstances of poverty), the costs and side-effects of adaptation, the knowledge about those adaptations, their timeliness, the (dis-)incentives for adaptation actors to actually implement them, and their compatibility with individual or cultural preferences.

The adaptation literature (see [Chapter 17](#)[Chapter 17](#)[Chapter 17](#)) can be largely separated into two groups: one with a more favourable view of the potential for adaptation of social systems to climate change, and an opposite group that expresses less favourable views, stressing the limits to adaptation in dealing with large climate changes and the social, financial and technical obstacles that might inhibit the actual implementation of many adaptation options (see, e.g., the debate about the Ricardian climate change impacts methods – Mendelsohn et al., 1994; Cline, 1996; Mendelsohn and Nordhaus, 1996; Kaufmann, 1998; Hanemann, 2000; Polsky and Easterling, 2001; Polsky, 2004; Schlenker et al., 2005). This chapter reports the range of views in the literature on adaptive capacity relevant for the assessment of key vulnerabilities, and notes that these very different views contribute to the large uncertainty that accompanies assessments of many key vulnerabilities.

**Distribution**

The distribution of climate impacts across regions and population groups raises important equity issues (see [Section 19.1.2.4](#) for a detailed discussion).[Section 19.1.2.4](#)[Section 19.1.2.4](#) for a detailed discussion). The literature concerning distributional impacts of climate change covers an increasingly broad range of categories, and includes, among others, income (Tol et al., 2004), gender (Denton, 2002; Lambrou and Laub, 2004) and age (Bunyavanich et al., 2003), in addition to regional, national and sectoral groupings. Impacts and vulnerabilities that are highly heterogeneous or which have significant distributional consequences are likely to have higher salience, and therefore a greater chance of being considered as ‘key’.

**Importance of the vulnerable system**

A salient, though subjective, criterion for the identification of ‘key vulnerabilities’ is the importance of the vulnerable system or system property. Various societies and peoples may value the significance of impacts and vulnerabilities on human and natural systems differently. For example, the transformation of an existing natural ecosystem may be regarded as important if that ecosystem is the unique habitat of many endemic species or contains endangered charismatic species. On the other hand, if the livelihoods of many people depend crucially on the functioning of a system, this system may be regarded as more important than a similar system in an isolated area (e.g., a mountain snowpack system with large downstream use of the melt water versus an equally large snowpack system with only a small population downstream using the melt water).

6.8 Programme co-financing estimates.

Project Component	Activity	Partner	Support/Contribution	Estimated contribution
Training Programme (Rauti Para)	Training delivery in the Pa Enua community	European Union – Global Climate Change Alliance – Pacific Small Island States Programme) EU-GCCA PSIS/ SRIC-CC	Finance	
Training Programme (Logical Framework Approach)	Training in LFA	EU-GCCA PSIS/ SRIC-CC	Finance	

Training Programme (Reporting)	Video Documentary development	EU-GCCA PSIS/ SRIC-CC	Finance	
Marine Project	Research on Penrhyn Project	EU-GCCA PSIS/ SRIC-CC	Finance	
Marine Project	Contract TA to support Marine laboratory	EU-GCCA PSIS/ SRIC-CC	Finance	
Agriculture	Mangaia Home Gardens	Mangaia Island Government	Free Labour (Construct)	5 structures – Sand/ labour/ transport – Approx: \$1000.00 per structure. Total; <b>NZD\$5,000.00</b>
Agriculture	Manihiki Hydroponics	Manihiki Island Government	Free Land Parcel/ site	Land parcel – Valued approximately NZD\$45,000.00
Water Project	Support for assessment of Project site for water project	Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ)	Free use of services of a water engineer from New Zealand	
Water project	Installation of water tanks	Tamarua Village	Free labour provided by Tamarua Community (Construct/ Install)	30 tanks – Sand/ labour/ transport – Approx: \$450.00 per household. Total; <b>NZD\$13,500.00</b>
Water project	Installation of water tanks	Atiu Local Government	Free labour (Construct/ Install)	155 tanks – Sand/ labour/ transport – Approx: \$450.00 per household. Total; <b>NZD\$69,750.00</b>
Water project	Installation of water tanks	Palmerston Local Government	Free labour (Construct/ Install)	33 tanks – Sand/ labour/ transport – Approx: \$450.00 per household. Total; <b>NZD\$14,850.00</b>
Water project	Installation of water tanks	Aitutaki Island Government	Free labour (Construct/ Install)	309 tanks – Sand/ labour/ transport – Approx: \$450.00 per household. Total; <b>NZD\$139,050.00.</b>
Small Grants Programme (SGP)	Management of SGP through a National Host Institution (NHI).	Global Environment Fund (GEF) & SRIC-CC	Finance & technical support	SRIC-CC USD\$40k/ GEF USD\$40k
*Water project	Implementation of Northern Water tanks	European Union – German Cooperation - (EU-GIZ)	Finance (400,000 Euro)	Approx: <b>NZD\$600,000.00.</b>

## 6.9 Detailed recommendations for various programme outcomes.

### Outcome 1.

Technical and financial support to develop a climate change GIS-based platform to share information, data and maps regarding

Conduct a comprehensive climate change V&A on national fisheries, and development of adaptation strategies (

Support a study to determine the coastal areas vulnerability to climate change threats and risks (sea level rise, erosion, etc. in 2030, 2050 and 2100), to support reviewing the current coastal development legislation

Conduct a cost-benefit analysis of (i) climate change economic costs for the Cook Islands if no adaptation measures are implemented and (ii) various hard climate change adaptation measures (i.e. infrastructure, agriculture and water scheme) to be presented to various decision-makers. (Outcome 1).

#### Outcome 2.

Support the establishment of water committees for each Pa Enua, responsible to M&E activities

Climate change resilience is a still relatively new concept in Cook Islands (even though historically Cook Islanders have withstood and coped with extreme climatic events)

Develop a training module for climate change policy development and risk assessment for decision makers

Further engage other government, civil society and private stakeholders towards the government priorities in ridge to reef approach for climate resilience (Outcome 2).

Develop a training module for climate change policy development and risk assessment for decision makers

#### Outcome 3.

Conduct Climate Compatible Development and Disaster Risk Reduction must be provided to Tourism stakeholders.

The tourism operators on these 3 Pa Enua will be targeted by SRIC CC To participate in this training. (Outcome 2).

Strengthen the communication with the Programme Islands focal points, and ensure at least quarterly trainings on M&E, reporting and communication to the programme team .

Further engage the Cook Islands Tourism Chamber to partner in pilot project activities for coconut oil production, handicraft making and coffee production by sharing potential existing market studies, tourist surveys and product certification.

#### Outcome 4.

Communication channels should be strengthened for various beneficiaries (individual, community and institutions). The programme is clearly trying to increase its visibility and impact via weekly television interviews.

More communication activities (radio, newsletters, town-hall meetings);

6.10 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)*

