



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Annexes: 1 -TOR

Terms of Reference

Project Title:	UNDP/AF project "Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia"
Location:	Home based with one mission to Georgia
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Position:	International Terminal Evaluator, Team Leader
Starting Date:	5 December 2016
End Date:	7 February 2017

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and AF M&E policies and procedures, a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full-size project "Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia" is to be undertaken upon completion of implementation. The project started on 01.07.2012 and following no-cost extension, ends on 28.02.2017. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for this TE. ***This ToR also sets out the scope of work, deliverables, timeframe and payment terms for International Evaluator, Team Leader.***

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

Project Title:	"Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia"			
UNDP Project ID:	00076540	Project financing	at endorsement (Million US\$)	at TE (Million US\$)
ATLAS Project ID:	00060698	AF financing:	US\$ 4,900,000	
Country:	Georgia	IA/EA own:		
Region:	South Caucasus and Western CIS	Government:		
Focal Area:	Tbilisi	Other (UNDP):	US\$ 160,000	
		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia (MoENRP) through the National Environmental Agency (NEA)	Total Project Cost in cash:	US\$ 5,060,000	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Infrastructure and regional development (MRDI); Emergency Management Department; Pilot municipalities.	Project Document Signature (date project began):		11 June 2012
			Planned closing date: July 2016	Revised closing date: February 2017

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The project objective is to improve resilience of highly exposed regions of Georgia to hydro-meteorological threats that are increasing in frequency and intensity as a result of climate change. The project will help the governments and the population of the target region of Rioni Basin to develop adaptive capacity and embark on climate resilient economic development.

The project is comprised of three main components:

1. Floodplain development policy introduced to incentivize long term resilience to flood/flash flood risks;
2. Climate resilient practices of flood management developed and implemented to reduce vulnerability of highly exposed communities;
3. Early warning system in place to improve preparedness and adaptive capacity of population.

3 outcomes contribute to this objectives:

Project Components	Expected Concrete Outputs	Expected Outcomes
1. Floodplain development policy introduced to improve long term resilience to flood / flash flood risks	1.1. Hazard and inundation maps produced; 1.2. Reviewed and changed land use regulations (land use planning, including zonings and development controls, e.g. on protection / buffer zones, settlement expansion; economic development categories etc.) to internalize climate change risks into floodplain management and spatial planning. 1.3. New building codes reviewed and streamlined for the housing rehabilitation schemes to flood proof new buildings (e.g. material standards, traditional house raising etc.) taking into account alternative climate change scenarios; 1.4. Targeted training of national and local authorities responsible for climate risk management in advanced methods of forward looking climate risk management planning and flood prevention measures; 1.5. Community-based flood insurance scheme designed and implemented covering highly exposed villages under 6 municipalities.	Floodplain development policies in place to minimize exposure of highly vulnerable people of Rioni river basin to climate change induced flood risks.
2. Climate resilient practices of flood management developed and implemented to reduce vulnerability of highly exposed communities	2.1. Direct measures of long term flood prevention and risk mitigation designed with participation of local governments and population in 6 municipalities (Lentekhi, Oni, Ambrolauri, Tskaltubo, Samtredia, Tsageri); 2.2. Community-based adaptation measures, such as bank terracing, vegetative buffers, bundles and tree revetments implemented building on an existing municipal employment guarantee scheme; 2.3. Flood plain seasonal productive systems (e.g. short season annual cropping, cattle rearing plots or seasonal pastures, agro-forestry) benefit 200,000 people and improve resilience to flood threat; 2.4. Lessons learned and best practices documented and disseminated to raise awareness of effective climate risk management options for further up-scaling;	Direct investments and local actions in highly exposed and vulnerable communities improve flood management practice on 8,400km ² and build resilience of 200,000 people
3. Early warning system in place to improve preparedness and adaptive capacity of population	3.1. Long term historical observation data digitized and used in policy formulation and risk management practices; 3.2. Multi hazard risk assessment for the Rioni river basin (floods, flash floods, associated mudflows and landslides, linked with climatic alterations under alternative scenarios); 3.3. Series of targeted training delivered for the NEA staff and partner organizations in the advanced methods of climate change risk assessment and forecasting; 3.4. Essential equipment to increase monitoring and forecasting capabilities in the target basin procured and installed; 3.5. Systems established at the national and sub-national level led by the NEA for long and short term flood forecasting of hydrological risks; including dissemination and communication of forecasts.	Institutional Capacity developed for early warning and timely alert communication to vulnerable communities of the Rioni river basin

3. TERMINAL EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures reflected in the "UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects" (2012), henceforth referred to as "TE Guidance"¹. An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported AF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the TE Guidance. A set of questions covering each of these criteria will be provided to the selected evaluator. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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

¹ The guidance document for UNDP-supported GEF financed projects can be used for AF financed projects as well. The document is available via this [link](#).

The objective of TE is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of project results by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements against project objectives endorsed by the UNDP and AF including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results, and draw lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework **included in this ToR as Annex 3**.

TE has three complementary purposes:

- To evaluate results and impacts, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability
- To suggest recommendations for replication of the project successes
- To document, provide feedback on and disseminate lessons learned

More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

Assess the project concept and design. Review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. Assess the relevance of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes, impact and lessons learned

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria:

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

The completed Required Ratings table (as found in the TE Guidance) must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales can be found in the TE Guidance.

4. OBJECTIVES OF TERMINAL EVALUATION

The TE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with Government Counterparts, including project six (6) target municipalities, UNDP Country Office, Project Team, UNDP-AF Regional Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is an important aspect of TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, local government and CSOs, etc.

Additionally, the TE should include field missions to Tbilisi and project sites in project six (6) target municipalities - Oni, Ambrolauri, Lentekhi, Tsageri, Tskaltubo and Samtredia.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals as a minimum:

1. UNDP Country Office management and relevant Programme staff
2. UNDP/AF project staff;
3. Executing agency (NEA)
4. National Project Director and relevant staff of MoENRP, MRDI and NEA
5. Project Board members and partners: Emergency Management Department, USAID project IWRM. MRDI; Target municipalities.

TE should include evaluation of all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports including Annual PPRs, AF Tracking Tools, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) report and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide for review is **included in this ToR in Annex 1**.

The TE report shall be a separate document which will contain the recommendations and conclusions. Respective Report template is **included in this ToR as Annex 2**.

The report will be intended to meet the needs of all the related parties (AF, UNDP, project partners, local communities and other related parties in Georgia and foreign countries).

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

The TE will assess the following four categories of project progress. Each category is required to be rated overall progress using a six-point rating scale **outlined below and included in this ToR under Rating section**.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Evaluate the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Evaluate the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Evaluate how the project addressed country priorities.
- Evaluate the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- Evaluate if there are major areas of concern.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Evaluate if the project's objectives and outcomes or components are clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame.
- Examine if progress so far has led to 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.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

ii. Progress Towards Results and Impacts

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Evaluate the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project
- Examine whether progress so far has led to potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Evaluate if these risks were managed, mitigated, minimized or offset.
- Evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners, and how the different needs of male and female stakeholders has been considered. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review and evaluate overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review and evaluate the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s).
- Review and evaluate the quality of support provided by the AF Partner Agency (UNDP).

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based?

- Examine the use of the project's results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-AF requirements and evaluate the impact of the revised approach on project management

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review and evaluate the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Evaluate if project budget and duration were planned in cost effective way.
- Review and evaluate if the project had an appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds.
- Complete the co-financing monitoring table **included in this ToR in Annex 1**.

Mainstreaming:

- UNDP supported projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including SDGs, poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Evaluate the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
- Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators meet UNDP-AF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil AF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PPRs, if applicable)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review and evaluate project communication with stakeholders. Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review and evaluate external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- Evaluate and summarize the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability, replication and scaling up

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, PPRs, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Describe the replication and scaling up potential of the project.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the AF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions, Lessons Learned & Recommendations

The TE Report must include section setting out the TE’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. Recommendations should include aspects of enhanced sustainability, national ownership and exit strategy. Analysis of the lessons learned is an important part of the terminal evaluation report. The lessons learned section/annex should analyze the lessons learned and best practices generated by the project, including but not limited to project’s contribution to SDGs, gender equality, replication and scaling up potential.

Rating

The TE Report should include ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a TE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table in the Executive Summary of the TE report. Following rating scales should be used:

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is achieved or exceeds all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is achieved most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is achieved most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is achieved of its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is not achieved of most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all three components ó management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications ó is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some componentsø significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the three components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with most componentsø shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the three components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Evaluation
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Detailed methodology and work plan should be developed during the preparatory phase of the TE. The TE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- Desk review;
- Interviews with major stakeholders, including UNDP/AF project implementing and executing agencies, government representatives, etc.
- Field visits to the project sites;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

6. TEAM COMPOSITION FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION

TE Evaluation will be undertaken and led by one independent International Evaluator, Team Leader and will be assisted by the National Consultant, Team Member. The International Evaluator, Team Leader, will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation, and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

7. DUTIES, REQUIRED QUALIFICATION AND COMPETENCIES FOR TEAM LEADER

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and TE outline;
- Briefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report;
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives, Project CTA and UNDP/AF Regional Technical Advisor;
- Field visit to the project pilot municipalities/project sites and interviews with respective local authority representatives;
- Debriefing with UNDP CO;
- Development and submission of the first TE report draft;
- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;

Required Qualification and Competencies:

- A Master's degree or equivalent in Natural Resource Management, Natural Sciences, Environmental Economics/Policy and/or other closely related field;
- Previous experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least seven (7) years;
- Experience of working CIS region will be an asset;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be an asset;
- Experience working with the AF and/or evaluations will be an asset;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Fluency in English both written and spoken and good technical writing skills.

8. TIMEFRAME FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION / TEAM LEADER

The total duration of the TE should be from **5 December 2016 to 7 February 2017**. Determined evaluation period for Team Leader includes in total 25 work days, including one (1) mission with up to 9 travel days to Georgia. Timeframe should be according to the following plan:

Activity	Evaluation Timeframe and Number of Work Days for Team Leader
Preparatory Phase	(5 - 11 December 2016 period) (3 work days)
Evaluation mission and debriefing	(12 - 23 December 2016 period) (7 work days with up to 9 Travel days)
Draft evaluation report	(24 December 2016 ó 12 January 2017) (10 work days)
Finalisation of final report	(no later than 7 February 2017) (5 work days)

9. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Tbilisi, Georgia. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of travel costs and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions to Tbilisi, Georgia including the following target municipalities in Rioni river basin: Oni, Ambrolauri, Tsageri, Lentekhi, Tskaltubo and Samtredia.

10. TERMINAL EVALUATION DELIVERABLES FOR TEAM LEADER

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	clarifies timing and method of evaluation	Before the evaluation mission	submits to UNDP Country Office
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management and UNDP Country Office
Draft Report	Full report (template included in this ToR as Annex 3)	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTS, ICTA
Final Report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report).	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO

Key Products Expected from the TE

- Detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
- Terminal Evaluation Report, including Conclusions and Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach, as well as Lessons Learned;
- Description of best practices, and an action list in a certain area of particular importance for the project.

The Draft and Final Report should be prepared in the format as provided as a template **included in this ToR hereto**. **The draft report** will be presented to UNDP/AF not later than **12 January 2017**. **The final report** will be prepared on the basis of the comments to be obtained from the parties related. The deadline for the final report is **7 February 2016**. The report will be presented electronically and in hard copy, in English, and will be translated by the project into Georgian language for distribution to national counterparts.

11. PAYMENT MODALITY FOR TEAM LEADER

%	Milestone
100% of travel costs (including living allowance, ticket cost and any other travel related transfer costs)	Upon arrival in Tbilisi, Georgia
50% of consultation fee	Upon approval of 1 st draft terminal evaluation report
50% of consultation fee	Upon approval of final terminal evaluation report

List of Documents

1. Project Document
2. AF Project Performance Reports (PPRs) & AF Tracking Tool
3. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Audit reports
5. The Expert Reports
6. Mid-Term Evaluation Report
7. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
8. Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

9. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
10. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
11. Maps
12. The AF Operations guidelines; and
13. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks

Other relevant project related documents will be provided upon need and request.

Co-financing table

Sources of Co-financing ²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ³	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm	Actual Amount Materialized at Closing
		TOTAL			

Explain "Other Sources of Co-financing":

² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other

³ Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other

Table of Contents for the Terminal Evaluation Report

- i. Opening page:**
 - Title of UNDP supported AF financed project
 - UNDP and AF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements

- ii. Executive Summary**
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations**

- 1. Introduction**
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report

- 2. Project description and development context**
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results

- 3. Findings**
- 3.1 Progress toward Results and impact:**
 - Project Design
 - Progress
 - Impact

- 3.2 Adaptive Management:**
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Monitoring systems
 - Risk management
 - Reporting

- 3.3 Management Arrangements:**
 - Overall project management
 - Quality of executive of Implementing Partners
 - Quality of support provided by UNDP

4. Sustainability, replication and scaling up

5. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- Lessons learned

6. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing table

Project log frame for the programme proposal, including milestones, targets and indicators

<p>Objective: To improve resilience of highly exposed regions of Georgia to hydro-meteorological threats that are increasing in frequency and intensity as a result of climate change.</p> <p>Indicator: number of people protected from the flood and flash flood risks in the Rioni river basin;</p>				
Outcomes and indicators	Baseline	Targets and Milestones	Source of Verification	Outputs and indicators
<p>Outcome 1: Floodplain development policies in place to minimize exposure of highly vulnerable people of Rioni river basin to climate change induced flood risks.</p>	<p>Fragmentation and gaps in policies and national regulations for long-term flood/flash floods under climate change</p> <p>Lack of appropriate hazard maps on which to base floodplain policy</p> <p>Low capacity among national and regional staff to undertake hazard mapping and risk assessment to support development of floodplain policy</p>	<p>Floodplain land use and development policy which addresses fragmentation and gaps in place by project completion</p> <p>Local-level flood insurance scheme to steer development away from high risk areas in place by project closure</p> <p>Accurate hazard and risk maps on which to base development policy</p> <p>at least 42NEA staff and 60 municipality staff (at least 50% women) trained in modern hazard mapping and risk assessment techniques</p>	<p>Official Edition „Sakanonmdeblo Matsneõ</p> <p>Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; training test results;</p> <p>Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; training test results;</p> <p>staff training record and certification</p>	<p>Output 1.1. Hazard and inundation maps produced for whole basin</p> <p>Indicator 1.1.1: Studies conducted to develop to model and map the hydro meteorological hazards of the whole Rioni basin</p> <p>Output 1.2. Enhanced land-use regulations introduced (land-use planning, including zoning and development controls, e.g. expansion, economic development categories etc.) to ensure comprehensive floodplain management and spatial planning</p> <p>Indicator 1.2.1. A comprehensive and robust land use and floodplain development policy framework for Rioni basin.</p> <p>Output 1.3. New building codes reviewed and streamlined for the housing rehabilitation schemes to flood proof new buildings (e.g. material standards, traditional house raising etc);</p> <p>Indicator 1.3.1. New building codes including building flood resilience measures</p>
<p>Indicator 1.1: Floodplain development policies in place, which minimize Climate change vulnerability implemented by close of the project</p>				

				<p>Output 1.4. Targeted training of national and local authorities responsible for climate risk management in advanced methods of forward looking climate risk management planning and flood prevention measures;</p> <p>Indicator 1.4.1. at least 42NEA staff and 60 municipality staff trained in modern hazard mapping and risk assessment techniques</p> <p>Output 1.5. Community-based flood insurance scheme designed and implemented covering highly exposed villages under 6 municipalities.</p> <p>Indicator 1.5.1. At least 1 pilot community-based flood insurance scheme in place</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Direct investments and local actions in highly exposed and vulnerable communities improve flood management practice on 8,400km² and build resilience of 200,000 people</p>	<p>Investment in flood intervention measures limited and annual, falls short of what is required</p> <p>Traditional engineering measures employed which do not take account of climate change and fail in subsequent hazard events. Climate resilience not built into current approach to direct flood intervention measures.</p> <p>Current approaches do not involve local communities in the implementation of measures and do not address the recurring problem of loss of agricultural property to flood damage</p>	<p>Implementation of adaptation measures that are a mix of traditional engineering and bioengineering solutions</p> <p>Set up and implement employee guarantee scheme (targeting 200 employees in each municipality, at least 50% women)</p>	<p>Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; training test results;</p>	<p>Output 2.1. Direct measures of long term flood prevention and risk mitigation designed with participation of local governments and population in 6 municipalities (Lentekhi, Oni, Ambrolauri, Tskaltubo, Samtredia, Tsageri);</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.1. Feasibility outline and detailed design studies undertaken to ensure the best climate resilient intervention measures are adopted which will include bioengineering solutions as well as traditional hard engineering options.</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.2. 15 schemes implemented in the 6 municipalities</p>

<p>Indicator 2. 1: Number of community based adaptation solutions implemented at the local level upon project closure.</p> <p>Indicator 2.2: % of population with improved water management practices resilient to climate change impacts in the targeted regions.</p>				<p>Output 2.2. Community-based adaptation measures, such as bank terracing, vegetative buffers, bundles and tree revetments implemented through the municipal employment guarantee scheme;</p> <p>Indicator 2.2.1. Municipal employment-guarantee scheme employing local people in the implementation of the adaptation schemes being implemented. Long-term involvement of local population in the maintenance of flood protection infrastructure</p> <p>Output 2.3. Flood plain seasonal productive systems (e.g. short season annual cropping, cattle rearing plots or seasonal pastures, agro-forestry) benefit 200,000 people and improve resilience to flood threat;</p> <p>Indicator 2.3.1. Agro-forestry, cattle rearing plots and seasonal cropping measures adopted in all 6 municipalities established</p> <p>Output 2.4. Lessons learned and best practices documented and disseminated to raise awareness of effective climate risk management options for further up-scaling;</p> <p>Indicator 2.4.1. Municipal records of employees guarantee scheme and number of people employed per year</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Institutional Capacity developed for early warning and timely alert communication to vulnerable communities of the Rioni river basin</p>	<p>Monitoring network in the Rioni basin was reduced from 22 to 4 meteorological stations since the early 1990s. The 4 remaining meteorological stations covering all of Rioni basin is inadequate for effective early warning.</p>	<p>Implementation of adaptation measures that are a mix of traditional engineering and bioengineering solutions</p>	<p>Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; Community Surveys;</p>	<p>Output 3.1. Long term historical observation data digitized and used in policy formulation and risk management practices;</p>

<p>Indicator 3.1. Flood forecasting and early warning systems introduced to benefit over 200,000 people at risk in the Rioni basin from flood, flash flood and landslide risk in the basin.</p>	<p>There is currently limited capability among national NEA staff for undertaking flood risk assessment and forecasting and limited experience of EW systems implementation and operation</p> <p>Various out-of-date and inadequate hazard maps are used for emergency planning and response by different agencies</p>	<p>Set up and implement employee guarantee scheme (targeting 200 employees in each municipality, at least 50% women)</p> <p>Purchase and install 5 Met stations, 20 Met posts, and 10 Hydrological posts</p>	<p>Social programme budget statements</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.1. Database of historical observation data for Rioni digitized</p>
<p>Indicator 3.2. Establishment/rehabilitation of monitoring stations to increase spatial coverage</p>	<p>Emergency plans currently available at MIA but propriety of the information is unknown</p>	<p>At least 10 NEA staff with gender balanced composition trained in risk assessment and forecasting and EWS</p>		<p>Output 3.2. Multi hazard risk assessment for the Rioni river basin (floods, flash floods, associated mudflows and landslides, linked with climatic alterations under alternative scenarios);</p> <p>Indicator 3.2.1. Rioni flood forecasting model developed, which will couple outputs from downscaled meso-scale meteorological systems to HEC-HMS hydrological models. Linked forecasting met-hydrological-hydraulic model.</p>
<p>Number of associations with improved institutional capacity to deliver water services to target communities.</p>	<p>Currently limited warnings to communities</p>	<p>Provision of access to up-to-date, definitive hazards and forecast information via single GIS-based data management and dissemination system</p> <p>Development of emergency plans</p>		<p>Output 3.3. Series of targeted training delivered for the NEA staff and partner organizations in the advanced methods of risk assessment and forecasting;</p>
<p>Indicator 3.2: % of targeted population with more to early warning in the face of climate change</p>				<p>Indicator 3.3.1. At least 10 NEA staff trained in risk assessment and forecasting and EWS. Municipality emergency staff trained in emergency response. Strengthened capacity of national and local staff in monitoring, flood forecasting, early warning and emergency response</p>
<p>Indicator 3.3. Number of national and local staff with flood forecasting, early warning and flood risk assessment capabilities</p>		<p>90% of people in Rioni basin to have access to early warning messages/signals by completion of project</p>		<p>Output 3.4. Essential equipment to increase monitoring and forecasting capabilities in the target basin procured and installed;</p>

Indicator 3.4.1. Purchase and install 5 Met stations, 20 Met posts, and 10 Hydrological posts. Observation network of all hydrological and meteorological variables to provide an appropriate level of spatial resolution of these variables for early warning

Output 3.5. Systems established at the national and sub-national level led by the NEA for long and short term flood forecasting of hydrological risks; including dissemination and communication of forecasts.

Indicator 3.5.1. A fully integrated flood early warning system (Deltares-FEWS) which links forecasting models to telemetered data as input and forecasting reporting and warning systems as output.

Indicator 3.5.2. An early warning communication network using different communication links such as telephone trees, SMS and e-mail networks

Indicator 3.5.3. GIS-based website for dissemination of hazard maps and associated information, such as hydro meteorological telemetric and Deltares-FEWS data to central and local government stakeholders.

Indicator 3.5.4. A public-facing website presenting key layers of information, with the potential to disseminate early warning information to the public.

Indicator 3.5.5. Early warning awareness and training workshops for community, NGOs, government and media representatives.

Annex 2: List of people interviewed and evaluation itinerary

Date	Place	Key informant	Position	Interview time
12.12.16	Skype interview	Dr. Margaretta Ayoung-Monk	UNDP CTA	50 min.
13.12.16	Skype Interview	Dr. Margaretta Ayoung-Monk	UNDP CTA	90 min.
15.12.16	Tbilisi airport	00h10 arrival of evaluation team leader in Georgia	TK flight	
15.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Ms. Nino Antadze	UNDP Energy and Environment Team Leader	50 min.
15.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Mr. Nikoloz Kuchaidze	MINT, Emergency Department	50 min.
15.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Presentation of the evaluation methodology to Project Executive Board members	PEB members	120 min.
15.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi Project management team	Mr. Ivane Tsiklauri Ms. Natia Lipartiani	UNDP project manager UNDP Admin/finance assistant	45 min.
15.12.16	Hotel Betsy Tbilisi	Dr, Hans Ewoldsen	Technical expert Dam Safety	45 min.
16.12.16	Elkana Office, Tbilisi	Ms. Medea Gabunia, ELKANA	Head of Administration Dept.	55 min.
16.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Mr. George Badurashvili	M&E Specialist, UNDP	40 min.
17.12.16	Departure to municipalities	Road travel to target municipalities	Driver and TE team	
17.12.16	Samtredia municipality	11 men from Ianeti village, FGD		50 min.
17.12.16	Samtredia municipality	Observation of project sites (river bank protection and agroforestry activities)		60 min.
17.12.16	Samtredia municipality	Mr. Mamuka Tavadze and Mr. Paata Kokhraidze	Deputy Governor and community representative	45 min.
17.12.16	Travel to Tskaltubo municipality	Mr. Aleko Dadunashvili Mr. Grigol Gabidzashvili Mr. Avtandil Qvachakidze	Assistant to Head of municipality Director of contractor company öMerksiö NEA ö Kutaisi regional branch	80 min.
17.12.16	Travel to Tsageri municipality	Mr. Iuri Dartsuliani	Municipality project focal point (Infrastructure Unit Head)	50 min.
Overnight				
18.12.16	Travel to Lentekhi municipality	Mr. Germane Qurasbediani	Head of economic development unit at Lentekhi	60 min.

		Mr. Soso Museliani	Municipality Head of agriculture at Lentekhi Municipality	
18.12.16	Lentheki municipality	Observation of project sites (infrastructure only)		45 min.
18.12.16	Travel to Ambrolauri municipality	Mr. Malkhaz Lomtadze Mr. Parna Bakuradze Mr. Aleko Qurtsikidze Mr. Koba Gamkrelidze Mr. Soso Chelidze	Head of Municipality Deputy head of Municipality Infrastructure Unit at Ambrolauri Municipality Infrastructure Unit at Ambrolauri Municipality Community Representative in village Bugeuli and Subcontractor for infrastructural works	45 min.
Overnight				
19.12.16	Travel to Oni municipality	Group discussion with 8 people, including: Mr. Giorgi Lobjanidze Mr. Givi Bendianishvili Ms. Nino Metreveli Ms. Irma Koberidze Mr. Teimuraz Grdzlishvili Mr. Nugzar Gamkrelidze Mr. Mikheil Lobjanidze Mr. Budo Rekhviashvili	Head of Municipality Head of Infrastructure Unit at the Municipality Senior Specialist of the Infrastructure Unit Main Specialist of the Economic Development Unit of Municipality Specialist of the Infrastructure Unit Community member from Village Comandeli Community member from Oni Community Community member from Oni Community	45 min.
19.12.16	Oni municipality	Observation of project sites, both infrastructure and agroforestry		60 min.
19.12.16	Travel back to Tbilisi		Driver and TE team	
20.12.16	NEA office, Tbilisi	Mr. Ramaz Chitanava Mr. Tariel Beridze	Head, hydrometeorological dept. Deputy Head	90 min.
20.12.16	MoERNP Office, Tbilisi	Mr. Grigol Lazierivi	Head of Climate Change Division	45 min.

20.12.16	MRDI office, Tbilisi	Mr. Temur Kapanadze Mr. Revaz Sajaia Mr. Temur Metreveli	Head, Bank Protection Division Deputy Head, Bank Protection Division Head of Monitoring of Bank Protection	70 min.
20.12.16	Skype discussion	Ms. Natalia Olofinskaya	UNDP Regional Technical Specialist	30 min.
21.12.16	NEA Office, Tbilisi	Mr. Merab Gafrindashvili	Head, Geological Department	45 min.
21.12.16	MoERNP Office, Tbilisi	Ms. Nino Tkhilava, National Project Director	Head, Department of Environmental policy and international relations	60 min.
21.12.16	CENN Office, Tbilisi	Mr. Rezo Getiashvili	Environmental projects coordinator	60 min.
21.12.16	Tbilisi	Ms. Mariam Shotadze	Former USAID Country Programme Director of Integrated Natural Resources Management in Watersheds of Georgia	55 min.
21.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Ms. Natia Lipartiani	UNDP Project assistant	60 min.
21.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Mr. Dimitri Ukleba Mr. Zaqro Onioani Mr. Kakha Avaliani Mr. Vakhtang Burchuladze Mr. Joni Alavidze	UNDP supervising engineer Mshenebeli LM 2009 SpetsHydroMsheni SpetsHydroMsheni SpetsHydroMsheni	45 min.
22.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Preparation of debriefing/validation presentation	TE team	90 min.
22.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Mr. Shombi Sharp Ms. Natia Natsvlishvili Ms. Nino Antadze	UNDP Deputy RR UNDP Assistant RR UNDP Energy and Environment TL	45 min.
22.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Presentation of preliminary TE findings to the PEB	Powerpoint presentation enclosed	120 min.
22.12.16	UNDP Tbilisi	Wrap-up and follow-up with Project Team		60 min.

Annex 3: reference documents and bibliography

- É **Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia Project Project Document**
- É **AF Project Performance Reports (PPRs) & AF Tracking Tool**
- É **Project Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams**
- É **Audit reports**
- É **Expert Reports**
- É **M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project**
- É **UNDP Financial and Administration guidelines.**
- É **Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems**
- É **Minutes of the Project Board Meetings**
- É **Maps**
- É **The AF Operations guidelines**
- É **UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**

As well as

- **OECD/DAC glossary of key terms in evaluation and RBM, 2002**
- **UNDP Handbook on PME**
- **M. Q. Patton, Utilization-focused evaluation, sage publications, 3rd edition, 1999**
- **OECD/DAC Quality standards for development evaluation, 2010**

Annex 4: FGD guide and key evaluation questions (as indicated in the inception report)

FGD Municipalities:

Count participants and sex (F/M)

1. Ask about what they know of the project – what is the project objective?
2. What has it done in the municipality?
3. What difference did it make to them personally?
4. Do they consider that it contributed to increase their resilience to climate change?
5. If so, how so?
6. Overall value of the project, 1 to 5

Other comments and suggestions

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	LINE OF ENQUIRY	ISSUE	DATA SOURCE & METHODS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
1. Relevance				
1.1. To what extent did the project respond to the needs of the government	a) b)	responsiveness	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders	Project documents and interview notes
1.2. To what extent did the project respond to the needs of the municipalities and the population of the catchment area	a) b) c)	responsiveness	Documentary analysis, KII and FDG at municipality level	Project documents, notes from KII and FDG
1.3. What gaps were filled by the project?	a) b) c) d)	Responsiveness, priority level	Documentary analysis, KII	Project documents and interview notes
2. Efficiency				
2.1. Is the project bringing value for money	a) b) c) d)	Value for money	Budget analysis, KII with UNDP staff and counterparts	Financial reports, audits, interview notes
2.2. Has it been efficiently managed	a) b) c) d)	efficiency	Workplan analysis, KII with UNDP staff and counterparts	Workplan, budget, PPR and PEB minutes
2.3. How well was the project designed?	N/A	PCM and RBM value	Documentary analysis and KII with UNDP staff	Analysis of project document and notes
3. Effectiveness				
3.1. What are the key results of the project?	a) b) c) d)	Key results	Documentary analysis and	Project documents, KII,

			KII including field level FGD	FGD, triangulated
3.2. To what extent are the outcomes achieved?	a) b) c) d)	Outcome achievement	Documentary analysis and KII including field level FGD	Project documents, KII, FGDs, triangulated
3.3. To what extent is the project objective achieved?	a) b) c) d)	Achievement of objective	Documentary analysis and KII including field level FGD	Project documents, KII, FGDs, triangulated
3.4. What are examples of good practice	a) b) c) d)	Good practice	Documentary analysis, KII and FGD, interpretation	Documentation, interview notes, data analysis
3.5. What capacities have been developed as a result of the project?	a) b) c) d)	Capacity development	Documentary analysis, KII and FGD, interpretation	Project documents, KII, FGD, triangulated
4. Impact				
4.1. To what extent have people's lives been affected by the project	a) c) d)	Project effects	Documentary analysis, KII and FGD, interpretation	Documentation, interview notes, data analysis
4.2. To what extent has the project changed the way GoG and municipalities manage flood risks and develop resilience?	a) b) c) d)	Institutional effect	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders including municipalities	Project documents and interview notes
4.3. What has changed as a result of the project?	a) b) c) d)	Ownership and commitment	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders including municipalities	Project documents and interview notes
5. Sustainability				
5.1. How much of the project outputs can be incorporated in the GoG budgets for implementation	a) b) c) d)	Ownership	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders	Project and GoG documents, interview notes
5.2. To what extent are policy guidance materials being used by the GoG	a) b)	Ownership	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders	Project and GoG documents, interview notes
5.3. Are there any examples of replication, scaling-up or spin-off from the project	a) d) c) d)	Commitment	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders	Project and GoG documents, interview notes

Annex 5: Power point presentation of the evaluation methodology and presentation of the TE preliminary findings

pres15dec16.pdf

pres22dec.pdf

EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹

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

Name of Consultant: Ketevan Skhireli

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 *Tbilisi* on *Feb 20, 2017*

Signature:  _____

¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

To the comments received on (02/09/17 and 02/16/17) from the Terminal Evaluation of (Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia”) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS #4583)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	1	General	The evaluation does not seem to provide an in-depth analysis of the project impact and achievements. The issue on M&E plan or poor M&E framework is dominating the whole report despite the fact that overall ratings are HS and excellent performance is praised	Followed throughout the doc at certain level
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	2	General	The role of technical teams was indeed crucial for the implementation of the project and achieving project outputs. I think it will be fair to acknowledge this role and the fact that this project, has brought in important, innovative know-hows through team of experienced international experts	Reflected in the text
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	3	General	As noted during TE mission, including by colleagues from the Government, this evaluation is expected to be used as a strong advocacy tool with decision-makers, or potential donors, especially when we speak about replicating or upscaling of the project. Thus, will be useful to have more emphasis on the innovative approaches that were brought in Georgia by this project, that have been tested in Rioni basin, and that this project has built significant capacities with NEA.	Reflected at certain level in the body of the text
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	4	General	Some of the TE TOR requirements have not been fully reflected in the report. Will be grateful if you can take a careful look at the ToR and revise the report accordingly. Some of missing/incomplete sections include: a) Co-financing analysis – including table 1 and table 2 are missing this info b) Executive Summary – Evaluation Rating table. The obligatory rating scales can be found in the TE Guidance. c) Acronyms and Abbreviations – there is a need for some additions/corrections, please see comments in the attached document	Your point 4.a. about co-financing, the PPR indicates the same information as I put in table 1. And 2. – that is, 4,9 mio from AF and 160,000 usd from UNDP, and there is no other information. If you have other

			<p>d) Chapter 3 - The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including SDGs, poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.</p> <p>e) Not all the elements outlined in section 5 of the TOR are reflected in the report. Could you please kindly review this list and update the report accordingly</p> <p>f) Lessons learned section seems rather light, while it is indeed a crucial element of the evaluation report</p>	<p>data, please share so I can incorporate it in the report. As already discussed during the TE, UNDP Georgia doesn't have a strong evaluation culture. I am not a technical expert but definitely I am an evaluation expert as member of the EES, former board member of the Spanish Evaluation Society, having 82 evaluations completed and being a vetted trainer for M&E and RBM for the UN, and having trained UNPD staff and government in various countries. The TOR contained no less than 41 questions in bullet points, something that is impossible to address comprehensively in the evaluation time-frame and with the limited field presence required. I sent you an inception report, which details how the evaluation would be undertaken, the main focus of the evaluation,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				and the main evaluation questions and evaluation approach. There was no discussion on its contents, which means that UNDP has agreed to this approach. Obviously we did not cover every single aspect of the TOR in detail, and your comments under point 4. d) and e) were not within the 3 main evaluation purposes, so they were not covered as mentioned in my inception report, as there is always a choice to make between depth and breadth, including in determining the length of an evaluation report (where good practice is actually on short and synthetic reports and not descriptive narratives).
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	5	General	Usually the evaluation reports include a verified project results tracker (logframe with the end of project indicator values) – do you plan to include such a tracker?	Added
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	6	General	Recommendation regarding community-based EWS – as mentioned by Margareta, the wording needs to be changed towards the need for community-based EWS/“last mile” communication element that has not been covered by Rioni project but will have to be covered by the new project.	Changed

UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	7	General	Regarding Komandeli site in Oni municipality, project int. consultant (Hans Ewoldsen) did physical inspection of all sites last year and his site visit report from last May when he went to inspect the site. Han's description of the intended work for the site seems to align with what the TE described as what was implemented. However, Hans' report clearly states that the measures were not meant to address the landslide which was too deep to address with the funds. Here are some excerpts from the report: "The landslide zone is thought to be continuing to move slowly toward the river channel, and is reported to be as much as 20 meters deep in the center portion. The exact position of the toe of the landslide is not known, but is thought to be at riverbed level. It is also reported that the current "existing landslide zone" is part of a large zone of ground movement, this zone may extend a considerable distance upslope. Water seepage has been reported as continuing at the roadway level on the slide"; "The scope of work to stabilize the landslide is beyond the financial capacity of the project to fund, thus the only treatment of the landslide will be to plant trees along the slope above the roadway, this may serve to slow movement of the earth mass. During the site visit of 18 – 22 April 2016, it was noted that a fenced strip several meters wide above the roadway had been constructed, extending from the downstream edge of the landslide to the upstream edge. The strip was planted with seedling trees, with 4 rows of trees planted on about 2 meter spacings, and the rows about 1 meter apart. No other measures are planned for landslide control." Hope above clarifies the issue and if you seem appropriate please reflect this in the report	Point on Komandeli is given below.
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	8	General	Regarding rating for 'Sustainability' – if you strongly feel that is should remain moderately unlikely, may I suggest then that you include specific recommendation on this topic in the recommendations section. Please also look at my comment in the attached file.	Rating not changed

	9		It would be useful if in the sections on replication and recommendations the report emphasizes importance of implementing specific risk reduction measures (structural and non-structural) along with the EWS. In the other sections of the report there is an acknowledgement in this regard. However, it is important to make the point even stronger – this is important for justifying similar actions in the proposal that we are currently working on.	
UNDP email from Feb 9, 2017	10	General	Under the section on 'Progress towards Outputs, Outcomes, and Objective: Ratings & Achievements Summary Table', there is no discussion on the progress towards outputs only outcomes. I would expect to see a discussion of how each of the activities that contributed to the result, were executed and how they contributed to the outcomes. I would also expect to see discussion of the technical contributions of all activities that resulted in the outcome. The report seems to miss some very important contributions of the outputs to the overall outcome. You may wish to consult/interview Margareta again on these issues	Your comment 10 about how activities contribute to the outcomes: this is not the trend in current evaluation practice, nor on how UNDP undertakes outcome evaluations. While GEF has its own guidance, this is not a GEF funded project, and the GEF TE is not always consistent with the higher-level evaluation guidance from UNDG and the UNDP EO. As I am not a technical expert, it is not realistic to expect me to appraise the work of the technical experts or specific technical aspects, so the focus and value of the evaluation report is not the TE assessing the quality of the activities carried out per say, rather their

				contribution to the outcomes. Descriptive narrative evaluations based on the logframe are much more compliance-oriented evaluations which is not the type of evaluations I conduct.
	11		In general, the report does not seem to provide a sufficient level of detail of the project or of the significance of the technical achievements. As a reader with no knowledge of the project, it would be difficult to understand what the project was about or the significance of its achievements based on this report	
	12		The report has largely missed the key contribution that was made by international expertise and this is reflected in the fact that apart from the CTA and dams expert (who happened to be in country at the time) no other international experts were interviewed to gain an understanding of their contributions to the project outcomes. The TE is supposed to assess the technical expertise that have been employed in the project (under efficiency).	
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	13	Executive Summary	This is Agency, not Department; please correct this in other parts of the report too. It used to be EMD, but since 2015 is EMA	Title of the department has been changed throughout the text

<p>Technical Adviser <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p> <p>UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 16, 2017</i></p>	14	Executive Summary	<p>Under this section, I would expect to see a detailed discussion of how each of the activities that contributed to the result, were executed. I would expect to see an assessment of the approaches used and the how they all contributed to the outcome. I would also expect to see discussion of the technical contributions of all activities that contributed to the outcome. The report seems to miss some very important contributions of the outputs to the overall outcome. For example:</p> <p>Output 1.1 hazard mapping. A state-of-the-art hydraulic model was developed and implemented for the basin which accounts for approximately 25% of the land area of Georgia. It has introduced technologies and tools that places Georgia on par with European countries in this area and contributes towards Georgia’s EU FD responsibilities when it eventually becomes part of the EU.</p> <p>Furthermore, the capacity that was built is extremely sustainable and has equipped NEA with the ability to do this type of modelling for themselves. This is a key example of technical sustainability. All other outputs and activities have made invaluable technical contributions which I think are largely missed in this report. The report, in general, reflects a lack of assessment of the technical detail, technical achievements and relevance of such to the development goals in DRM and CCA for Georgia.</p> <p>This info is embedded in the various sections of the report – perhaps not extensively but some sections are certainly covering some of the important activities that contributed to the achievement of outcomes.</p>	Description was reflected in the main body of the text, rather than an executive summary
<p>Technical Adviser</p>	15	Executive Summary	<p>Project documents are not meant to provide the level of detail you are suggesting, but are meant to make the case for the project (to the funding body) and set out, in outline, how these will be achieved. During project inception phase, a detailed Project methodology document, and project programme were developed by the CTA and this is what was used to guide all project implementation alongside (and mostly instead of) the project document. These documents may not have been provided during your review, but can be provided on</p>	<p>Not considered.</p> <p>Comment from the UNDP was added in a footnote.</p>

<p>UNDP Country Office</p> <p><i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p> <p><i>From Track-changes comments Feb 16, 2017</i></p> <p>Technical Adviser</p> <p><i>From Track-changes comments Feb 16, 2017</i></p>			<p>request.</p> <p>Moreover as is the practice with donor funded and UNDP implemented project, by the time Projects start, the ProDoc that is approved by a donor, require refreshing and doing a real detailed project work planning; therefore the inception reports/project detailed work plans are used and followed during the project implementation</p> <p>Perhaps our comments were more of a general character when we speak about ambitious character of the project document/logframe. The point was that ProDoc /proposal to funding body is relatively indicative while more details/clarity are provided at inception phase, including work plans that are followed later. You can keep this sentence as it is.</p> <p>To clarify, I was making the point that the project was not ‘exceedingly’ ambitious which implies a level of un-achievability. The point regarding the detailed methodology and programme is that the achievability of the technical scope and the timeframes of the project are further detailed within these documents and show that the project implementation was carefully guided by these documents and not the PD alone. UNDP’s view is that while the project was ambitious and well designed and well executed, it was partly due to the use of these more detailed guidance documents to stare the implementation. As it stands, the sentence implies that only the PD was available for guiding the implementation.</p>	
<p>UNDP Country Office</p> <p><i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p>	16	Executive Summary	<p>There is also a ‘road map’ document for the implementation of the policy which might not have been provided as it was a secondary document for this deliverable. However, it provides proformas for each stage of implementation and will enable government to monitor progress of the implantation in a step by step manner.</p>	Paragraph added
<p>Technical Adviser</p> <p><i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p>	17	Executive Summary	<p>The last PPR provides an analysis of the ‘lives saved’ by the implementation of the FFEWS systems based on standard ‘loss of life’ calculations for any FFEWS with climate change considerations. And this shows that, the FFEWS will save more than 200,000 lives over the next 50 years.</p>	<p>Did not agree with point raised. Point not taken into consideration.</p> <p>Please refer to the updated project results</p>

<p>UNDP Country Office</p> <p><i>From Track-changes comments Feb 16, 2017</i></p>		<p>With regard to monitoring the effectiveness of the FFEWS, there could be a recommendation to include improvements to the systems to enable such monitoring but these need to be built into monitoring of the wider emergency response success rate of the NEA and CMS. It should be noted that there hasn't been a major flood since the implementation of the new FFEWS, so results of its effectiveness will not be known until then. It might be useful to outline how the users of the FFEWS are better able to forecast and manage flood risk as a result of the FFEWS as part of your assessment of 'achievement' of the desired outcome.</p> <p>With respect to areas benefitting from improved FRM practices, this will need to include monitoring of the benefits that improved development planning/permitting and hazard zoning that the land-use policy (from component 1) provides.</p> <p>In addition it might have been useful to assess how staff in 6 target municipalities managed flood risk before the structures were built and how they manage floods now. Community interviews would also have provided a useful source of information for this assessment</p> <p>This is certainly too technical; I am not FFEWS specialist either, but I trust Margareta and Juan are. According to Margareta, international best practice has been applied in working out the lives that would be saved due to FFEWS. However, I see you have your own perspective on this. So this issue could be argued further. I think this is not needed at this stage. You seem to have your own interpretation</p>	<p>and resource framework that is included as annex and was discussed between the TE and the project management. It shows how project management would have revised the framework if this had been approved by the RTA, and the outcome could have been defined as: 2. Direct investments and local actions in highly exposed and vulnerable communities improve flood management practice, without mentioning the coverage or number of people whose resilience had been developed in CCA, something that is quite difficult to measure directly and is only feasible to measure after the end of the project.</p> <p>It is not a technical issue, it is the definition of the outcome indicator and therefore an RMB and M&E issue, on how you</p>
--	--	--	--

				link/interpret the statement. Sorry but I do not agree here. Let me know if you want to footnote it please.
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	18	Throughout the text	Please spell out and / or add this under abbreviations list	Abbreviation is spelled out
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	19	Sustainability rating in Executive summary	TE suggests that sustainability will be unlikely? Sustainability of project results can never be guaranteed by UNDP; we actually face this issue in other projects too. So perhaps TE should explain this issue in more detail	Rating not changed: "It is indeed a recurrent challenge common to all projects, as most projects do not contemplate a sustainability strategy that may inform how benefits can continued to be leveraged after the end of the project. It is therefore always a difficult question for projects as they are not designed to become sustainable. Some activities have become part of the ongoing work of the different stakeholders (such as flood modelling maps in NEA), but some will require additional funding that may

				be difficult to obtain considering the national budget reductions”.
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	20	Abbreviations table	Do you mean Emergency Management Agency? Please correct to EMA then; to my knowledge such department does not exist in MIA, but rather in EMA	Abbreviation changed
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	21	1.2. Scope and Methodology (tools and methodology)	Please spell out, is this Interior Ministry?	Spelled out in the abbreviation list
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	22	Project Description and Development Context	Not clear what is the source, please add	Source added
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	23	Project Description and Development Context	Emergency Management Department (EMD) under the Ministry of Internal Affairs (in 2005) and the National Environmental Agency (NEA) (2008) ¹ under the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection. At a later stage, other institutions and entities became engaged in DRM.	Changed accordingly
Technical Adviser <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	24	Project Description and Development Context	These are supposed to be longer-term strategic FRM/DRM management functions, which is not only linked to emergency response. But lack of funding means that it has been largely reactive in the past. With hazard mapping, increased capacity in strategic hazard management, risk models on which to do Cost-benefit analysis of specific intervention, they are now hopefully able to advocate for funds to carry out these strategic	Paragraph added respectively

¹ The Centre of Monitoring and Prognosis, established in 2006 and re-established later as NEA.

			functions	
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	25		National Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy and Action Plan, which was formally adopted by the Government in late December 2016; I think this is important strategy document and is worth mentioning; BTW, this strategy paper was developed with the technical assistance of UNDP/UN back in 2015, following a comprehensive assessment of the DRR system in Georgia; it was coordinated by the State Security and Crises Management Council; and is first ever DRR-related Strategy which is indeed a very progressive step.	Paragraph added
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	26	Project Description and Development Context	True, but HFA period ended in 2015 and globally Sendai Framework is now adopted and used. This section needs an update, but shortly, Georgian nat. DRR strategy follows the Sendai priorities and Georgia is committed to regularly monitor the implementation as well as ensure regular reporting to Sendai secretariat	Changed accordingly
Project Team <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	27	Project Description and Development Context	Instead of CENN should be USAID Project "Integrated Natural Resources Management in Watersheds of Georgia"	Changed accordingly
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	28	Findings: 3.1. Progress towards results and impacts	Do you mean RTA? We at country office level followed RTA advice on this issue	Question was clarified. RTA added to the text.
Technical Adviser <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	29	Findings: 3.1. Progress towards results and impacts	I would expect to see here, a table of project logframe including the Project Outcomes, indicators, baseline and targets (as in PD and/or Inception report). There should then be detailed examination of the barriers that the project is aiming to address. Finally, this section should list progress against targets as detailed in the PPRs and with comments on the achievement against targets.	Table added
Technical Adviser <i>From Track-changes comments Feb</i>	30	Findings: 3.1. Progress towards results and impacts	It was also developed for the whole basin and not just the 6 target municipalities and includes state-of-the-art modelling tools (not even found in some more advanced countries) which will enable the GoG to fully management weather index insurance	Added under the progress sub-section.

9, 2017			(WII) scheme for Rioni. It is also highly scalable to the rest of Georgia once similar hazard maps and socio-economic data are included in the model.	
<p>UNDP Country Office Technical Adviser From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</p> <p>UNDP Country From Track-changes comments Feb 16, 2017</p>	31	<p>Findings: 3.1. Progress towards results and impacts Effectiveness</p>	<p>I think there is too detailed description and explanation of this one case 'black spot' in this section. If TE describes such level of detail for this one case, then at least should be some balance with 'good cases' ??? or at least recognizing that all other measures were technically sound, etc? Also, please take a note of Margaretta's comment below</p> <p>This obviously was not planted to address the landslide which had been assessed as too deep for planting on the slopes to stabilise the ground.</p> <p>This could be a mis-communication with the LA's and community. They should have been informed that the project was not going to be able to address the landslide issue as intended, but only the river bank issue.</p> <p>Furthermore, this should not be within the progress section but should be within the effectiveness section where should also be discussion of other case studies showing a balance between 'issues identified' and good practices.</p> <p>Thanks for considering suggestion to move this case under effectiveness section and also rewording the text. However, both myself and Margaretta think that you have in fact, delved onto the assessment of effectiveness by raising the 'technical' issues around Komandeli site (despite that fact you are not a technical expert?). What about looking at the effectiveness of any other structures. This seems to be not a fair assessment of effectiveness. Nor are any other aspects of effectiveness addressed. I also think that this 'unsatisfactory result' is dominating, or perhaps it is because this was the only case and you describe it in detail? . You indeed mention the good results but if you describe in such a technical detail 'unsatisfactory result' wouldn't it be good to have good balance of good v. one bad case?? At least one good case, with photos and description will be useful to be noted. Or you don't have such detailed info at hand?</p> <p>Komandeli site description – it is becoming little too much of a discussion. The revised text is good</p>	<p>The paragraph was moved to the effectiveness section and revised at certain level.</p> <p>More details added to</p>

<p>UNDP Country From general comments- e-mail from Feb 20, 2017</p>			<p>to me, incl. yellow highlights. I think that providing so much technical detail on just one case and not doing so for at least one good case is not fair. So I suggest either revising/reducing the current case description or adding at least one good case. You decide, please.</p>	<p>highlight positive cases. “Komandeli site is now shortened so it doesn’t seem to stand out so much – I just didn’t have enough information from good cases to provide detailed structural analysis”. (Comment from Feb 20, 2017)</p>
<p>Technical Adviser From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</p> <p>UNDP Country Office From Track-</p>	<p>32</p>	<p>Findings: 3.1. Progress towards results and impacts Relevance</p>	<p>This is and all other sections is too brief and do not consider the sub-questions as per the GEF guidance used and as contained in your ToR. I would expect to see text addressing at least some of the sub-questions normally considered in evaluations.</p> <p>Under relevance for example you need to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Outline the country priorities (not just mentioning the Water Law) as well as the donor programme priorities and state how the project design is relevant to these. 2) Provide a detailed assessment of the problem to be addressed and how the project design and approach to implementation align with the country and donor priorities (Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results) 3) Assess the relevance of the tools / instruments / inputs applied by the project in supporting effective implementation 4) Assess the relevance and effect of technical assistance and planning support given to the NEA, MRDI other project target beneficiaries. This is an opportunity to detail the technical input to the project, state why they were relevant (against alternatives) and why there were effective <p>This could be further argued but certainly does not make sense at this stage. You have obviously followed your inception report and focused on issues that were noted in this report</p>	<p>Point not taken based on the approaches and methodology laid out in the Inception report.</p>

<i>changes comments Feb 16, 2017</i>				
Technical Adviser <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	33	Findings: 3.1. Progress towards results and impacts	<p>This section seems to mainly deal with financial efficiency and does not even provide a detail assess of such. Your comments on efficiency should be evidence based (i.e. where is the analysis of the finances to support your claim).</p> <p>It should also include the following measures of efficiency:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. timeliness and quality of the reporting followed by the project 2. qualitative and quantitative aspects of management and other inputs (such as equipment, monitoring and review and other technical assistance and budgetary inputs) provided by the project visa-vis achievement of outputs and target 3. factors and constraints which have affected project implementation including technical, managerial, organizational, institutional and socio-economic policy issues in addition to other external factors unforeseen during the project design. 	“As mentioned in the inception report, efficiency is not the focus of this evaluation nor is it mentioned in the evaluation purpose, please see review to TOR.”
Technical Adviser <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	34	Findings: 3.1. Progress towards results and impacts	<p>This section should have considered the following sub-questions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Review whether the project has accomplished its outputs. In particular the mission should review: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Area selection criteria and its implementation b. Targeting strategy for the identification of project beneficiaries including both men and women. c. Any emerging effect of the project on beneficiaries including both men and women. 2) Assess the performance of the project so far with particular reference to qualitative and quantitative achievements of outputs and targets as defined in the project documents and work-plans and with reference to the project baseline 3) Assess the effectiveness of the cost sharing arrangements between the project and beneficiary communities and between the Government and UNDP <p>Here the project actual interventions should not described in detail and should include a detailed account of what was done, Including technical approach and how it has effectively (or otherwise)</p>	Long narrative and descriptive reports are not exactly RBM friendly. Better to focus on the interpretation which is what the evaluation is about, than the facts that are already contained in the PPR, Results Framework, and other documents that can simply be attached to the evaluation report. The goal is to avoid an exceedingly long document that no one will read As I indicated, I am not a technical

			<p>addressed the barriers it sought to address. Here examples of good practice as well as poor practice should be highlighted. This is where the example of Oni should be placed, but alongside the examples of other sites as well as other types of interventions. In other words, you should take each expected output and discuss how it was done, how effective it was and what the impact has been and what longer-term impacts might result.</p>	<p>expert, so it is somewhat unrealistic to expect a technical analysis of every output – what is important is to determine how the structure contributed to the outcomes.</p>
<p>Technical Adviser <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p>	35	<p>Findings: 3.2.Adaptive Management</p>	<p>I strongly disagree with this entire paragraph. Most countries in the CIS are not practicing CCA, FRM and DRM in any strategic manner so cannot provide examples of good practice. Georgia is the first through this project, to do so in a comprehensive manner.</p> <p>Furthermore, most reports, while examining international best practice, have painstakingly developed Georgia-specific applications of these best practices and has only used Georgian data to develop outputs. All of the modelling work for example, has used Georgian data and applied best modelling approaches and software in line with EUFD requirements. Risk modelling used socio-economic data of Georgia (collected at length and with great difficulty) and applied EUFD risk methods. In the absence of data, for example, depth-damage curves, it used UK depth-damage curves and adjusted them to Georgia reality. This was validated by Georgian experts.</p> <p>Building codes, when reviewed were found to be applying several different European standards depending on the nationality of the contractors or none at all when local contractors did the work. The standard that was eventually suggested was that of a European country.</p> <p>It is important to note that the project tried to implement approaches, methods and standards that would enhance Georgia’s capacity to transition into the EU and the current EU approaches and requirements. This, I would suggest, is a more forward thinking and sustainable approach than trying to implement methods from other CIS countries that are not currently implementing good practice and certainly won’t be implementing EU</p>	<p>Clarifications added based on the feedback.</p>

			compliant practice.	
Technical Adviser/UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	36	Findings: 3.2.Adaptive Management	<p>This is impossible to implement and likely to be counter-productive rather than helpful.</p> <p>This is not feasible; there is not a single example when projects are planned as per the election periods, especially in transition countries like Georgia. In addition, post-electoral changes are often continuous – for instance since 2012 elections, Env ministers were changed 3 times, head of NEA and Deputies 4 times; and this was in between two elections.</p>	<p>not addressed</p> <p>“This view is not shared by UNDP who believes it is not feasible to do so. The TE sees no reason why a project document cannot match the time-frame of an electoral cycle, which is often four or five years”.</p>
UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i>	37	Findings 3.3. Management Arrangements	<p>I am surprised there is no mention of the CTA or group of technical experts; CTA was driving force for the projects good implementation. Could you please acknowledge this too. Also perhaps not here, but in general I’ve noticed that there is no good mention of the technical expertise, especially international experts that brought in crucial know-how and support during the project. I suggest you reflect on this too, please</p>	Paragraph added

<p>Technical Adviser/UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p>	38	Quality of execution of Implementing Partners	<p>NEA through its LoA with UNDP was the main implementing partner. The TE has not examined their performance on the project.</p> <p>Please review the LoA, the deliverables provide by NEA including:</p> <p>Geological hazard assessment – field work and development of landslide hazard maps. Structure design – NEA engineers were extensively involved in the design of structures</p> <p>Modelling – NEA staff trained in modelling were supposed to be involved in the development of the modelling and FFEWS systems.</p> <p>MRDI is the other implementing partner with responsibility for review of structural measures design and construction.</p> <p>Elkana was a contractor under the project. If you assess them as an implementing partner, I would suggest that you need to assess all other contractors as implementing partners. NEA, being responsible party for the project did these works and it should be noted/evaluated too. ELKANA was contracted only for one element of the project</p>	Paragraph added
<p>Technical Adviser/UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p>	39	4. Sustainability, replication, scaling up	<p>This section should consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)Environmental sustainability of project (environmental benefits of the project, protection of populations etc.) 2)Catalyzed benefits of the project contributing to sustainability (socio-economic development benefits of the project, protection of livelihoods and livelihood generation benefits) 3)Financial sustainability 4)Human resources sustainability (e.g. how has capacity development contributed to sustainability of the intended project outcomes) 5)Institutional sustainability. <p>You seem to have only considered institutional and financial sustainability.</p>	Sections are added in the text
<p>UNDP Country Office <i>From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</i></p>	40	4. Sustainability, replication, scaling up	<p>In addition to Margareta’s comment, I think the rating you provided on sustainability in the Exc. Summary, moderately unlikely, should be explored further based on the comments</p>	Rating is not changed. Arguments are added under the section of sustainability.
<p>UNDP Country</p>	41	4. Sustainability,	Doubt this is realistic; however, I agree to	Explanation has

<p>Office From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</p>		<p>replication, scaling up</p>	<p>Margeratt's comment below and suggest perhaps reformulation of this sentence?? Placing under PM's office does not guarantee better coordination. However, having PM's office SSCMC on the Board and assigning them a coordination function perhaps will ensure better coordination.</p>	<p>been added</p>
<p>Technical Adviser From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</p>	<p>42</p>	<p>4. Sustainability, replication, scaling up</p>	<p>While the CMC's coordinating role is useful, it should be noted that it's focus is on 'response' and not <i>a priori</i> 'risk management' or 'risk reduction'. While the new project is aimed at developing a multi-hazard EWS, it is much broader than just FFEWS and will include more strategic risk management and risk reduction approaches building on those introduced for Rioni. I would be concerned that these more strategic risk management/reduction aspects of the project could be over-shadowed if the project is placed under the CMC. However, their situation within the OPM would be useful for elevating the profile of the project and perhaps getting the level of government ownership that is needed.</p>	<p>Note taken, clarification added.</p>
<p>Technical Adviser From Track-changes comments Feb 9, 2017</p>	<p>43</p>	<p>4. Sustainability, replication, scaling up</p>	<p>This recommendation does not make sense from a technical perspective and you seem to be confusing terminology. An EWS is not used to determine what 'concrete preventive measures are needed at community level'. It is strategic FRM planning that is used to determine the most appropriate measures that are needed and this could include structural measures and well as non-structural measures. EWS is an example of a non-structural measure. Flood prevention exercises is a completely different matter linked to response and is a normal part of any EWS.</p> <p>The new project is introducing a multi-hazard EWS, but it is also undertaking strategic FRM planning and implementation to ensure that risk management/reduction/preventative measures are identified, prioritised, designed and implemented in an appropriate manner (in line with EUFD).</p> <p>Please revise this recommendation as it is currently confused.</p>	<p>Note taken</p>
<p>Technical Adviser From Track-changes comments Feb</p>	<p>44</p>	<p>5. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons</p>	<p>International experts did a lot more than simply 'discuss' the project with the municipalities. The project was driven by international expertise in terms of technical leadership, detailed technical assessments, knowledge transfer and development</p>	<p>Comment reflected.</p>

<p>9, 2017</p>			<p>of systems.</p> <p>While I understand the point you make regarding the confidence that the local communities got in having international experts come to them to discuss issues, I think the report has largely missed the key contribution that was made by international expertise and this is reflected in the fact that apart from the CTA and dams expert (who happened to be in country at the time) no other international experts were interviewed to gain an understanding of their contributions to the outcome.</p> <p>I think an example of good practice is actually the way that international expertise was used to embed good practice throughout the project. This point has been largely missed in your assessment.</p>	
----------------	--	--	--	--

EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: Nino Antadze

Signature: 

Date: 24 may 2017

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: Natalia Olofinskaya

Signature: 

Date: 24 may 2017