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# Executive Summary

The Canada-UNDP Climate Change Adaptation Facility (CCAF) was established in 2013 by Canada in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with the aim to address the impacts of climate change on food security in developing countries. The Facility was composed of six national CCA projects in Cambodia, Cabo Verde, Haiti, Mali, Niger and Sudan (previously LDCF project extended under CCAF through addition funds) aiming to strengthen resilient approaches to agriculture and water management, with a focus on gender-related issues. In addition to these six projects, the Facility included a global project - with a total initial budget of USD 1,166,763 - aiming to enhance coordination across the CCAF national projects portfolio, promote knowledge sharing, and promote gender considerations. This evaluation report focuses in particular on the global CCAF project, whose evaluation findings are presented below.

**A. Project Formulation**

* **Relevance**

*Q1. Is the project relevant to CIDA’s strategic priorities and UNDP’s strategic plan and objectives, as well as to the national objectives of the 6 project countries?*

The project was overall relevant to: (i) CIDA’s priorities at the time, (ii) UNDP strategic priorities in terms of gender and climate change, and (iii) the national priorities of the 6 CCAF countries that were presented in their NAPA; even though mixed feeling were expressed in an interview about the geographic scope of the CCAF - in particular the fact that only one Asian country was included in the portfolio.

*Q2. To what extent was the project design internally coherent, and relevant within a broader external context?*

Overall, the project design was found externally coherent. It took stock of UNDP’s strong presence in the field as a comparative advantage for the implementation of this project. The CCAF approach itself – offering a global component to a portfolio of existing projects being expanded - is considered very complementary to other initiatives. The project design was also found internally coherent as a whole, even though the project document presented some weaknesses with regards to (i) its logical framework (ambitious objective, limited number of outputs, hardly measurable indicators); (ii) the lack of explanation of how assumptions and risks were used to tailor project activities; and (iii) the lack of identification of other interventions and lack of incorporation of other project’s lessons learned (in particular the 6 LDCF projects). While the design process of the global project did not involve all relevant stakeholders such as the national project teams, it did allow for the flexibility required to accommodate a demand-driven approach to better respond to countries’ need during implementation.

*Q3. To what extent was the design of management arrangements relevant to the project objective?*

The CCAF global project required a certain amount of flexibility in order to best respond to national project teams, which makes the lean management structure of the project relevant. The project would have nevertheless benefitted from a higher level formality in its structure, in particular through the establishment and regular meetings of a project board, which would have increased the transparency of the overall project management without hindering its flexibility.

**B. Project Implementation**

* **Efficiency and Effectiveness**

*Q4. To what extent was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?*

The management of the project was not formally recorded and happened mostly through informal channels. Nevertheless, several outputs of the global project show indications that adaptive management was used to ensure an efficient use of resources, and in particular to make sure that the outputs of the global project are responding to the needs of the national project teams.

*Q5. To what extent were partnership arrangements and stakeholders’ engagement effective during project implementation?*

Without establishing formal partnership arrangements, the global project did facilitate exchanges between the six national projects teams, brought together several departments of UNDP, and was represented at different global events. However, the communication and partnership between the governments of the 6 countries remained limited. The engagement of the national project teams in the implementation of the global project was deemed highly satisfactory by a majority of the teams.

*Q6. To what extent were project financial resources used efficiently?*

The project expenditures were relatively well aligned to what was originally planned, and as of May 2017, 94% of the initial project budget had been disbursed. The project did not mobilize cofinancing, which is conform to the project document, but it managed to leverage some additional funds through a grant from UNDP innovation. Overall, the use of project resources is considered efficient, project implementation has been as cost-effective as originally planned, and the CCAF approach itself is considered efficient. The project’s efficiency is therefore rated as satisfactory.

*Q7. To what extent was the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) plan effectively and efficiently implemented?*

The project complied with the requirements from the Government of Canada who was satisfied with the project monitoring and reporting. However, project monitoring was not conducted by using the logical framework neither by reporting project results against the initial targets, which did not provide a clear overview of the project progress according to its expected results. However, internal monitoring tools such as the coordinators’ annual work plan used the logical framework and allowed her to adequately monitor the project progress.

*Q8. To what extent were UNDP’s project implementation, execution, coordination and operations efficient?*

Overall, all stakeholders were highly satisfied with UNDP’s implementation and execution of the project. However, it can be noted that the project lacked a certain level of formality in its implementation which did not guarantee the existence of an efficient response mechanisms able to mitigate issues with project implementation.

**C. Project Results**

* **Effectiveness**

*Q9. Has the project been effective in achieving its main objective, expected outcomes and outputs?*

Overall the project is considered effective. The global project delivered on its three outputs: it established a coordination mechanism for cooperation and communication amongst the six national projects, even though its use remained limited (output 1.1); many quality knowledge products on CCA and gender were elaborated and well received by the national teams (output 2.1); gender-based adaptation approaches and practices were compiled and disseminated through many knowledge products (output 3.1). The overall achievement of project outcomes is considered satisfactory, the only mixed result being on the limited use of the coordination mechanism by the national team established under outcome 1. While most of the 6 CCAF national projects performed relatively well on the gender and communication sides, it is difficult to directly link the success of the global project to the national projects’ – and vice versa. In some instances however, it seems that the global project helped fill some gaps in the national projects (on communication for instance).

*Q10. How were risk and risk mitigation being managed?*

Even though the project did not have a formal risk mitigation strategy, it seems that the risks were appropriately managed during project implementation.

* **Impacts**

*Q11. Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward its intended impact?*

While it is too soon to assess the real impacts of the project, the positive reception of the knowledge products elaborated by the global project - at the national and at the global levels - give an indication on the fact that these products are likely to be used in the future, and therefore further spread the findings on gender and CCA that emanated from the 6 CCAF projects.

*Q12. To what extent did the project successfully mainstream other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women's empowerment?*

Given its focus on CCA – a particularly cross-cutting theme - the global project was able to fully mainstream in its outputs other UNDP priorities such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women’s empowerment.

*Q13. To what extent did the project play a catalytic role?*

Even though it is too soon to fully assess the catalytic role of the project, it seems that the catalytic potential of the project is quite high. This catalytic aspect mainly lays in the fact that it is an umbrella project that is taking stock of six existing national projects, and which is successfully building on their experiences and sharing them with a broad audience at the global level. While there is no evidence yet on the uptake of the gender publication, the interviews conducted for the evaluation have suggested that its findings are being picked up within UNDP to update knowledge tools.

* **Sustainability**

*Q14. To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?*

While the financial, socio political and environmental risks are considered limited, the main risk to sustaining the project’s outcomes lays in the fact that the community of practice initiated under the project might not continue after project end. However, it should be noted that this global project is unique and very different from traditional UNDP-GEF projects. As an umbrella project aiming to share knowledge and experiences between projects, the sustainability of this global project should mainly be considered through the elaboration of high quality knowledge products that will remain after project end.
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Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Acronym | Definition |
| CCA | Climate Change Adaptation |
| CCAF | Climate Change Adaptation Facility |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| CO | Country Office |
| DIM | Direct Implementation Modality |
| GAC | Global Affairs Canada |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GMS | General Management Services |
| LDC | Least Developed Country |
| LDCF | Least Developed Country Fund |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| NAPA | National Adaptation Programmes of Action |
| NWP | Nairobi Work Progamme |
| OECD DAC | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee |
| RTA | Regional Technical Advisor |
| SIDS | Small Island Developing States |
| TAMD | Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development |
| TE | Terminal Evaluation |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNOSSC | United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation |

# Introduction

## Purpose of the terminal evaluation

As mentioned in the Terms of Reference (ToR) presented in Annex 1, the main objective of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Canada- UNDP Climate Change Adaptation Facility (CCAF) global project is to assess the achievement of project results, and draw lessons in order to improve the sustainability of the benefits generated by the project, as well as to contribute to the overall improvement of UNDP programming.

As indicated in the *UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations*[[1]](#footnote-1) (the TE Guidance), the objective of a TE is to provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of performance at the end of the project cycle, considering the totality of the effort from project design, through implementation to wrap up, also considering the likelihood of sustainability and possible impacts.

It is expected that the TE:

**1. Relevance**

* The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.

**2. Effectiveness**

* The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.

**3. Efficiency**

* The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.

**4. Results**

* The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention.

**5. Sustainability**

* The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.
* Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable.

Box 1: UNDP Evaluation criteria

* Assesses the project’s performance against the 5 criteria for public policy evaluation, as defined by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC), namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact;
* Promotes transparency and accountability and disclose information about the project that is credible, useful, and accurate;
* Synthesizes lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP activities;
* Follows a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement of all project stakeholders at the global, regional and national levels;
* Provides ratings, as per the TE Guidance, on a variety of performance criteria[[2]](#footnote-2);
* Assesses the financial aspect of the project, variances between planned and actual expenditures, and the results of financial audits, as available;
* Gauges the extent of project convergence with other UNDP priorities such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender; and
* Provides a set of conclusions, lessons and recommendations on how the model presented by the CCAF global project was effective at complementing the broader UNDP national project portfolio, and how this could potentially be replicated or scaled up.

## Scope and methodology

### Scope of the evaluation

The TE covers the five evaluation criteria mentioned in Box 1 above. These 5 criteria have been broken down into 14 evaluation questions that include themselves a number of sub-questions. The evaluation questions are organized per evaluation criteria, and according to the three main phases of the project cycle, namely project formulation, project implementation and project results. The evaluation questions are listed below, and all the associated sub-questions are presented in the evaluation matrix presented in Annex 2:

**A. Project Formulation**

* Relevance
  + Q1. Is the project relevant to CIDA’s strategic priorities and UNDP’s strategic plan and objectives, as well as to the national objectives of the 6 project countries?
  + Q2. To what extent was the project design internally coherent, and relevant within a broader external context?
  + Q3. To what extent was the design of management arrangements relevant to the project objective?

**B. Project Implementation**

* Efficiency and Effectiveness
  + Q4. To what extent was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
  + Q5. To what extent were partnership arrangements and stakeholders’ engagement effective during project implementation?
  + Q6. To what extent were project financial resources used efficiently?
  + Q7. To what extent was the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) plan effectively and efficiently implemented?
  + Q8. To what extent were UNDP’s project implementation, execution, coordination and operations efficient?

**C. Project Results**

* Effectiveness
  + Q9. Has the project been effective in achieving its main objective, expected outcomes and outputs?
  + Q10. How were risk and risk mitigation being managed?
* Impacts
  + Q11. Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward its intended impact?
  + Q12. To what extent did the project successfully mainstream other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women's empowerment?
  + Q13. To what extent did the project play a catalytic role?
* Sustainability
  + Q14. To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

### Methodological steps

The main steps of the TE were follows:

**Inception phase**

The evaluator conducted a preliminary documentation review to clarify the context around the project and identify the main challenges of the evaluation mission and information gaps to be completed. Based on this review, the evaluator elaborated an evaluation matrix - a key tool for data collection and analysis that guided the whole evaluation process. The matrix was organized along the 5 OECD DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact) and included the set of evaluation questions presented above. The matrix is included in Annex 2.

The evaluator elaborated an inception note reflecting his improved understanding of the assignment and including evaluation tools such as the evaluation matrix, interview protocols and a detailed work plan. A final version of the inception note was submitted and approved by UNDP.

**Data Collection Phase**

The data collected for this evaluation came from both primary and secondary sources.

Secondary data was collected from an in-depth documentation review that covered all documentation from the global project (Project Document, Semi-Annual reports, documentation produced by project activities, etc.), as well as documentation from the six national projects (project documents, available evaluation reports, etc.). A full list of reviewed documentation is presented in Annex 4.

Primary data was collected through interviews with a wide range of stakeholders involved in the project. These interviews complemented the documentation review and allowed the evaluator to deepen his analysis and to understand the key determinants of the project implementation history, the strengths and weaknesses of the project, and how beneficiaries and other key stakeholders perceived the project relevance, results, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The interviews also helped the evaluator assess challenges, cross-cutting issues and possible ways for improvement. A list of people interviewed during the evaluation is presented in Annex 3.

By the end of the data collection phase, a wrap up discussion was organized with the evaluator and the project coordinator to present and review initial findings, and request additional information as needed.

**Data Analysis and Reporting Phase**

The evaluator compiled and analyzed all the data collected through the interviews and the documentation review using the evaluation matrix. All data has been systematically analyzed and triangulated to ensure that all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence.

Based on this analysis, the evaluator prepared this first draft of the evaluation report that will be submitted to UNDP for review and comments on May 12th. All comments will be duly taken into consideration by the evaluator who will address them in a final version of the report. The evaluator will develop an audit trail tracking all comments received and explaining how they have been addressed.

## Structure of the evaluation report

After a succinct presentation of the evaluation’s purpose, scope and methodology, this evaluation report first presents the context of the evaluation together with a brief description of the CCAF global project. The report then presents the evaluation findings organized in three main sections: (i) project design and formulation; (ii) project implementation; and (iii) project results, covering the 5 OECD DAC criteria - relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability – and all the evaluation questions. After the presentation of the evaluation findings, the report compiles the main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

While this evaluation report follows overall the UNDP TE Guidance[[3]](#footnote-3), it should be noted that it was slightly adapted to the unique aspect of this project. The TE Guidance is tailored to GEF funded projects implemented by UNDP whereas this project was funded by Canada, and therefore had different requirements. In addition, this project is an umbrella project overarching 6 national projects, which gives a different dimension to the analysis of its potential impacts and sustainability, as compared to nationally or regionally implemented GEF projects.

# Project description and context

The CCAF was established in 2013 by Canada - through the former Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), now named Global Affairs Canada (GAC) - in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with the aim to address the impacts of climate change on food security in developing countries.

Table 1: Canada-UNDP Climate change adaptation portfolio

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country | Project |
| Cambodia | Promoting Climate-Resilient Water Management and Agricultural Practices in Rural Cambodia |
| Cape Verde | Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde |
| Haiti | Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti |
| Mali | Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector in Mali |
| Niger | Implementing National Adaptation Programmes of Action Priority Interventions to Build Resilience and Adaptive Capacity of the Agriculture Sector to Climate Change in Niger |
| Sudan | Adaptation to the Effects of Drought and Climate Change in Four Agro-Ecological Zones in Sudan |

In the framework of this Facility, six projects funded by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by UNDP were selected based on their results, their potential for replication and their location with the aim of extending them or scaling them up through follow-up projects under the CCAF. The six countries are: Cambodia, Cabo Verde, Haiti, Mali, Niger and Sudan. The six Canada-UNDP national projects aim to strengthen resilient approaches to agriculture and water management, with a focus on gender-related issues. They are presented in Table 1.

In addition to these six projects, the CCAF included a global project aiming to promote south-south cooperation and enhance understanding about initiatives that address climate change adaptation (CCA), and in particular the gender dimension of adaptation. This 3.5 year project had a total initial budget of USD 1,166,763[[4]](#footnote-4) and was implemented by the UNDP-GEF Unit from January 2014 to June 2017. The project was originally intended to close in December 2016, and was extended a first time to March 2017, and then extended a second time to March 2018, with the intention to close all activities by June 2017.

The original tasks assigned to this global project were:

* To support global coordination and knowledge management involving the portfolio of national CCA projects;
* To collect and analyze information, experiences, and lessons learned emanating from the projects to produce and disseminate knowledge that can be shared among the project countries and usefully applied in other contexts; and
* To broadly inform climate and sustainable development policies at the local, national, and global levels.

This has been translated into three outcomes expected from the project:

* Outcome 1: Global coordination of Canada-UNDP portfolio of CCA projects is operational and visible;
* Outcome 2: Global knowledge management of CCA experiences and lessons emerging from UNDP – CIDA portfolio of projects is enhanced and effective; and
* Outcome 3: Gender results from Canada-UNDP CCA project portfolio inform broader adaptation processes.

The intervention logic of the project, outlining the logical links between the project’s expected impact, outcomes, outputs and activities is summarized in the diagram below.

Figure 1: Intervention logic of the global Canada UNDP CCAF global project

**South-south cooperation is promoted and the understanding about initiatives that address adaptation to climate change, especially the gender dimensions, are enhance**d

1. Global coordination of Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects is operational and visible

2. Global knowledge management of climate change adaptation experiences and lessons emerging from Canada - UNDP portfolio of projects is enhanced and effective

3. Gender results from Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation project portfolio inform broader adaptation processes

1.1. Global coordination mechanism established for cooperation and communication among Canada - UNDP portfolio of national climate change adaptation projects in Cambodia, Cape Verde, Haiti, Mali, Niger, and Sudan

2.1. Global knowledge based on Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation projects actively produced and exchanged

3.1. Proven gender-based adaptation approaches and practices are compiled and disseminated

1.1.1 Enable effective communication among Canada - UNDP national adaptation projects through virtual conferences and listservs

1.1.2 Convene or participate in international CCA workshops, including UNFCCC side events, to showcase and share Canada - UNDP CCA project portfolio experiences and lessons and learn from others

2.1.1 Review, analyze, and distil information, good practices, and lessons learned emerging from Canada - UNDP portfolio of CCA projects and related initiatives

2.1.2 Establish dedicated window within the UNDP-ALM knowledge platform for the Canada – UNDP CCAF

2.1.3 Conduct preliminary assessment of adaptation training needs and audiences

2.1.4 Prepare online training modules on CCA approaches, practices and measures that are generated by the Canada - UNDP portfolio of CCA projects and related initiatives

2.1.5 Elaborate global knowledge products on CCA themes, including resilient food security, agro-pastoralism, and water resources management, based on Canada - UNDP portfolio

2.1.6 Translate as appropriate global online and published knowledge products into French and Spanish for wide dissemination

3.1.1 Review, analyze, and distil information and lessons regarding women’s participation in Canada - UNDP portfolio of CCA projects and related initiatives

3.1.2 Prepare online training module on gender-based adaptation approaches and practices

3.1.3 Produce global knowledge materials on gender and climate change adaptation

3.1.4 Convene international workshop on gender and climate change adaptation to discuss and disseminate findings from Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects and related initiatives

**IMPACT OUTCOMES OUTPUTS ACTIVITIES**

# Findings

## Project Design / Formulation

### Relevance

|  |
| --- |
| Rating on Relevance: Project rated as **RELEVANT[[5]](#footnote-5)**. |

**Q1. Is the project relevant to CIDA’s strategic priorities and UNDP’s strategic plan and objectives, as well as to the national objectives of the 6 project countries?**

The CCAF global project is relevant to Canada’s strategic priorities in terms of food security and gender equality.

According to CIDA’s report on Plans and Priorities 2013-2014, the period when the global CCAF project started, the strategic outcome of the organization was: “reduction in poverty for those living in countries in which CIDA engaged in international development”[[6]](#footnote-6). Within this overarching strategic outcome, one of the organizational priorities was the increase of food security. CIDA’s food security strategy focused on agricultural development, food assistance and nutrition, and research and development. This strategy aimed to address as a priority the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable populations, and in particular women, giving for instance specific attention to the empowerment of women farmers. Today, increasing food security remains one of Canada's five development priorities, and gender equality is one of GAC’s current three cross-cutting themes[[7]](#footnote-7).

The objective of the global CCAF project is to “promote south-south cooperation and enhance understanding about initiatives that address adaptation to climate change, especially the gender dimension”. The objective of the global CCAF is therefore aligned and relevant to Canada’s thematic priorities in terms of food security (enhanced through the promotion of CCA) and gender equality.

Under its overarching strategic outcome, CIDA had 5 different programs including: (i) fragile sates and crisis-affected communities, (ii) low income countries, (iii) middle-income countries, (iv) global engagement and strategic policy, and (v) Canadian engagement for development. The CCAF global project is relevant to at least 3 of these 5 programs, namely program i, ii, and iv.

The geographic coverage of the global project that targets 6 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) was relevant to CIDA’s program for fragile states and crisis-affected communities (program i), and the program for low income countries (program ii).at the time. GAC now focuses 90% of its bilateral development assistance in 25 countries of focus, amongst which includes two of the 6 CCAF countries (Haiti and Mali).

The global engagement and strategic policy program (program iv) aimed at building effective partnerships to improve the effectiveness of Canada’s development investment, in particular by pooling resources and combining expertise to achieve a greater reach for poverty reduction. This is in line with the CCAF global project that aimed to pool resources and combine experiences between 6 different countries.

The CCAF global project is relevant to UNDP Strategic Plan.

When the global CCAF project was first elaborated, it was embedded in one of the four focus areas of the UNDP 2008-2013 Strategic Plan: “environment and sustainable development”, and in particular under the adaptation to climate change outcome. It was also aligned to at least 2 of the 6 UNDP key approaches, namely: “mainstreaming south-south cooperation”, and “mainstreaming equality and empowerment of women”. In addition, the project was aligned to UNDP typology and regional priorities at the time, namely: Africa, LDCs, land-locked developing countries and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The global CCAF project was therefore relevant to UNDP strategic plan 2008-2013 when it was developed.

During its implementation (2014-2017), the global CCAF project remained relevant to the new UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The project is aligned to UNDP’s mission “To help countries achieve the simultaneous eradication of poverty and significant reduction of inequalities and exclusion”, and to at least 2 of the 7 strategic plan’s outcomes, namely: outcome 4: “faster progress is achieved in reducing gender inequality and promoting women’s empowerment”; and outcome 5: “Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict, and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change”.

The global project was relevant to the 6 CCAF countries to help them face challenges related to climate change and gender inequalities, with some mixed reactions expressed in interviews, regarding the geographic scope of the CCAF.

It is recognized that LDCs and SIDS are amongst the most vulnerable countries to the adverse effects of climate change, which are likely to hinder their development process. In addition, in many of these countries, underlying gender dynamics (roles and responsibilities in the communities, access to resources and power relations, etc.) tend to make women carry a disproportionate burden of the impacts of climate change. At the same time, women often have the most potential to drive successful adaptation[[8]](#footnote-8). The six CCAF countries are all LDCs and/or SIDS. The global project addresses the two challenges of climate change and gender inequality -shared by these six countries- through coordination and knowledge management across the six projects. In this sense, the global project is relevant to the countries where national Canada-UNDP CCA projects were implemented, which was a general agreement that came out from the interviews.

In addition, the LDCF-funded projects that were originally implemented in the six countries all focused on implementing the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA) priorities of these countries. The Canadian funding under the CCAF aimed at expanding and scaling up these projects and therefore the NAPA priorities. The global CCAF project is thus relevant to the national priorities of six countries as it focuses on coordination and knowledge sharing between projects implementing national priorities.

However, a reservation was made during an interview regarding the geographic coverage of the global project and of the Canada-UNDP adaptation project portfolio. The CCAF countries had very different contexts and environments, especially Cambodia as the only Asian country in the portfolio, which made it sometimes difficult to integrate and capitalize on lessons learned across projects. On the other hand, other interviewees found that the geographic coverage was relevant and considered that the diversity of countries allowed fruitful and enriching exchanges.

*To conclude, it can be said that even though the geographic scope of the CCAF was questioned once during interviews - in particular the fact that only one Asian country was included in the portfolio - it is considered that the project was overall relevant to: (i) CIDA’s priorities at the time, (ii) UNDP strategic priorities in terms of gender and climate change, and (iii) the national priorities of the 6 CCAF countries that were presented in their NAPA.*

**Q2. To what extent was the project design internally coherent, and relevant within a broader external context?**

The overall project logic, budget and timeframe are coherent but the project objective seems too ambitious and the number of expected outputs is insufficient.

The project’s objective is to promote south-south cooperation and enhance understanding about initiatives that address adaptation to climate change, especially the gender dimension. This objective seems ambitious with regards to the allocated budget and timeline of the project, especially in terms of south-south cooperation.

The United Nation Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC) gives the following definition of south-south cooperation:

“[…] a broad framework for collaboration among countries of the South in the political, economic, social, cultural, environmental and technical domains. Involving two or more developing countries, it can take place on a bilateral, regional, subregional or interregional basis. Developing countries share knowledge, skills, expertise and resources to meet their development goals through concerted efforts. Recent developments in South-South cooperation have taken the form of increased volume of South-South trade, South-South flows of foreign direct investment, movements towards regional integration, technology transfers, sharing of solutions and experts, and other forms of exchanges.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

While the global CCAF project does aim to enhance understanding about CCA initiatives and their gender dimension, its scope does not seem broad enough to fully promote south-south cooperation. Indeed, south-south cooperation includes -but is also much broader than- the sharing of experiences and knowledge between projects. As it has been raised in interviews, a full south-south cooperation approach would for instance require technology transfer between countries – going beyond the exchange of information between projects - with appropriate training given by experts from a country to another, which was outside the scope of this global project. In this sense, it seems that the project’s objective was more about **creating a community of practice** between different projects across 6 countries than promoting a true south-south cooperation.

The project document includes a results framework with three outcomes, as mentioned above:

* Outcome 1: Global coordination of Canada-UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects is operational and visible;
* Outcome 2: Global knowledge management of climate change adaptation experiences and lessons emerging from Canada-UNDP portfolio of projects is enhanced and effective; and
* Outcome 3: Gender results from Canada-UNDP climate change adaptation project portfolio inform broader adaptation processes.

The three outcomes are clearly stated and realistic given the available resources and timeline. However, each outcome are linked to only one output each. There is therefore not a clear difference between the output and the outcome levels. Usually, it is the combination of several outputs that leads to the achievement of an outcome. In the case of the global project only one output conditions the achievement of an outcome, which seems insufficient to properly define how the outcome shall be reached. At the same time, this did have some advantages as well. It was mentioned during an interview that the project was very well designed to leave enough flexibility within each outputs to adapt to the needs of the countries.

The global project had an initial total budget of USD 1,166,763, which seems relevant and sufficient to produce most of the expected outputs. However, several interviewees mentioned that they would have liked to have more than one global workshop gathering all the national teams physically, which was not possible to do within the budget allocated to the global project[[10]](#footnote-10).

The 3.5 year duration of the project seems relevant to achieve the expected results (outputs and outcomes). However, the global project aimed to take stock of the experiences of the national projects, which required the national projects to be advanced enough in their activities for them to have experiences to share. In this sense, several stakeholders mentioned in interviews that the timing between the global project and the six national projects could have been better staggered. This was partly due to the fact that all six projects weren’t aligned on the same timeframe. For instance, the national project in Cambodia terminated at the end of 2015, while the project in Haiti encountered several delays, postponing the delivery of its first outputs. It was therefore difficult for the global project to produce outputs early on to benefit more advanced projects, while it required the input of other national projects that experienced delays in implementation. Overall, the timeframe of the global project remains relevant, but was made difficult by the heterogeneity in timing amongst the Canada-UNDP CCA portfolio.

Even though a sufficient M&E framework is included in the project document, the project results framework and the indicators present some flaws that can hinder the acute monitoring of project results.

The results framework only includes one indicator for the project’s objective, one indicator for outcome 1, one indicator for outcome 2 and two indicators for outcome 3. No indicators are defined for the outputs. This limited number of indicators is not sufficient to fully track, monitor and evaluate the achievement of the outputs and outcomes and track the progress made towards the project’s objective.

In addition, the indicator for the project objective - “number of exchanges by government and civil society entities, practitioner and policy makers, across countries involved in the Canada-UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation project” – is at a result level, but not at an objective/impact level. This indicator does not allow the measurement of the promotion of south-south cooperation nor the enhanced understanding of CCA initiatives, nor does it reflect the gender dimension of the project.

The indicator for Outcome 2 – “number of attempts by government and civil society entities, practitioners and policy makers, associated with the Canada-UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects to use and adapt approaches and solutions across projects” is difficult to measure since it does not define precisely what an “attempt” is, and the proposed end-of-project target is not directly linked to this indicator as it does not set the targeted “number of attempts”.

The indicator for Outcome 3 – “extent of gender-based cross-fertilization among Canada-UNDP portfolio of CCA project” - is also hardly measurable.

The project document does include a succinct M&E framework, including an M&E plan and budget with defined responsible parties for each tasks. Therefore, even though brief and simple, the M&E framework was rather well conceived and proved to be sufficient during project implementation to monitor results and track progress towards achievement of the objective. In addition, the simplicity of the M&E framework contributed to the flexible and innovative aspect of the project, which is valuable for this type of global umbrella project overarching several national projects. This aspect is further detailed in the Project Implementation section below.

|  |
| --- |
| Rating on M&E design at entry: **MODERATELY** **UNSATISFACTORY (MU)[[11]](#footnote-11)** |

Assumptions and risks have been elaborated in the project document but the extent to which they were used to tailor or adjust planned activities or outputs is not explained. Externalities such as the effects of climate change are not directly reflected in the assumptions and risks.

The project results framework includes underlying assumptions for the achievement of the project objective and the achievement of each of the three project outcomes. In total, 5 assumptions are made, but no risks are stated in the results framework. The five assumptions are as follows:

* Governments and civil society organizations in the global south are concerned about climate change and are actively seeking information and experiences about effective adaptation measures and practices;
* Government and civil society stakeholders have the technical capacity to participate in virtual cross-border coordination activities and the ability to travel to international project sites, workshops, and meetings;
* Governments are supportive and engaged in sharing local and national experiences and good practices in international fora;
* Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects in Cambodia, Cape Verde, Haiti, Mali, Niger, and Sudan have the capacity to codify and provide sufficient information, good practices, and lessons learned (as per their project documents) to elaborate global knowledge products; and
* Projects and countries are willing to strengthen gender-based approaches to increase women’s participation in climate change adaptation policies and activities.

The project document also provides an annex with a risk log that includes the 4 following risks:

* Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation projects unable to participate fully in global coordination due to communication gaps and lack of time and interest;
* Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation projects do not participate fully in global knowledge management due to inability to produce and document sufficient information, lessons, and experiences;
* Insufficient financial resources to achieve outcomes and outputs; and
* Insufficient personnel to achieve outcomes and outputs.

For each risk, the probability and impact is rated between 1 and 2 for all risks - which means that all risks are considered having a low probability and low impact - and an appropriate countermeasure/ management response is provided with the responsible person.

The project document does not mention how assumptions or noted risks were used to tailor or adjust planned activities or outputs.

Externalities such as the effects of climate change are not directly reflected in the project document. It could have been incorporated in the risks and assumptions related to the ability of national projects to generate knowledge and best practices for instance.

While the CCAF approach aims to build on previous LDCF projects, and create linkages across a portfolio of projects, the project document does not explicitly incorporate lessons from other relevant initiatives nor does it identify other interventions within the sector.

The CCAF consists in building on existing and successful LDCF projects to quickly expand and scale up their intervention through a new funding phase, while also offering a global component making the links between six national projects. This approach in itself builds on existing projects and on their respective lessons learned, and aims to create linkages between different initiatives. The project document of the global CCAF project could have better emphasized the great added value of this type of approach.

The project document mentions all six projects of the Canada-UNDP adaptation portfolio and refers to their respective project documents. However, the project document of the global CCAF project does not mention explicitly lessons learned from the previous LDCF projects in the six countries, nor from other similar global project overseeing a portfolio of several national projects. In addition, the project document does not identify other interventions at the global level on CCA and gender to analyze possible linkages. While it is clear that the CCAF project is focusing on making the link between the 6 Canada-UNDP CCA projects, it could have nevertheless benefitted from lessons learned from other projects outside the Canada-UNDP CCAF portfolio. There is no evidence that such lessons/recommendation were used in the planning process of the project.

Nevertheless, it was mentioned in an interview that the global project was designed through a back and forth discussion between UNDP Headquarters and CIDA, and that it was first envisioned based on their experience with national projects that usually focus on the national level and don’t have time to either communicate or bring together lessons learned at the global level.

In addition, several project teams at the national level mentioned that they were closely involved in the design of the Canada-UNDP project at the national level and that they were able to feed the lessons learned from the previous LDCF project into the new Canada-funded phase.

UNDP’s strong presence in the field was a comparative advantage for the implementation of the project, and the CCAF funding was complementary to other donors’ initiatives.

Interviewees mentioned that UNDP was chosen by CIDA as a natural partner to implement this global project. UNDP was seen as a good fit for this project due to its strong connection to the field through its widespread network of Regional Technical Advisors (RTA) and Country Offices (CO). According to interviewees, this UNDP structure facilitates the creation of partnerships and gives the agency the ability to know key players on the ground and to engage them more easily. The UNDP structure also allowed the project coordinator to sit in both the UNDP Headquarters in New York, and in the Addis Ababa regional UNDP office, allowing her to gain an in-depth knowledge of UNDP global priorities on the one hand, and an in depth knowledge of the African region and its own priorities and challenges.

CIDA’s funding through the CCAF can be considered complementary to other donors’ support in the sense that it aimed to expand and scale up initiatives on CCA funded by the LDCF, while also offering a global component to take stock, share and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned from a portfolio of projects, and strengthen their gender dimension, with a view to inform the international development community at large.

While the design process of the global project did not actively involve relevant stakeholders such as the national project teams, and while the project document did not provide a description of the project’s beneficiaries nor did it provide an assessment of their needs, it can be noted that the project was designed to accommodate a demand-driven approach during implementation.

The 6 CCAF countries were selected before the elaboration of the global CCAF project, through a collaborative process between the countries, UNDP and CIDA. Interviewees mentioned a variety of criteria that were used to select the countries, including among others: being an LDC, having an on-going LDCF-funded project with a strong project management structure in place, addressing CCA and food security, focusing on the poorest and most vulnerable, and the potential impacts that additional Canada funding could have.

According to the interviews conducted for this evaluation, the global project was developed through a back and forth discussion between the UNDP headquarters in New York, and CIDA. While most of the project teams involved in the previous LDCF projects at the national level contributed to the design of the second phase of their national project under CIDA’s funding, the interviews showed that none of them directly contributed to the design of the global project itself. The design process of the project remained at UNDP headquarters, without specifically involving the national teams (UNDP COs and government counterparts). At the RTA level, while some mentioned in interviews that they had not been involved in the design of the global project, one of them did confirm his/her input into the design of the global project, in particular regarding the need to have a strong global knowledge synthesis component. The recent staff changes within UNDP did not allow the evaluator to properly assess the involvement of the UNDP gender team in the design of the global project at the time

The project document does not describe in details the project beneficiaries, nor does it provide an assessment of their needs. The project’s objective and outcomes imply that the direct project beneficiaries are the Canada-UNDP CCA project teams, as well as other adaptation practitioners (such as UNDP and its partners) that could benefit from the experiences of the CCAF portfolio. This was confirmed in an interview, but it could be stated more clearly in the project document.

The evaluator was unable to assess the degree of coherence between the needs of the national project teams and the objectives of the global project since no need assessment was conducted at the project design stage. However, all the national teams that could be interviewed expressed their satisfaction regarding the relevance of the global project to their needs and to their own national project. In addition, while the needs of the national project teams were not assessed initially at the project design stage, the project coordinator used the first year of implementation of the global project to consult the national teams on their respective needs and expectation and adjust the support provided by the global project accordingly. The results of this needs assessment process are presented and used in two strategies elaborated by the global project: a “Community of Practice Strategy”, and a “Knowledge Products Strategy”. It can therefore be said that the project design allowed for the flexibility required to accommodate a demand-driven approach responding to national projects’ needs during implementation.

*Overall, the project design was found externally coherent. It took stock of UNDP’s strong presence in the field as a comparative advantage for the implementation of this project. The CCAF approach itself – offering a global component to a portfolio of existing projects being expanded - is considered very complementary to other initiatives. The project design was also found internally coherent as a whole, even though the project document presented some weaknesses with regards to (i) its logical framework (ambitious objective, limited number of outputs, hardly measurable indicators); (ii) the lack of explanation of how assumptions and risks were used to tailor project activities; and (iii) the lack of identification of other interventions and lack of incorporation of other project’s lessons learned (in particular the 6 LDCF projects). While the design process of the global project did not involve all relevant stakeholders such as the national project teams, it did allow for the flexibility required to accommodate a demand-driven approach to better respond to countries’ need during implementation.*

**Q3. To what extent was the design of management arrangements relevant to the project’s objective?**

The lean management structure of the project was overall relevant to the project’s objective, but the project could have benefitted from more formalized partnership arrangements, in particular with the national projects.

The CCAF global project was implemented under the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) which is “the modality whereby UNDP takes on the role of Implementing Partner. In DIM modality, UNDP has the technical and administrative capacity to assume the responsibility for mobilizing and applying effectively the required inputs in order to reach the expected outputs. UNDP assumes overall management responsibility and accountability for project implementation. Accordingly UNDP must follow all policies and procedures established for its own operations[[12]](#footnote-12)”.

According to the project document, the CCAF global project was designed to have a lean management structure, made out of a project coordinator, a project board (composed of UNDP, the UNDP-GEF Unit, and CIDA), and a project assurance entity.

As mentioned above and according to the interviews, UNDP was chosen by the Canadian government to be the implementing partner of this project based on its good connection to the field and track record. Since the global project was implemented directly by UNDP, through a unique project coordinator, a more specific assessment of an executing agency was not conducted when the project was designed, which seems appropriate in such context.

At the national level, project teams, government counterparts and project management arrangements were already in place since CIDA’s funding came as an addition to existing LDCF projects. Most of the six projects kept the same structure between the two phases of funding (LDCF and then CIDA).

Under the global project, partnerships arrangements were not formally defined at project entry. The project document does describe the role of the project management entities (project board, UNDP, project assurance, project coordinator), but only briefly, and interviews revealed that the project Board was never formally put in place.

In addition, no partnerships arrangements were formalized between the global project and the six national projects – such as for instance Memorandums of Understanding specifying that the national projects will contribute the to the global CCAF project- which could have served as a safety net to ensure the contribution of the national projects to the global project. Such measure could have contributed to mitigate one of the risks identified in the project document (“Canada-UNDP CCA projects unable to participate fully in global coordination due to communication gaps and lack of time and interest”), and to compensate the fact that no accountability line existed between the national projects and the global project. However, it should be noted that the unformal aspect of the relationship of the six country teams was also perceived by some stakeholders as an advantage, enabling easy and direct communication between the national teams.

*The CCAF global project required a certain amount of flexibility in order to best respond to national project teams, which makes the lean management structure of the project relevant. The project would have nevertheless benefitted from a higher level formality in its structure, in particular through the establishment and regular meetings of a project board, which would have increased the transparency of the overall project management without hindering its flexibility.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on RELEVANCE**  The project is considered relevant to the priorities of Canada, of UNDP and of the 6 project countries, even though mixed feelings were expressed regarding CCAF’s geographic scope. The project was also found externally and internally coherent and relevant even though its design process presented some weaknesses, in particular regarding its logical framework, the lack of incorporation of lessons learned from other projects, and the lack of participation of national project teams in the design of the global project. The lean management structure of the project was also considered relevant, in particular to ensure the flexibility and ability of the global project to adapt to the needs of the national project teams. Nonetheless, a higher level of formality in the project management structure could have increased its transparency without hindering its flexibility.  The project is rated as RELEVANT. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on PROJECT DESIGN/ FORMULATION**  The project design process is deemed satisfying since it succeeded in creating an overall relevant, unique and innovative project able to adapt to the needs of the national project teams. Nonetheless, the project design could have been improved by a more robust project document and logical framework. A better integration of lessons learned from other projects (in particular the 6 LDCF projects) as well as the involvement of the national project teams could have contributed to the good alignment with the national projects. In addition, a more formal project structure with a board could have increased the transparency of project management, without hindering its flexibility. |

## Project Implementation

### Efficiency and Effectiveness

|  |
| --- |
| Rating on project Efficiency**: SATISFACTORY**. |

**Q4. To what extent was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?**

The management of the global project was relatively adaptive.

The global project had a very lean management structure that mainly consisted of the project coordinator, and her supervisor that made the link with CIDA/GAC. As mentioned above, even though the project document mentioned a project board, it was never put in place. The management structure was therefore relatively informal, which makes it difficult for the evaluator to fully assess the extent to which the project management was adaptive. In addition, the person overseeing the project at CIDA at the time changed position and could not be interviewed by the evaluator.

Five semi-annual reports were submitted to CIDA/GAC from April 2014 to October 2016 throughout the implementation of the project. As only positive responses but no specific feedback was received from Canada on each report, the semi-annual reports do not mention follow-up actions taken in response to the feedback received on previous reports. Interviews showed that the feedback and exchanges between UNDP and CIDA on the semi-annual report happened in an informal way, which was therefore difficult to assess for the evaluator.

Interviewees mentioned that some minor adjustments were made to budget lines such as for instance increasing the travel budget during the first year to allow the project coordinator to visit the national projects. These small adjustments were not detailed nor explained in the semi-annual reports, since they were not required, but interviews suggested that adequate explanations were given by UNDP to CIDA through more informal channels.

Even though not formally reported as such in the semi-annual reports, several elements do show the adaptive nature of the management of the global project. For instance, the semi-annual report from October 2014 mentions that “the first 10 months of implementation of the global project has been focused on in depth consultations with project teams and regional advisors in order to develop a strategy for the global component that is demand-driven, cohesive, and realistic given available resources (both human and financial)”. Even though it wasn’t planned per se in its results framework, the global project developed three strategies based on the three areas of work that were acknowledged as most useful by the national project teams, namely:

* Community of Practice focused on sharing experience and lessons learned amongst the six national project teams in order to inform and strengthen national project activities;
* Substantive Analysis and Knowledge focused on analyzing and documenting substantive experiences and lessons learned from the CCAF portfolio and disseminate them to inform adaptation projects both within the CCAF and outside; and
* Communication and Outreach focused on showcasing results and communicating successes of CCAF national projects to the global community.

The elaboration of these strategies, based on the consultative process at the beginning of the global project, shows an ability of the global project to adapt to the needs of the national projects and deliver outputs that are relevant to them.

Another example of adaptive management can be extracted from the October 2015 semi-annual report. This report takes notes of the fact that “many case studies and experiences from one country does not “seem” relevant to another country, given the context-specific nature of these adaptation practices”. In response to this challenge, the project supported the application to a UNDP Innovation Grant, jointly with the national project in Cabo Verde, to build a platform for visualizing common data emerging from the 6 countries and for making them more applicable across contexts for the purpose of replication and scaling up.

*The management of the project was not formally recorded and happened mostly through informal channels, but some outputs of the global project show indications that adaptive management was used to ensure an efficient use of resources and in particular to make sure that the outputs of the global project are responding to the needs of the national project teams.*

**Q5.To what extent were partnership arrangements and stakeholders’ engagement effective during project implementation?**

While the global project facilitated exchanges between the teams of the six national projects, the partnerships between the governments of the six countries were limited. At the global level, the CCAF project brought together different branches of UNDP, and even though no formal partnerships agreements were signed through the project, different collaboration happened with other initiatives.

Interviews showed that at the national level, partnerships operated mostly through the teams of the national projects who already had existing partnerships with government counterparts, NGOs or other partners based on their experience with the LDCF project.

The global project aimed at developing coordination and cooperation between the six Canada-UNDP CCA projects. At the global level, it can be said that partnerships between the six countries were facilitated by the global project. For instance, the October 2014 semi-annual report mentions that the global project launched an email listserv between the six projects and initiated discussions on various topics. In addition, a global exchange workshop was organized through the global project in Niamey, Niger, in March 2015 to share experiences and lessons learned across countries. It can therefore be considered that the global project helped build informal relationships between the teams of the six national projects. The composition of the national project teams were different for each project but they involved for the main part at least a project coordinator contracted by UNDP, and a government counterpart. Even though the global project strengthened relationships between the different teams, and even though government representative from 5 of the 6 CCAF countries participated to the global workshop in Niamey[[13]](#footnote-13), several stakeholders interviewed mentioned that the project did not facilitate strong and direct partnerships between the governments of the different countries. Interviews revealed that most of the interactions between the teams, in particular through the email listserv, occurred with the stimulation of the global project team, and not at the initiative of the national teams. In addition, there is no evidence that the relationships between governments went further than the team members of the national projects. This finding echoes the statement according to which the global project’s objective on south-south cooperation was too ambitious. On this basis, it seems unlikely that partnerships between the national teams, and partnerships between the governments of the six countries will be sustained outside of the global project.

Within UNDP, the global project brought together different arms of UNDP such as the UNDP CO, RTAs, the gender team, the communication team and the innovation team. The UNDP COs and RTA were involved in the implementation of the national projects, but also in the consultations with the global project. Interviewees mentioned that the communication team was involved in the global project, in particular to promote highlights on the CCAF on the UNDP website. The UNDP gender team was consulted in an ad hoc manner throughout the project, for instance during the consultation conducted in the first year of project implementation on project teams’ needs and existing material[[14]](#footnote-14) or, as interviewees mentioned, for input into the publication on gender “Filling buckets, fuelling change”. The innovation team was involved in the development of the innovation platform for visualizing common data emerging from the different countries.

No formal partnerships were facilitated with external global stakeholders, but the global project did collaborate with several initiatives through more informal channels. This collaboration can be illustrated but is not limited to the following examples:

* UNDP worked with the University of Warwick on the innovation platform for visualizing data across projects;
* The CCAF organized a side event at the GEF Assembly meeting in May 2014; and
* The CCAF participated in UNFCCC inter-sessional meetings in Bonn in May 2016[[15]](#footnote-15), as part of the In-session Workshop on Gender-responsive Climate Policy.

The national project teams consider that they were sufficiently involved and that the global project team was very attentive to their needs, even though some reservation were made regarding the engagement of the government counterpart of one country.

All interviewees agreed on the inclusive and collaborative nature of the global CCAF project. As it is reported in the October 2014 annual report, the first year of implementation of the project was focused on building a strong relationship with the national project teams. During that year, as reported in the October 2014 semi-annual report, several actions were undertaken to ensure the engagement of the national project teams, such as for instance:

* An email listserv was launched to facilitate the communication between the global team and the national project teams;
* A Community of Practice Strategy was drafted based on the result of a survey conducted among the 6 CCAF project countries, and further individual consultations with country teams; and
* The project coordinator visited 5 out of the 6 national projects (the sixth was visited in year 2) to undertake consultations with project stakeholders and gather first-hand information about project activities.

All the national project teams from UNDP COs interviewed expressed a feeling of being well included in the developments of the global project. They confirmed that the global project team always made the effort to reach out to them before elaborating a new product or study. For instance it was mentioned that all the methodological aspects of studies/products to be elaborated were shared with the national teams in advance, as well as the draft and final version of communication products. The global project team was perceived by the national project teams interviewed as very attentive to their needs, and the overall implementation of the global project was seen as participatory. However, one government counterpart from a national project did wish that they would have been more directly involved in the global project.

*Without establishing formal partnership arrangements, the global project did facilitate exchanges between the team of the six national projects, brought together several departments of UNDP, and was represented at different global events. However, the communication and partnership between the governments of the 6 countries remained limited. The engagement of the national project teams in the implementation of the global project was deemed highly satisfactory by a majority of the teams.*

**Q6. To what extent were project financial resources used efficiently?**

The project disbursement of funds was relatively well aligned to the total planned budget, as well as to the budget distribution per outcome, and per year of project implementation. As of May 2017, 94% of the initial project total budget had been disbursed.

According to the project document, the total project budget was of USD 1,166,763.40. Upon financial closure of the Cambodian project, remaining funds of USD 47,167.20 were transferred to the global project, increasing the total budget to 1,213,930.60. As of 9 May 2017, a total of USD 1,092,430.45 had been disbursed, which represents 94% of the initial project budget, and 90% of the total amended project budget.

The planned and actual budget distribution is broken down between outcomes in the following manner:

Table 2: Planned and actual budget distribution[[16]](#footnote-16) per outcomes (excluding GMS)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Budget line | Budget distribution according to project document | Actual Distribution (% of initially planned budget) |
| Outcome 1: Global coordination | 28% | 24% |
| Outcome 2: Global knowledge management | 32% | 38% |
| Outcome 3: Gender dimensions of adaptation | 31% | 26% |
| M&E | 1% | 0,2% |
| Project Management | 7% | 5% |

Figure 2: Actual budget disbursement per Outcome (excluding GMS)

Overall, the project funds were extremely well disbursed, in relatively similar proportions to what was originally planned.

Figure 3 below gives an overview of the planned budget versus disbursed funds per year of project implementation. Minus a slower start than expected due to the postponing of the project start by 6 months, the disbursements per year were relatively well aligned to what was originally planned.

Figure 3: Planned budget vs. disbursed funds per year of project implementation (including GMS)

Table 3: Project Expenditure as of 9th May 2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **TOTAL BUDGET** | **2014\* Expenditures** | **2015\* Expenditures** | **2016\* Expenditures** | **Exp. up to**  **May 2017\*** | **Total Accum Exp as of**  **9 May 2017** |
| Outcome 1 | 301.672,00 | 82.967,38 | 108.628,75 | 70.974,00 | 18.326,18 | 280.896,31 |
| Outcome 2 | 339.693,00 | 114.722,82 | 119.725,42 | 144.927,00 | 63.575,59 | 442.950,83 |
| Outcome 3 | 331.590,00 | 60.960,16 | 111.875,12 | 110.103,00 | 18.326,18 | 301.264,46 |
| M&E | 11.062,00 |  |  |  | 2.433,75 | 2.433,75 |
| Project Management | 76.677,00 | 20.548,35 | 22.397,07 | 9.216,00 | 12.723,69 | 64.885,11 |
| GMS (10%) | 106.069,40 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL Initial Budget** | **1.166.763,40** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Funds from closed project | 47.167,20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Amended Budget** | **1.213.930,60** | **279.198,71** | **362.626,36** | **335.220,00** | **115.385,38** | **1.092.430,45** |
| *\* Including GMS* | | | | | | |

The financial reporting of the project was made in April and October of each year and was included in the semi-annual reports. The financial reporting included:

* The budget allocated for the on-going year;
* The budget disbursed to date for the on-going year;
* The total budget disbursed to date;
* A brief description of expenditure to date for the on-going year; and
* Some notes explaining the expenditure for particular years, such as:
  + 2013: no expenditure because the project start was postponed from July 2013 to January 2017[[17]](#footnote-17).
  + 2014: “the focus has been on consultations and strategy development, with some initial products developed based on early national project results […] Nonetheless, now that the project strategies are in place, expenditure will accelerate quite rapidly”[[18]](#footnote-18).
  + 2015: the justification provided for the actual expenditure was that “several of the expenditures will not be recorded until the end of the year – for example for staff costs, consultancy contracts not yet finalized, or travel not yet processed”[[19]](#footnote-19).

Several inconsistencies can however be noted in this financial reporting included in the semi-annual reports, which were mainly due to the fact that the reporting was made in April and in October and not on a calendar year basis. For instance:

* The budget allocated for the on-going reporting year is not the same in the April and October semi-annual reports of the same year;
* The budget disbursed to date for the ongoing reporting year does not clarify if it is the budget disbursed since January of that year or since the last semi-annual report from April or October; and
* The total budget disbursed to date is not aligned to the sum of the announced budget disbursed per year.

Several interviewees mentioned that while some minor changes in budget allocations were made, they were always justified and explained, and allowed some flexibility in the implementation. However, as this occurred through informal channels, the evaluator was not able to fact-check these statements. In this sense some formality would have increased the transparency of the project implementation.

The project did not have cofinancing, which is conform to what was planned in the project document, but it did manage to leverage a grant from the UNDP innovation facility to develop a platform to better visualize and use data from across the six countries.

No cofinancing was planned in the project document and none has been reported.

In terms of resources leveraged, the global project applied jointly with the national project in Cabo Verde for a UNDP innovation grant of USD 60,000[[20]](#footnote-20) to develop an analytic and semi-automated platform for visualizing common data emerging from the different countries[[21]](#footnote-21). In April 2016, it was reported that the platform was still in the early stage of development but was being tested by six researchers that were extracting and inputting data from across the six countries into the system[[22]](#footnote-22). A prototype version of the platform is available online[[23]](#footnote-23) as well as a blog documenting the experience[[24]](#footnote-24). It was planned at that time to apply - together with University of Warwick’s Center for Interdisciplinary Methodologies which is the main partner for this initiative - for a grant in Q3 2016 for further funding and partnerships with the academia. No update on this process was given in the last semi-annual report from April 2017, but interviews suggested that this application had not been successful.

In addition, it can be noted that the global workshop held in Niamey in 2015 was co-organized with a Japan-funded Africa Regional programme on food security and resilience, which brought together project teams from 12 countries to share experiences and lessons learned[[25]](#footnote-25).

Overall, the use of project resources is considered as efficient, project implementation has been as cost-effective as originally planned, and the CCAF approach itself is considered efficient.

The CCAF approach itself seems efficient. The CCAF, by building on existing and functioning LDCF projects through a funding extension, allowed the national projects to quickly expand and upscale their results. These results were then fed into a global project that was able to pull and disseminate knowledge from these 6 projects while having a lean management structure in place.

The project results are further detailed in the following section, but the amount and quality of the outputs produced by the global project given its USD 1,166,763 budget indicate that the project resources were used quite efficiently. The interviews showed that stakeholders were satisfied with what was delivered given the initial budget. It was also pointed out that the lean management structure of the project, with a team limited to a P3-level project coordinator, increased the project efficiency. It could however be noted that several stakeholders would have liked to have another workshop with the six project teams but that the budget was not sufficient to organize a second global workshop.

In light of the section on project results below, the global project has delivered quality outputs, while staying below the planned project budget. It is therefore considered that the project implementation was as cost effective as originally proposed.

As the project was directly implemented by UNDP, it benefitted from UNDP procurement process, UNDP accounting and financial systems, as well as support from the gender team on the gender publication for instance, and support from the communication team regarding the promotion of the project on a variety of media. In addition translation support for various knowledge products was provided by volunteer translators. This added value to the project at no cost.

*The project expenditures were relatively well aligned to what was originally planned, and as of May 2017, 94% of the initial project budget had been disbursed. The project did not mobilize cofinancing, which is conform to the project document, but it managed to leverage some additional funds through a grant from UNDP innovation. Overall, the use of project resources is considered efficient, project implementation has been as cost-effective as originally planned, and the CCAF approach itself is considered efficient. The project’s efficiency is therefore rated as satisfactory.*

**Q7. To what extent was the M&E plan effectively and efficiently implemented?**

The project complied with the reporting requirements, but since it was not required, the project monitoring reports do not provide a comprehensive overview of the project progress against the initial targets partly due to the lack of use and reference to the logical framework.

The logical framework provided in the project document was not used during project implementation as a management tool and has not been revised. No work plan was provided in the project document nor in the semi- annual reporting. The semi-annual report format was very minimalist and only included:

* A general description of the project;
* A list of the project objective and expected outcomes;
* A bullet-point list of the results achieved to date;
* Allocated budget vs. disbursed;
* A narrative description of project achievements and impacts to date; and
* The reporting of the six national projects.

The list of results achieved to date is not organized by expected outcome nor by outputs which makes it difficult to have an overview of how the project was progressing against the initial targets. In addition, it is not clear whether the reporting of the national projects included in the global project’s is only covering the six-month period since the last report or the period since the project started as the same results are mentioned in different reports. In the view of the evaluator, the use of the logical framework would have made the reporting much clearer.

To facilitate the day-to-day implementation of the project, the project coordinator developed detailed annual work plans organized according to the logical framework outcomes, outputs and activities. These work plans were only used for personal use and not for the reporting.

Nevertheless, interviews shed light on the fact that linking the monitoring of the project results to the original logical framework was not a requirement for this project, and interested parties were satisfied with the timeliness and quality of the semi-annual reporting.

|  |
| --- |
| Rating on M&E plan Implementation: **MODERATELY** **SATISFACTORY (MS)[[26]](#footnote-26)** |

*The project complied with the requirements from the Government of Canada who was satisfied with the project monitoring and reporting. However, project monitoring was not conducted by using the logical framework and by reporting project results against the initial targets, which did not provide a clear overview of the project progress according to its expected results. However, internal monitoring tools such as the coordinators’ annual work plan used the logical framework and allowed her to adequately monitor the project progress. That is why the implementation of the M&E plan is rated as moderately satisfactory.*

**Q8. To what extent were UNDP’s project implementation, execution, coordination and operations efficient?**

While all interested parties were highly satisfied with the implementation of the project, the project management structure and its decision making process appeared to be relatively informal. While this informal structure was not problematic for this particular project - whose implementation was successful - it did not guarantee that efficient response mechanisms were in place to face project implementation issues.

As mentioned above, the project was directly implemented by UNDP and presented a lean management structure mainly composed of a project coordinator, with input from a supervisor, support from different UNDP departments, and a couple of consultants contracted through the project. In terms of project supervision, as previously mentioned, the project board that was originally planned in the project document was never put in place, and most of the supervision was provided by the project coordinator’s supervisor. For the first year, the project coordinator worked closely with her supervisor in UNDP headquarters in New York. Then she moved to the UNDP regional centre in Addis Ababa, and the supervision became more focused on managing the relations with CIDA and providing general guidance rather that overseeing the day-to-day implementation of the project. Interviews showed that the decision making process of the project was mainly based on the judgement of the project coordinator, with the approval of the supervisor. Even though all interested parties were satisfied with the functioning of the project management structure, most of the exchanges, coordination and supervision occurred through informal channels, which makes the objective assessment of their quality difficult. In addition, the limited use of M&E tools, the absence of a project board, and the lack of evidence on the project decision making process all contribute to a general lack of formality in the way the project was implemented.

Nonetheless, all national project teams expressed their high satisfaction during the interviews regarding the execution of the global project. For instance, an interviewee explained that while the global project team was small, it performed very well as a hub knowing how to direct the national teams to relevant stakeholders outside the team. Many interviewees highlighted the quality of the global project team inputs and supports, as well as their attentiveness to the national project teams’ needs.

In terms of team composition, the global project coordinator received ad hoc support from the UNDP gender team (on the global publication on gender for instance), and from the UNDP communication team (on the promotion of the global project). In addition, the project coordinator was able to contract consultants such as for instance a communication specialist throughout the project, and a gender specialist to conduct field work in the 6 CCAF countries for the gender publication. While the team was deemed sufficient to implement the global project, several stakeholders mentioned in interviews that they would have preferred having the communication consultant throughout the entire duration of the project rather than through multiple contracts with gaps of several months in between

|  |
| --- |
| Rating on overall quality of UNDP Implementation/ Execution**: SATISFACTORY (S) [[27]](#footnote-27)** |

*Overall, all stakeholders were highly satisfied with UNDP’s implementation and execution of the project. However, as previously mentioned, it can be noted that the project lacked a certain level of formality in its implementation which did not guarantee the existence of an efficient response mechanisms able to mitigate issues with project implementation. The overall quality of UNDP Implementation/Execution is therefore rated as satisfactory.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on EFFICIENCY**  Overall, the use of project resources is considered efficient, with 94% of the initial project budget disbursed as of May 2017. The management of the project was adaptive and ensured that project resources were used efficiently and responded to the needs of the national project teams. Even though the project did not have cofinancing, some resources were leveraged through a UNDP Innovation Grant. However, it can be said that the efficiency of the project relied heavily on the project coordinator - which was successful in this case – because no formal system was in place to track the project management and monitor project progress against initial targets. The lack of formality of the management structure did not allow the evaluator to assess its capacity to properly mitigate project implementation issues in a case where the coordinator would have not succeeded in her mission. Project efficiency is rated as SATISFACTORY. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**  The implementation of the project was overall efficient, participatory and innovative. The project management is considered relatively adaptive and driven by the needs of the national project teams. However, it lacks a certain level of formality - in particular regarding the project’s monitoring, decision making process, and reporting. In terms of stakeholders’ engagement, a majority of the national project teams considered that they were sufficiently involved in the implementation of the global project, and they were particularly satisfied with the execution of the global project. In terms of partnerships, the project facilitated exchanges between the 6 national project teams but their relationships remained relatively limited. At the global level, no formal partnerships were established but the project facilitated exchanges between different branches of UNDP, and with some other global stakeholders. Overall, the use of project resources was efficient. As of May 2017, 94% of the initial project budget was disbursed and used efficiently to respond as much as possible to the needs of the national project teams. |

## Project Results

### Effectiveness

|  |
| --- |
| Rating on project Effectiveness: **SATISFACTORY** |

**Q9. Has the project been effective in achieving its main objective, expected outcomes and outputs?**

The global project has been effective in delivering on its three expected outputs: it established a coordination mechanism for cooperation and communication amongst the six national projects, even though its use remained limited (output 1.1); many quality knowledge products on CCA and gender were elaborated and well received by the national teams (output 2.1); gender-based adaptation approaches and practices were compiled and disseminated through many knowledge products (output 3.1).

The project included 3 different outputs. An assessment of the project’s progress toward each of these three outputs is provided below. This assessment is based on a review of the project’s products, the semi-annual reports, the interviews conducted for the evaluation, as well as a document prepared by the project coordinator for the evaluation that compiles all project results per output and activity.

* **Output 1.1: Global coordination mechanism established for cooperation and communication among Canada - UNDP portfolio of national climate change adaptation projects in Cambodia, Cape Verde, Haiti, Mali, Niger, and Sudan**

At the time of the TE, the following had been achieved under this output:

* A CCAF listserv was created, including a detailed members list with bios. This list was established in 2014 and maintained throughout the lifetime of the project. According to interviews, it was the main communication channel between the global project and the six national projects, but it was not used a lot by the national project teams.
* A Community of Practice Strategy was developed based on a country survey and further individual consultations with country teams. This strategy identified four mains ways of engaging the community of practice: global in-person workshop, email listserv, video/teleconference calls, and webinars.
* In 2015, a Global Exchange Workshop was held in Niamey, Niger from 2-5 March. The workshop was co-organized with a Japan-funded Africa Regional programme on food security and resilience, and brought together project teams from 12 countries to share experiences and lessons learned. The four-day workshop included presentations and discussion on key issues of importance to the projects (such as gender issues), as well as a fieldtrip to project sites from the Niger CCAF project.
* A side event on the CCAF was held at the GEF Assembly from 25-26 May, 2014. This event highlighted the Facility to partners and donors, and focused specifically on the experiences of two country projects: Cambodia and Sudan.
* Brainstorming meeting (2014) on the second phase of the UNFCCC Nairobi Work Progamme (NWP), sharing the model of the CCAF and results from the work to date. Two CCAF projects were showcased in the UNFCCC Adaptation Calendar 2017: “Women leading adaptation action.”
* Examples from the CCAF were used in various speeches and briefing notes for senior management during COP 20, COP 21 and COP 22 (e.g. Helen Clark’s speech on South-South Cooperation), to showcase the achievements of the Canada-funded projects. Specifically, support was provided for review/input and development of over 10 briefings and other climate policy-related documents, with inputs from the CCAF.

The interviews revealed that the listserv was not very active and that few common virtual conferences took place. According to the interviewees, this lack of activity came more from the fact that the national project teams did not have a lot of time to dedicate to these exchanges than from a lack of incentive and involvement from the global project team. An interviewee from a national team wished in retrospect that they had dedicated more time to these exchanges. Another interview with a government counterpart highlighted the limited exchanges between the different CCAF countries.

* **Output 2.1: Global knowledge based on Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation projects actively produced and exchanged**

At the time of the TE, the following had been achieved under this output:

* Project consultations and strategies:
  + Initial consultation with project teams led to an assessment of training interests and needs. The results of this consultation are reflected in the Knowledge products and Community of Practice strategies.
  + Knowledge products strategy developed.
  + Communications Strategy developed.
* Online platform: UNDP Adaptation webpage (http://adaptation-undp.org/projects/ccaf) was developed for countries to be able to access information and products that other teams were creating. This was maintained and updated regularly throughout the project.
* Trainings
  + Support provided for the facilitation of a workshop on the methodology Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development for the national project team in Sudan, to explore innovative ways of measuring impact of project activities.
  + Guidance document on generating content: Capturing and Creating Stories, Photos and Films.
  + Webinar (one in French, one in English) was organized for project teams to provide training on tools for developing communications products.
  + A CCAF branding and communication product template was developed to establish coherence among communications and knowledge products under the Facility.
* 6 case studies developed (in both English and French):
  + Using a Rural Financing mechanism - Sandug - to Scale up Climate Change Adaptation in Sudan.
  + The Use of SMS to Improve Climate Information and Climate Change Adaptation in Niger.
  + Understanding Gender and its links to Climate Change in Mali.
  + The Use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to Guide Interventions related to Climate Change Adaptation in Haiti.
  + Capturing evidence-based Impacts of Adaptation Project Interventions in Cambodia.
  + Strengthening Resilience to Climate Change through Innovative Radio Programmes in Cabo Verde.
* Photo stories (Exposure) developed:
  + Women. Work. Climate
  + Adaptive farms, resilient tables
  + Equal access to water
  + Women. Food. Climate
  + Run the world
  + Solar empowerment
  + No water no life (Cambodia)
  + An island without water (Cabo Verde)
  + Waiting for rain (Sudan)
  + The power of women (Mali)
  + Coasts at risks (Haiti).
* 7 project briefs were developed on the global component and each of the six national projects.
* 1 Impact Brief on the CCAF national projects and global component – Scaling up Multi-country Adaptation.
* Videos:
  + A series of videos were developed for three countries, used for communications purposes during the GEF Assembly side event.
  + A trailer and longer video on the CCAF was produced on the common adaptation efforts and exchange of experience across countries.
  + A series of photo-based videos were developed based on the mission undertaken in the first year of implementation[[28]](#footnote-28).
* Publication on food security and climate change adaptation: full cookbook *Adaptive Farms, Resilient Tables*, a 120-page publication showcasing 18 traditional recipes from the 6 CCAF countries. The cookbook was launched at a venue in Brooklyn, NY with over 115 participants[[29]](#footnote-29).
* Two blogs posts were also written which showcased the CCAF.
  + One focusing on the challenge of sharing experiences on adaptation across contexts[[30]](#footnote-30).
  + One on South-South Collaboration – with the CCAF as one of the key examples.
* Translation:
  + Translation support for various knowledge products provided by volunteer translators.
  + Most products were translated into French, including project briefs and case studies, exposure essays, and all flagship products (Gender Study and Food Security Cookbook). Several of the exposure essays were also translated into Spanish. The communications templates and logos were in English, French and Portuguese.
* An interactive, online ‘how-to-guide’ was designed using experience from Cambodia. This was meant to act as a training-type tool for replication and scaling up good practice. While this was not fully fleshed out to other countries (as was the original plan), the template remains a viable product to be applied to other projects within UNDP’s portfolio.
* The initiative, entitled “Applying Integrated Methods and Visual Analytics to Learn from Experience on Climate Change Adaptation” obtained additional funding from the UNDP Innovation Facility and was implemented in partnership with the UN Cabo Verde Country Office. It aimed to identify new ways of analyzing and learning from project experiences.

Numerous quality knowledge products were created under the global project, which were well received by the national project teams. All interviewees mentioned the innovativeness of many of these products, and of the cookbook publication in particular.

* **Output 3.1: Proven gender-based adaptation approaches and practices are compiled and disseminated**

At the time of the TE, the following had been achieved under this output:

* Gender infographics: Comparative analysis of the gender-responsive approaches to adaptation undertaken across the six countries.
* Detailed CCAF gender study:
  + Detailed analysis done in each country by an international consultant.
  + Full publication: “Filling buckets, fuelling change - ensuring Gender-Responsive Climate Change Adaptation”.
  + A [summary publication](http://adaptation-undp.org/resources/knowledge-products/summary-doc-filling-buckets-fueling-change-ensuring-gender-responsive) of the full study, developed originally for distribution during UNFCCC meetings.
  + Online interactive website with content from the gender study was produced, to act as a training and resource module on how to implement gender-responsive adaptation approaches through projects (the website is ready to launch by the end of May 2017)[[31]](#footnote-31).
  + Training/learning module using the content from the CCAF Gender Study was initiated, but not completed in the time allotted. Will be finalized in 2017.
* Integration of gender consideration in many CCAF knowledge products:
  + Case studies
  + Project briefs
  + Food Security cookbook publication
  + Photo Stories/ Exposure essays
* CCAF experiences on gender shared at several events:
  + Global CCAF workshop in Niamey (2015)
  + GEF General Assembly meeting in New York (2015)
  + UNFCCC Sessions in Bonn (May 2016)
  + COP22 in Marrakech
* One blog post clarifying misconceptions on gender and risks[[32]](#footnote-32)

Gender issues were analyzed in a dedicated in-depth gender study (“Filling buckets, fuelling change”) that was well received by the stakeholders interviewed. Gender issues were also integrated in many of the knowledge products on CCA elaborated by the global project. According to the latest semi-annual report from April 2017, an online training module, which will draw on experiences from the CCAF countries highlighted in the gender study, will be launched before the end of the project. An interactive website on the gender publication is also set to launch by the end of May.

The level of achievements of project’s outcomes is considered satisfactory.

The level of achievement of project outcomes is provided in Table 4 below. The assessment of the level of achievement of the project outcomes is based on the project’s products, the semi-annual reports, a document prepared by the project coordinator that compiles all project result per output and activity, and the interviews conducted for this evaluation.

Regarding the project progress towards achievement of its objective, some cooperation was facilitated between the six national projects through the CCAF global project – in particular through the global workshop held in Niamey and through the compilation of experiences through the knowledge products. However, there is no evidence that the project contributed to the promotion of a true South-South cooperation that would have required a much closer and direct relationship between the governments of the different countries.

Outcome 1 is rated as “Moderately Satisfactory” mainly because the coordination mechanism established by the global project was not actively used at the initiative of the national projects.

Outcome 2 is rated as “Highly Satisfactory”. Even though the global project did not provide as many trainings as originally planned, it was mainly due to a lack of appetite from the six national projects. However, the global project exceeded the expectation in terms of the knowledge products developed, which were of great quality, have been very well received, and were particularly innovative.

Outcome 3 is rated as “Highly Satisfactory” since gender issues have been well integrated in a number of knowledge products on CCA elaborated by the project. Even if the cross fertilization and the uptake of the gender-related knowledge products are difficult to assess, interviewees mentioned that the gender study “filling buckets, fuelling change” was being used to inform the design of new projects.

Table 4: Level of achievement of project’s outcomes and objective

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | End of project status | TE Comment and rating |
| **Project Objective**  To promote south-south cooperation and enhance understanding about initiatives that address adaptation to climate change, especially the gender dimensions | Number of exchanges by government and civil society entities, practitioners and policymakers, across countries involved in the Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects | Minimal interaction among national climate change adaptation projects and stakeholders in different countries of the global south | All Canada - UNDP national climate change adaptation projects are actively cooperating among themselves and with other related initiatives in the global south | The Canada-UNDP projects cooperated through the global project, in particular on different knowledge products and during workshop held by the global project, but they did not directly cooperate amongst themselves in an active manner.  There is no evidence that the Canada-UNDP CCA project cooperated with other initiatives in the global south expect for the global workshop in Niamey that was organized with another Japan-funded project | The project objective has only been partially reached. Some cooperation between the six countries was supported by the global project, in particular through global products that made the link through the different projects.  However, interviews suggested that the projects and governments did not directly communicate without the intervention of the global project team.  A true south south cooperation would have required much more direct collaboration and technical assistance between the six countries. |
| **Outcome 1**  Global coordination of Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects is operational and visible | Number of attempts by government and civil society entities, practitioners and policymakers, associated with the Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects to use and adapt approaches and solutions across projects. | Primary focus is on local and national coordination of climate change adaptation activities | Canada – UNDP Climate Change Adaptation Facility is established and effectively links all projects in Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation portfolio  Government and civil society stakeholders in the national climate change adaptation projects in Cambodia, Cape Verde, Haiti, Mali, Niger, and Sudan have increased their understanding of adaptation practices and approaches in different contexts and shared their own experiences | An email listserv has been established among the Canada-UNDP Portfolio of CCA projects, and the global project made the link between the different projects through numerous knowledge products.  There is no clear evidence that the understanding of the government and civil society stakeholders of adaptation practices and approaches has increased. However, several government partners participated in the global workshop in Niamey. In addition they received the knowledge products elaborated by the global project which, according to some government counterparts, increased the understanding of CCA approaches and practices  Support was provided to the initiative on “Applying Integrated Methods and Visual Analytics to Learn from Experience on Climate Change Adaptation”  The national projects shared their own experiences through contributions to the global project products (case studies, photo stories, cookbook, global workshop, etc.) | It is not clear how the target relates to the indicator.  A global coordination mechanism was established between the six countries but has not been actively used. Interviewees agree that the global project of the CCAF improved the visibility of the UNDP-CCAF portfolio.  **Rating: MS** |
| **Outcome 2**  Global knowledge management of climate change adaptation experiences and lessons emerging from Canada - UNDP portfolio of projects is enhanced and effective | Number of global online and published knowledge products that integrate experiences and lessons learned across projects, countries, and climate adaptation themes | Knowledge management of climate change adaptation projects is generally conducted at the local and national levels | Global online knowledge component established and integrated into UNDP-ALM  At least 3 online training modules on climate change adaptation, proven measures, and good practices completed and operational  At least 4 global knowledge products prepared and widely available on various climate change adaptation themes, including resilient food security, agriculture, pastoralism, and water resources management | UNDP Adaptation webpage developed and updated throughout the project  1 online webinar on how to elaborate communication products was organized (one in French and one in English)  Support for Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) during a workshop in Sudan  Many innovative knowledge products were prepared and made available (1 Cookbook, photo stories, 6 case studies, etc.) | The global project exceeded in the target in terms of numbers of knowledge products developed.  Interviews suggested little appetite from the national projects for traditional trainings. More “untraditional” training material was therefore provided through webinar and tailored ones such as the TAMD Training. An online learning module on the gender publication should be launched before the end of the project.  **Rating: HS** |
| **Outcome 3**  Gender results from Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation project portfolio inform broader adaptation processes | Extent of gender-based cross-fertilization among Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects  Number of other initiatives that take on gender lessons and results from Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects | Minimal sharing of gender-based lessons, experiences, and good practices among Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects and related initiatives | Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects and related initiatives are sharing and applying gender-based knowledge, lessons, and results | Gender-based knowledge, lessons and results from the six countries collected and compiled through the gender study “filling buckets, fuelling change”, and integrated in many knowledge products on CCA elaborated by the project.  Uptake of the gender-related knowledge product difficult to assess. | The gender study “filling buckets, fuelling change” shares and compiles gender-based knowledge, lessons, and results from the Canada-UNDP portfolio of CCA projects.  Even though the uptake of the gender-related product is difficult to measure, several interviewees suggested that the gender study was used to inform the design of other project at the UNDP global level, as well as at least in one of the CCAF country.  **Rating: HS** |

While it is difficult to link the success of the global project to the 6 national projects and vice versa, it seems that the national projects, for the most part, were able to deliver on the gender and communication aspects that could then be fed into the global project. The global project has most probably helped to compensate some of the weaknesses of the national projects, but the direct impacts the project had in the implementation of the national projects is difficult to assess.

As mentioned above, the global project is an umbrella project that gathers six national projects. The table below provides a quick overview on the main results of these 6 projects as mentioned in their terminal evaluation - in particular regarding knowledge products and gender mainstreaming.

Table 5: Main results of the 6 national CCAF projects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project | Main Results |
| Cambodia | The project TE highlights   * Successful gender assessment and mainstreaming conducted by the project, that raised awareness and ensured the equitable participation of women; * Efforts made to capture project results and impacts (project activity database, household surveys, gender assessments, separate component studies) * Communication material: project update, story from the fields, photo essay, photo albums, articles, success stories, case studies, training manuals) were also elaborated and disseminated. * The data are insufficient to fully determine the actual adoption and replication of the project technologies, but the project has made a major effort to capture the lessons learned and to exchange experiences and lessons with other projects and countries. |
| Cabo Verde | According to the TE, overall most of the results were achieved, the activities were implemented effectively and have led to very satisfactory results. Some of the results mentioned in the evaluation include:   * The project allowed the eighteen demonstration zones to benefit from know-how and new technologies, which allowed them to better adapt to climate change. * The project has generated a wide amount of knowledge and information on climate change in Cabo Verde. Awareness-raising has reached not only people involved in the project, but also national institutions.   However, the TE also mentions that “the attempt to include gender aspects in the project activities was successful in the beginning, but unfortunately it was not carried out until the end”. |
| Haiti | Amongst others, the TE concludes that :   * The project has supported the development of 8 pilot projects on CCA, by transferring knowledge to local communities that allowed them to better adapt to climate change. * Gender-specific aspects were taken into account in project activities, and women’s participation in pilot projects, and in the elaboration of a gender strategy was high. * The project generated a high quantity of knowledge and information on CC and CCA in Haiti, which were disseminated |
| Mali | Some of the main achievement mentioned in the project TE were:   * Gender mainstreaming in the formulation of activities (training of women, tools and equipment, agricultural input and income-generating activities tailored to women) * Adaptation interventions customized to the needs of the beneficiary communities.   However, one of the shortcoming of the project lays in the fact that no communication specialist was hired to implement the third component of the project focusing on the dissemination of lessons learnt and best-practices to replicate and upscale them in other vulnerable communities in Mali. At the time of the TE, most of the activities of Component 3 had not yet started while it was a crucial component. |
| Niger | Some of the project results mentioned in the TE include: several knowledge products such as a guide on best practices, training guide on CC, document on gender, document on sharing experiences on gender and CCA, movies, etc. |
| Sudan | No TE had been conducted yet. However, the last global project semi-annual reports mentions the following: “the greatest achievement of the project is that the project beneficiaries have adopted a broad range of adaptation measures”. Based on the reported results, it seems that a number of project activities are specifically focused on women.  In addition, a survey was conducted by the project team for project beneficiaries, and in total 83% of respondent (48% women and 36% men) either agree or strongly agree with the following statement: “women have benefited as much as men from the project interventions”. |

It can be said that most of these projects were relatively successful in taking into account gender in their activities, and that most of them created a number of knowledge products. Even though it is difficult to link the success of the global project to the success of the national projects, it seems that the global project was relying on projects that performed relatively well and that were able to feed relevant experiences into the global project.

The TE of the Mali project sheds light on some issues with the communication component of the project, and on the fact that the project was not able to produce the expected communication material. However, interviews showed that the global project was helpful on this aspect since it managed to improve the communication on the Mali project through the knowledge products elaborated and disseminated at the global level.

On another note, it is interesting to note that the TE of the Cabo Verde project considered that the gender aspects were not carried out in project activities until the end, which was not reported as such in interviews. Interviewees rather mentioned that focusing on gender was very important in Cabo Verde, and while the national team did not know exactly how to mainstream these aspects at first, the global project provided some insight on the matter. However, the fact that these aspects were not mainstreamed until the end of the project shows that the impacts of the global project in the day-to-day implementation of the national project are difficult to assess.

*Overall the project is considered effective. The global project delivered on its three outputs: it established a coordination mechanism for cooperation and communication amongst the six national projects, even though its use remained limited (output 1.1); many quality knowledge products on CCA and gender were elaborated and well received by the national teams (output 2.1); gender-based adaptation approaches and practices were compiled and disseminated through many knowledge products (output 3.1). The overall achievement of project outcomes is considered satisfactory, the only mixed result being on the limited use of the coordination mechanism by the national team established under outcome 1. While most of the 6 CCAF national projects performed relatively well on the gender and communication sides, it is difficult to directly link the success of the global project to the national projects’ – and vice versa. In some instances however, it seems that the global project helped fill some gaps in the national projects (on communication for instance). The project’s effectiveness is rated as satisfactory.*

**Q10. How were risk and risk mitigation being managed?**

No formal system was in place to manage the risks at the global project level, however they were appropriately mitigated during project implementation.

As noted in the section “Project design / formulation” above, a risk log was provided in Annex of the project document. However, interviews conducted for this evaluation showed that this risk log has not been used nor referred to during the implementation of the project. No system was in place to assess, monitor and manage the risks at the global project level.

Nonetheless, Table 6 gives a brief assessment of how the four risks identified in the project document were managed during the implementation of the project.

Table 6: Assessment of Risk management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Identified Risks | Risk management |
| Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation projects unable to participate fully in global coordination due to communication gaps and lack of time and interest | In light of the interviews conducted, it can be considered that the project coordinator managed this risk well by visiting 5 of the 6 countries during the first year (the sixth project being visited not long after), by systematically consulting the national teams and sharing all products elaborated by the global project. The project coordinator also adapted the global project to the needs and interests of the national teams by elaborating the Community of Practice Strategy and the Knowledge Products Strategy based on country consultation, as well as by adapting the type of trainings to be delivered in spite of the lack of appetite of the national teams. |
| Canada - UNDP climate change adaptation projects do not participate fully in global knowledge management due to inability to produce and document sufficient information, lessons, and experiences | This risk did not occur and did not require a management response. |
| Insufficient financial resources to achieve outcomes and outputs | As mentioned above, the budget was not sufficient to organize a global workshop on gender, but the global project team adapted accordingly and provided for instance an online platform showcasing the findings of the “filling buckets, fuelling change” publication. In addition, the global workshop in Niamey did include a strong session on gender, which allowed to cover some of the gender related issues even though no specific workshop on the matter was held. |
| Insufficient personnel to achieve outcomes and outputs | This risk did not occur as the project coordinator was able to hire consultants and received support from various UNDP departments. |

*Even though the project did not have a formal risk mitigation strategy, it seems that the risks were appropriately managed during project implementation.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on EFFECTIVENESS**  The project’s effectiveness lays in the fact that it was able to deliver on all expected outcomes and outputs within the allocated budget. While results were mixed regarding the first outcome because of the limited use of the coordination mechanism by the national project teams, the global project exceeded the expectations regarding the knowledge products delivered. A high number of high quality and very innovative knowledge products on both CCA and gender were elaborated and were particularly well received. While most of the 6 CCAF national project performed relatively well on the gender and communication sides, it is difficult to assess the direct effects of the global project in the implementation of the national projects. However in some instances, it seems that the global project helped fill some gaps in the national projects.  Project effectiveness is rated as SATISFACTORY. |

### Impact

**Q11. Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress towards its intended impact?**

Even though there is no clear evidence of the project impacts at this stage, there are some indications that the communication work around the global project had some impacts at the global and national levels.

It is difficult to qualify project results as long-term impacts at this stage as impacts are usually more visible 2-5 years after project closure. However, several elements mentioned in interviews give an indication of the potential impact of the project.

At the national level, several interviewees mentioned that the global project helped promote the results of the national Canada-UNDP projects at a global scale, and increased their visibility. While there is no clear evidence that the global project had an impact on the implementation of the national projects, it was reported in interviews that the Sudan national project improved its logical framework following the training on Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) supported by the global project. A government counterpart of another project mentioned that the material elaborated by the global project has had a positive contribution to the knowledge base and has informed the design of upcoming adaptation projects.

At the global level, there are some indications that the global project helped generate knowledge that could be replicated to other initiatives. For instance, while it is too soon to assess the uptake of the “filling buckets, fuelling change” gender publication, some interviewees mentioned that they had been referencing the publication in other reports. In addition, the case studies and findings of the gender publication have been shared in global events with UNFCCC and other partners. According to interviewees, the publication is also being taken into account to frame UNDP knowledge tools on gender.

Another impact of the global project at the global level is the wide dissemination of knowledge products on CCA and gender to the broad development community. One of the unintended results of the global project that was pointed out in interviews is the broad reach of the knowledge products, which went much further than the community of practice of the six national projects. For instance, the combined view count of all the photo stories created by the global project was at 251,234 as of March 28, 2017. In addition, the Cookbook was promoted in several media outlets such as, among others: blog posts on the HuffingtonPost[[33]](#footnote-33) and on the Culture Collective[[34]](#footnote-34); and news articles published on the Boston Globe[[35]](#footnote-35), Zilient[[36]](#footnote-36), GrowNYC[[37]](#footnote-37),CTV News[[38]](#footnote-38); and Relief Web[[39]](#footnote-39).

The project in Sudan was also mentioned in an article on the Guardian[[40]](#footnote-40), and on the Thomson Reuters Foundation News[[41]](#footnote-41).

*Even though it is too soon to assess the real impacts of the project, the positive reception of the knowledge products elaborated by the global project - at the national and at the global levels - give an indication on the fact that these products are likely to be used in the future, and therefore further spread the findings on gender and CCA that emanated from the 6 CCAF projects.*

**Q12. To what extent did the project successfully mainstream other UNDP Priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women’s empowerment?**

The global CCAF project focuses on CCA, which is at the crossroads of other UNDP priorities that are therefore well considered and mainstreamed by the project.

Mainstreaming of other UNDP priorities, such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women's empowerment, is an important aspect of UNDP-supported projects. Table 7 below shows how these different dimensions were taken into account by the project.

Table 7: Mainstreaming of other UNDP priorities by the project intervention

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UNDP priorities | Project mainstreaming effect |
| Poverty alleviation | Poverty alleviation, in particular regarding women, was mainstreamed through several knowledge and communication products elaborated by the global project. For instance, the “filling buckets, fuelling change” publication includes a section on “unpaid care work time poverty and strategies for reducing women’s workload”, and another one on control over resources, incomes and finances as a key element of women’s economic empowerment”. In addition, several photo stories touch upon poverty alleviation issues through food security, CCA and energy sources (“Solar empowerment”, “Run the World”, “Women- Food – Climate”, “Adaptive farms, resilient tables”). The cookbook publication also deals with resilience and food security, which is directly linked to poverty alleviation. |
| Improved governance | The global project did not directly mainstream the issue of improved governance. However, some knowledge products touched upon this issue at a more local level, through a gender equality focus. For instance, the photo story “run the world” promotes women’s autonomy and ability to participate in making decisions to manage both natural and productive resources. “Equal access to water” is another photo story that promotes women’s participation and leadership on water management. In addition, the “filling bucket, fuelling change” publication on gender includes an entire section on “Access to water and governance structure for water distribution”. |
| Prevention and recovery from natural disasters | The CCAF global projects deals with CCA and food security, which is directly linked to the prevention and recovery from natural disasters. For instance, the “filling buckets, fuelling change” publication promotes a gender-responsive CCA, which aims to ensure that women are better prepared to cope with climate-change induces disasters. The Cookbook publication focuses on food security through the promotion of climate resilient recipes. The following photo stories also deal with CCA and resilience: “Solar Empowerment”, “Women – Food –Climate”, “Equal Access to Water”, and Adaptive Farm, Resilient Table”. In addition, a blog post was specifically written by the project coordinator on gender and its links to disaster risks[[42]](#footnote-42). |
| Women's empowerment | The CCAF project has an entire component focusing on gender issues, which are promoted and analysed through the majority of the knowledge products elaborated by the global project. For instance, the “filling buckets, fuelling change” publication, as well as the infographics on gender, focus exclusively on gender - responsive adaptation, and at least 4 photo stories focus on women (“women – food –climate”, “equal access to water”, “women work climate”, and “run the world”). The non –gender focused products – such as photo-stories, case studies and publications - also mainstreamed the concept of gender.  In addition, an interview highlighted the fact that the CCAF project was the first UNDP global project with a gender marker of 3. The gender marker is a UNDP corporate system to rate projects on how gender approaches are integrated into project outputs and activities. The gender marker scale goes from 0 to 3, the global project therefore has the highest score. |

*Given its focus on CCA – a particularly cross-cutting theme - the global project was able to fully mainstream in its outputs other UNDP priorities such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women’s empowerment.*

**Q13. To what extent did the project play a catalytic role?**

Even though it is too soon to fully assess the catalytic role of the project, the catalytic potential of the global project appears relatively high.

As per UNDP/GEF evaluation guidelines, the catalytic role of the project is assessed in Table 8 below, according to the extent to which the project has demonstrated: a) production of a public good, b) demonstration, c) replication, and d) scaling up.

Table 8: Assessment of the project catalytic role

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Catalytic result | Description[[43]](#footnote-43) | Assessment of Project catalytic role |
| Production of public good | The lowest level of catalytic result, including for instance development of new technologies and approaches.  If no significant actions were taken to build on this achievement, the catalytic effect is left to ‘market forces’ | A wide range of knowledge products and feedback of experience from the six projects on CCA and gender do constitute a public good that can be used at both the national and global levels. |
| Demonstration | Steps have been taken to catalyse the public good, for instance through the development of demonstration sites, successful information dissemination and training | The global project took steps to catalyse the public good, in particular through the organization of a global workshop in Niger and through the dissemination of the knowledge products elaborated to international events as well as on online platforms. The nature of the global project is a demonstration in itself of the advantages of this type of approach, which may inspire donors and development organizations for future projects. |
| Replication | Activities, demonstrations, and/or techniques are repeated within or outside the Project, nationally or internationally | Some of the experience and knowledge shared across the six countries did inform the implementation of the national projects, and some countries mentioned that it constituted a knowledge base that was being used to elaborate future CCA projects. |
| Scaling up | Approaches developed through the Project are taken up on a regional / national scale, becoming widely accepted, and perhaps legally required | Even though it is too soon to fully assess the uptake of the “filling buckets, fuelling change” publication on gender, interviews showed that this study is being referred to and that its findings are to be integrated in UNDP knowledge tools. The study has also been taken up by the Communications Initiative that considers that it “may be of interest to adaptation practitioners and decision-makers at all levels”.  In addition, the project will launch an online learning module which will draw on experiences from the CCAF countries highlighted in the publication, and the interactive website on the publication that is about to be launched will be scalable to include examples and experiences form other countries.  As per its media coverage, the cookbook publication has also leveraged significant interest from the development community. |

*Even though it is too soon to fully assess the catalytic role of the project, it seems that the catalytic potential of the project is quite high. This catalytic aspect of the project mainly lays in the fact that it is an umbrella project that is taking stock of six existing national projects, and which is successfully building on their experiences and sharing them with a broad audience at the global level. While there is no evidence yet on the uptake of the gender publication, the interviews conducted for the evaluation have suggested that its findings are being picked up within UNDP to update knowledge tools.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on IMPACTS**  It is difficult to qualify project results as long-term impacts at the TE stage, but there are indications that the project might have some impacts and might play a catalytic role at the global and national levels, in particular through the potential uptake and use of the knowledge products elaborated by the project to design new projects, and/or update existing knowledge tools. |

### Sustainability

|  |
| --- |
| Rating on the sustainability of project outcomes: **LIKELY** |

**Q14. To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?**

Overall, the sustainability of project outcomes is rated as “likely”, the main risk being the non-continuation of the community of practice initiated under the global project.

The project document does not devise a sustainability strategy nor an exit strategy; the project therefore does not have a robust sustainability plan that could have been implemented.

Some elements that arose during project implementation could become barriers to the sustainability of the project results. These are described below.

The global project created a community of practice amongst six national projects, in particular by seeking their input into overarching knowledge products, and by inviting them to share experiences through a global workshop or listserv. However, this community of practice was stimulated by the global project and interviews showed that there were few direct communication and cooperation between the projects and the countries themselves. The exchange of experience had to be initiated by the global project. In this sense, it seems unlikely that this community of practice between the project teams and governments of the six countries will continue after the end of the global project.

The knowledge products created by the global project will remain available even after the end of the project, and could be used in the formulation of future initiatives on CCA. It is the case for instance for the online learning module on the experiences on gender of the CCAF projects that is about to be launched, as well as the interactive website on the “filling buckets, fuelling change” publication. The interviews suggested that the potential uptake of the findings of the gender publication in UNDP knowledge tools and broader portfolio could ensure the sustainability of the projects’ knowledge products.

As per GEF/UNDP Guidance[[44]](#footnote-44), Table 9 below analyzes the project’s sustainability according to four categories of risks to sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental, and overall.

Table 9. Project sustainability rating

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Risk | Comment | Rating[[45]](#footnote-45) |
| Financial | Risk to the sustainability of the knowledge products is relatively low as all the products will remain available on the UNDP website and platforms after project closure, and could be used freely for the elaboration of future CCA initiatives. | L |
| Socio Political | Risk to sustainability is low as the products generated by the global project were well received by both the country teams and UNDP. | L |
| Institutional framework and governance | There is a high risk that the community of practice initiated between the teams of the six national project will not be sustained as most of the exchanges were initiated by the global project team and as no close and direct relationships between projects were built. | ML |
| Environmental risks | Project outcomes mostly aim to increase resilience to environmental risks, so there is no new threat on this aspect | L |
| Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) | | L |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on SUSTAINABILITY**  While the financial, socio political and environmental risks are considered limited, the main risk to sustaining the project’s outcomes lays in the fact that the community of practice initiated under the project might not continue after project end. However, it should be noted that this global project is unique and very different from traditional UNDP-GEF projects. As an umbrella project aiming to share knowledge and experiences between projects, the sustainability of this global project should mainly be considered through the elaboration of high quality knowledge products that will remain after project end.  The sustainability of project’s outcomes is rated as LIKELY. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion on PROJECT RESULTS**  The project has been effective in achieving its expected results (outcome and outputs), that proved to be particularly innovative. There is even some indication that the project might play a catalytic role and have some impacts at the national and at the global levels through its knowledge products that are being use to inform new initiatives and tools. The permanence of the knowledge products after the project end will ensure a certain degree of project sustainability. |

# Conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

### Conclusions

The CCAF global project was a first of its kind (as an umbrella project to 6 national projects run in parallel) and the TE concludes that the project was overall successful. The global project had an overall flexible structure that allowed it to adapt to the needs to the six national project teams and to share their experiences at a broader scale at the international level. The global project produced many quality knowledge products on CCA and gender that proved to be particularly innovative and were well received by the national project teams as well as by the broader global development community. Some of these products may be picked up at the international level to inform future initiatives dealing with gender and CCA.

For each of the 5 OECD DAC criteria, the TE concludes the following:

The project is considered **relevant** to the priorities of Canada, of UNDP and of the 6 project countries, even though one reservation was expressed regarding CCAF’s geographic scope. The project was also found to be externally and internally coherent and relevant even though its design process presented some weaknesses, in particular regarding its logical framework, the lack of incorporation of lessons learned from other projects, and the lack of participation of national project teams in the design of the global project. The lean management structure of the project was also considered relevant, in particular to ensure the flexibility and ability of the global project to adapt to the needs of the national project teams. Nonetheless, a higher level of formality in the project management structure could have increased its transparency without hindering its flexibility. The project is rated as Relevant.

Regarding the project **efficiency**, it is considered that the use of project resources is efficient, with 94% of the initial project budget committed as of May 2017. The management of the project was adaptive and ensured that project resources were used efficiently and responded to the needs of the national project teams. Even though the project did not have co-financing, some resources were leveraged through a UNDP Innovation Grant. However, it can be said that the efficiency of the project relied heavily on the project coordinator - which was successful in this case – because no formal system was in place to track the project management and monitor project progress against initial targets. The lack of formality of the management structure did not allow the evaluator to assess its capacity to properly mitigate project implementation issues in a case where the coordinator would have not succeeded in her mission. Project efficiency is rated as Satisfactory.

In terms of **effectiveness**, the project was able to deliver on all expected outcomes and outputs within the allocated budget. While results were mixed regarding the first outcome because of the limited use of the coordination mechanism by the national project teams, the global project exceeded the expectations regarding the knowledge products delivered. A high number of good quality and very innovative knowledge products on both CCA and gender were elaborated and were particularly well received. While most of the 6 CCAF national project performed relatively well on the gender and communication sides, it is difficult assess the direct effects of the global project in the implementation of the national projects. However in some instances, it seems that the global project helped fill some gaps in the national projects. Project effectiveness is rated as Satisfactory.

Regarding the project’s **impacts**, while it is difficult to qualify project results as long-term impacts at the TE stage, there are indications that the project might have some impacts and might play a catalytic role at the global and national levels, in particular through the potential uptake and use of the knowledge products elaborated by the project to design new projects, and/or update existing knowledge tools.

Finally in terms of **sustainability**, while financial, socio political and environmental risks are considered limited, the main risk to sustaining the project’s outcomes lays in the fact that the community of practice initiated under the project might not continue after project end. However, it should be noted that this global project is unique and very different from traditional UNDP-GEF projects. As an umbrella project aiming to share knowledge and experiences between projects, the sustainability of this global project should mainly be considered through the elaboration of high quality knowledge products that will remain after project end. The sustainability of project’s outcomes is rated as Likely.

Table 10 below presents the ratings attributed to each project performance criteria.

Table 10: Project Rating Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Performance criteria | Rating[[46]](#footnote-46) | Evaluators’ Summary Comments |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation** | | |
| Overall M&E rating | MS |  |
| M&E Design at entry | MU | The project results framework presents significant shortcomings, including an insufficient number of indicators, indicators that are hardly measurable, and inconsistencies between the indicators and the targets. |
| M&E Plan Implementation | MS | The project complied with the requirements from the Government of Canada who was satisfied with the project monitoring and reporting. However, project monitoring was not conducted by using the logical framework and by reporting project results against the initial targets, which did not provide a clear overview of the project progress according to its expected results. However, internal monitoring tools such as the coordinators’ annual work plan used the logical framework and allowed her to adequately monitor the project progress. |
| **Project implementation and execution** | | |
| Overall quality of project implementation/ execution | S | All interested parties were satisfied with the quality of project execution/implementation. However, the project management structure and its decision-making process appeared to be insufficiently formal. |
| **Project Outcomes** |  |  |
| Overall Quality of Project Outcomes | S |  |
| Relevance | HS | The project is deemed relevant to CIDA’s strategic priorities, UNDP strategic plan, as well as to the national objectives of the 6 countries of the Canada-UNDP CCA portfolio. The project was also found externally and internally coherent and relevant even though its design process presented some weaknesses. Even though a more formal structure would have increased the transparency of the project, a flexible structure was coherent for this type of umbrella project. |
| Effectiveness | S | The achievement of Outcome 1 is rated at MS, Outcome 2 is rated as HS, Outcome 3 is rated as HS. |
| Efficiency | S | Overall, the use of project resources is considered efficient. The management of the project was adaptive and ensured that project resources were used efficiently and responded to the needs of the national project teams. However the lack of formality of the management structure did not allow the evaluator to assess its capacity to properly mitigate project implementation issues in a case where the coordinator would have not succeeded in her mission. |
| **Sustainability of Project Outcomes[[47]](#footnote-47)** | | |
| Overall sustainability | L |  |
| Financial resources | L | Risk to the sustainability of the knowledge products is relatively low as these products will remain available on the UNDP website after project closure, and could be used freely for the elaboration of future CCA initiatives. |
| Socio-political | L | Risk to sustainability is low as the products generated by the global project well received by both the country teams and UNDP |
| Institutional framework and governance | ML | There is a relatively high risk that the community of practice initiated between the teams of the six national projects will not be sustained as most of the exchanges were initiated by the global project team and as no close and direct relationships between projects were built. |
| Environmental | L | Project outcomes mostly aim to increase resilience to environmental risks, so there is no new threat on this aspect |

### Lessons Learned

The analysis conducted throughout this TE has brought to light the following lessons learned:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LL1** | **Informal project structure, flexibility and innovation**  **On the one hand, an informal project structure and management can hinder the accountability and the transparency of the project**. For instance, a brief project document without enough details on key aspects might not ensure the relevance of the project regarding its identified beneficiaries, their needs, the partnerships to be developed, as well as regarding the lessons learned from other projects. In addition, the project potential sustainability should be presented at project entry through a sustainability strategy, and an exit strategy.  An informal project implementation makes it difficult to prove the appropriateness of the management and decision making of the project. A more formal structure allows to better capture the advancement of the project towards its targets, and can ensure more appropriate and systematic adaptive management, based for instance on concrete recommendations provided at each reporting. In addition, the lack of a formal system to monitor the project management and results makes the whole effectiveness and efficiency of the project rely on the ability of the project team to perform well, which is never guaranteed and can therefore jeopardize the project’s effectiveness and efficiency.  In other words, a more formal structure allows for better accountability and transparency, and ensure that appropriate measure can be taken in a systematic manner if the project management or results are not on track.  **On the other hand, this particular global project shows that an informal structure can be successful as it allows for more flexibility, which can in turn contribute to make the project innovative and demand-driven** – two aspects that are particularly relevant in the case of a global umbrella project.  For instance, if the project document of an umbrella project is too precise in its outputs, it might hinder the capacity of the global project team to adapt the outputs to the needs of the national project teams. In this sense, conducting a thorough consultation and needs assessment with the national project teams from the onset can ensure that the outputs of the global project are tailored and relevant to the needs of the national teams.  In addition, leaving the expected results of the project relatively open in the type of knowledge products to be developed allowed the global project to be particularly innovative, for instance by publishing a cookbook addressing climate resilience that reached a broad audience. This type of innovation is particularly relevant in the case of an umbrella project aiming to share experiences from a portfolio of several national projects, and to ensure that the knowledge products stand out and get there across amongst the numerous communication tools developed for the development community.  **Overall a balance between formality and flexibility must be found to ensure both accountability and transparency, while not hindering the flexibility and the potential innovative aspects of the project**. Such balance can be struck by establishing a number of safeguards (see recommendation 2 section below). |
| **LL2** | **The umbrella project model**  The CCAF approach was well received by a large majority of stakeholders and promoted a certain degree of efficiency. Building on existing and functioning LDCF projects and providing them with a funding extension allowed the national projects (selected for their initial level of success) to quickly expand and upscale their results. Feeding these results into a global umbrella project that pulls and disseminate knowledge from these 6 projects considerably increased the visibility of the national projects. This experience of establishing a structure consisting of a portfolio of projects with a lean global umbrella project focusing on coordination and communication proves to be an efficient way to ensure that the experience of the national projects are disseminated. The model established by the CCAF breaks down the silos created by individual projects and allows to provide a valuable contribution not only within and between the participating projects, but also at the global level. |
| **LL3** | **Link with national projects**  An umbrella project, such as the CCAF project, relies heavily on the inputs of several national projects. If no accountability line exists between the global umbrella project and the national projects, it can be difficult for the global project to get sufficient input and involvement from the national projects. To overcome this challenge, making significant efforts on consultations and such project visits have proved successful in the CCAF to build relationships between the global and the national projects.  In addition, when the logical framework of the global and the national projects are aligned through some common indicators, it allows for a comparative analysis between the national projects, and it facilitates the assessment of the global project’s impacts on the national projects.  Even though it is difficult to link the success of an umbrella project to the achievements of the national projects and vice versa, the global project seems to have contributed to filling some gaps in national projects in terms communication or gender. However, it is difficult to grasp the potential effects of the global project and its knowledge products in the day-to-day implementation of the national projects. |
| **LL4** | **South-South Cooperation**  South-south cooperation is a concept that goes further than exchanging experiences between country-level implementation project teams. It requires a true cooperation between countries, including for instance technology transfer between countries – going beyond the exchange of information between projects - with appropriate training given by experts from a country to another. In order to promote a real south-south cooperation, a project therefore needs to go further than creating a community of practice, and has to secure a deep involvement of the different countries and budget for example technical cooperation missions between countries/governments. |

### Recommendations

Looking forward, six main recommendations are proposed below, with the aim of ensuring project sustainability and replication, and improving the quality of future projects.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **R1** | When designing an umbrella project such as the CCAF global project, the project document should prove its relevance to clearly identified beneficiaries.  It should be kept in mind that having an accountability line between the national projects and the global project could ensure the input and engagement of the national projects in the implementation of the global project. In the case of non-programmatic set-ups such as CCAF, since a formal hierarchical accountability line between the national project teams and the global team would be difficult to establish, the accountability could instead be ensured by the signature of Memorandums of Understanding between each national projects and the global project, which would clearly define what is expected from each Party. If such accountability line was not possible, significant effort should be provided to ensure the engagement of the national projects from the onset, through for instance project visits during the first year of implementation to identify their needs as well as through regular follow up discussions with project teams.  In addition, the design of the M&E framework of the global project should be substantial to ensure an appropriate tracking of project progress, and of the impact of the global project on the national projects implementation. Ideally, this framework should include some kind of alignment with common indicators between the national projects and the global project, which would allow to quickly capture the effects of the global project in the national projects implementation, and reversely. For instance, some of the indicators of the global project could be adapted and incorporated in the logical frameworks and M&E systems of the national projects. The national projects would then report regularly to the global project on these indicators, which would allow to aggregate the progress of all national projects at the global level, and therefore to track the results of the global project at the national level. |
| **R2** | In an umbrella project, a balance should be struck between a certain level of formality in the project management structure - to ensure accountability, transparency, and systematic countermeasures if the project is not on track – and a certain level of flexibility to ensure needs-driven and innovative project outcomes.  Several safeguards should be put in place at the project design stage to ensure that such balance will be preserved throughout implementation:   * Designing a robust project document (including sufficient information on the project relevance, beneficiaries, previous lessons learned, and sustainability) while leaving some flexibility in the formulation of the planned outputs of the project to be able to tailor them to the evolving needs of the national projects throughout implementation; * Establishing a lean management structure with a project coordinator able to think outside the box and with limited reporting lines, while also setting up in parallel, appropriate response and countermeasure mechanisms able to mitigate risks and issues that could occur during the project implementation. For instance, the project could establish a board that would meet on a biannual or annual basis to discuss project implementation and main issues. In addition, reporting should be done against the initial logical framework of the project to allow for an appropriate monitoring of project achievements and progress against its objectives and targets. Proof of adaptive management, such as a comment tracking matrix at each reporting period for instance, should also be updated throughout the implementation of the project to ensure the transparency of the project decision making process; and * Conducting thorough needs assessments and consultations with the national project teams at project entry to ensure their needs drive the elaboration of the global project’s outputs. During the first year of implementation, the project coordinator should visit all national projects to better grasp their respective context and needs, and follow up consultation and could be conducted regularly (at least every year, or on a more ad hoc basis before developing specific products at the global level, as appropriate) . |
| **R3** | Global umbrella projects focusing on knowledge sharing and coordination benefit from comprising a diverse portfolio of projects implemented in different regions of the world to promote interregional cooperation. However, to make sure that all countries can benefit equally from the experience sharing, it is best to ensure that all projects can at least relate to one or more projects in the portfolio in terms of region, or similar environments, contexts and challenges. |
| **R4** | The timeline of an umbrella project should be sufficiently staggered with the national projects’ to ensure that national experiences can be fed into the global project, while also making sure that the knowledge products elaborated by the global project can inform the implementation of the national projects. This can also be facilitated by ensuring that all the projects in the portfolio are at similar stages of advancement. For instance, in the case of 5-year long national projects, the timing could be as follow:   * Year 1: simultaneous start of all national projects of the portfolio; * Year 2: Start of the global project, focusing first on conducting consultations and needs assessments as the national projects’ results would remain limited at this stage; * Year 3 and 4: The national projects feed their achievements into the global project that in turn compile their experiences at the global level and produce knowledge products that inform and help improve if needed the implementation of the national project; * Year 5: Closure of activities and evaluation of the national projects that are fed into the global project that can help disseminate the results at the global level and therefore support the sustainability of the national project activities; and * Year 6: The global project reflects on the completion of the whole portfolio and produces higher level lessons learned documents. |
| **R5** | In the framework of an umbrella project such as the CCAF global project, it is important to carefully assess the budgetary needs upstream according to the project’s objectives, in particular when they require global physical meetings across the portfolio of projects, exchange visits, or even technical cooperation between countries, which are all particularly costly. When the project budget doesn’t allow for numerous meetings, exchange visits or technical cooperation, the global project’s objective should be adapted accordingly in order to be realistic. |
| **R6** | The CCAF model should be replicated to other portfolios of projects when funding is available. While costing limited additional funding, it disseminates projects’ results and experiences across projects as well as at the global level, and contributes to some level of cross-fertilisation between projects and their national counterparts. Overall, it generates a good return for both the donor and implementing agency, and it allows projects to share experiences and communicate at a broader scale, and remain linked to a community of practice. This is usually difficult when focusing on day-to-day project implementation at the national level. |

# Annexes

## Annex 1: ToR of the Evaluation



## Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria/Questions | Sub - Questions | Indicators | Method of collection | Data Source |
| **A. PROJECT FORMULATION** |  |  |  |  |
| **Relevance** |  |  |  |  |
| **Q1. Is the project relevant to CIDA’s strategic priorities and** **UNDP’s strategic plan and objectives, as well as to the national objectives of the 6 project countries?** | * How does the project contribute to the GAC’s strategic priorities? | * Existence of a clear link between the project objective and the GAC’s strategic priorities | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project Document * GAC strategic documentation * GAC |
| * How does the project contribute to the objectives of the UNDP Strategic Plan? | * Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and UNDP strategic plan | * Desk review | * Project Document * UNDP strategic plan |
| * To what extent does the project contribute to the objectives of the 6 national project countries | * Degree to which the global projects supports the national climate change adaptation objectives of the 6 national projects countries * Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to project adequacy to national priorities | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project Document * Projects Documents of national projects * Government partners |
| * To what extent does the project support the needs of national project teams? | * Degree of coherence between the needs expressed by the national project teams and the objectives of the global project | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * GEF national projects evaluation * National project teams |
| **Q2. To what extent was the project design internally coherent, and relevant within a broader external context?** | * Were the project's objectives, outcomes and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame? | * Coherence/difference between stated objectives and progress to date * Implementing entities’ staff understanding of objectives, components, timeframe | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Project coordinator * National project teams * Project Board |
| * Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)? | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic | * Desk review | * Project Document |
| * Was the M&E plan well-conceived and sufficient to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives? | * Existence of an M&E plan * Existence and quality of baseline assessment, performance measurement framework/ logframe, SMART monitoring indicators, methodology, roles and responsibilities, budget and timeframe/ work plan in planning documents | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project Document * Monitoring and reporting documents * Project Coordinator |
| * Were the project assumptions and risks well-articulated in the project document and did they help determine activities and planned outputs? | * Assumptions and risks stated in planning documents, with corresponding response methods/measures * Quality of risk management system(s) in place at appropriate levels of reporting, accountability * Use of assumptions or noted risks to tailor or adjust planned activities and outputs | * Desk review * Interview | * Project document * Project documents of national projects * Project coordinator |
| * Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries? | * Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders * Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * National project teams * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender focal specialist and focal points, and communication specialist |
| * Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? | * Evidence of planning documents utilizing lessons learned/ recommendations from previous projects as input to planning/strategy process | * Desk review | * Project document * GEF national projects evaluations |
| * Were other interventions within the sector clearly identified? | * Other interventions within the sector duly described and their possible linkages with the project analysed | * Desk review | * Project Document |
| * How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? | * Evidence of niche/gap/overlap between Canada funding support activities and objectives compared to other donors’ * Extent to which Canada funding comparative advantage is justified * Evidence of coordination and complementarity between this global project and the broader UNDP portfolio on climate change, with a particularly focus on the GEF-funded project portfolio | * Desk review * Interview | * Project Document * Project coordinator * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender specialist and focal points, and communication specialist * National project teams * Project Board |
| **Q3. To what extent was the design of management arrangements relevant to the project objectives?** | * Were the capacities of the executing institution and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? | * Evidence of scoping activity or assessment of executing agency’s capabilities with respect to executing this project * Number, extent and types of gaps between planned and available capacities by executing agency | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender focal specialist and focal points, and communication specialist * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| * Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? | * Coherence/extent of gap in timing between counterpart resource and institutional readiness and project commencement | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * GEF national projects evaluations * Government partners * National project teams * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| * Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? | * Evidence of local partnership (lack of) understanding of roles and responsibilities prior to and following project approval * Coherence between nature and extent of Project Board responsibilities and roles, and project needs and objectives | * Interviews | * Project Coordinator * National project teams * Project Board |
| * What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? | * Degree of coherence between the global project and the 6 national projects * Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities * Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process | * Interviews | * National project teams * Government partners * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist |
| **B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION** | |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency & Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |
| **Q4. To what extent was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?** | * What (if any) follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management were taken in response to monitoring reports? | * Evidence of management response/changes in project strategy/approach as a direct result of information in semi-annual reports | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| * Did the projects undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from workshops, project Board, or other review procedures? | * Number and quality of mechanisms for feedback and re-adjustment of project strategy or approach * Responsiveness of project team/ respective implementing bodies to recommendations made through review processes * Origins of suggestions for significant project changes (e.g. sources of recommendations) | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| * If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes? | * Nature and degree of change in project outcomes (activities, outputs) as a result of recommendations from review procedures | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator |
| * Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project Board? | * Number and type of approved project changes that were put in writing for Board consideration (number and type that were not put into writing and/or not approved) | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| **Q5. To what extent were partnership arrangements and stakeholders’ engagement effective during project implementation?** | * To what extent were partnership/linkages with different partners, and different departments/Bureaus of UNDP encouraged and supported? | * Specific activities conducted to support the development of partnership arrangement between partners * Extent and quality of interaction/exchange between project partners | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator * Project Board * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist * Government partners |
| * Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? | * Number and types of partnerships developed * Evidence that particular partnerships will be sustained | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator * Project Board * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist * Government partners |
| * Which methods were successful or not and why? | * Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator * Project Board * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist * Government partners |
| * Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders (six national Canada-funded project teams, UNDP staff, broader UNDP project portfolio, etc.) | * Number, type, and quality of stakeholder engagement at each stage of project implementation and M&E | * Desk review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshops/Meeting minutes * Project coordinator * Project Board * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist * Government partners |
| * Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the implementation of project activities? | * Quality of consultations / feedback mechanisms/ meetings/ systems in place for project implementers to learn the opinions of 1. Community groups 2. Local government 3. National government 4. Non-government groups 5. Other * Number and frequency of engagement with local stakeholders for consultation | * Desk Review * Interviews | * Semi-annual reports * Workshop/planning meeting minutes and action items * Project coordinator * National project teams * UNDP TA for CC, RTAs, gender specialist and focal points, and communication specialist * Government partners |
| * Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? | * Extent of beneficiary needs integrated into project design * Evidence of participation from a wide range of stakeholder groups (in support and opposed to the project) | * Desk Review * Interviews | * Workshop/planning meeting minutes and action items * Project coordinator * National project teams * Government partners |
| * Was a specific coordination mechanism created to improve coordination between the global project and the 6 national projects? | * Existence of coordination mechanism | * Desk review | * Semi Annual reports |
| **Q6. To what extent were project financial resources used efficiently?** | * What are annual costs for implementation and what proportion is co-financing? | * Budget execution per year, activity * Amount of co-financing per year, activity * Amount of resources that project has leveraged since inception (and source(s)) | * Desk review | * Financial audits and reporting * Annual and semi-annual report |
| * Is there any variance between planned and actual expenditures? If there is, what is the explanation? | * Planned budget per year, activity * Actual budget execution per year, activity | * Desk review * Interview | * Financial Audits and reporting * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator |
| * What resources has the project leveraged since inception? (Leverage resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector) | * Amount of resources that project has leveraged since inception (and source(s)) | * Desk review * Interviews | * Financial Audits and reporting * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator |
| * Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? | * Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency | * Desk review * Interviews | * Financial Audits and reporting * Annual and semi-annual reports * Financial reporting of similar projects * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| * Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? | * Adequacy of project procurement process in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost | * Desk review * Interviews | * Financial Audits and reporting * Annual and semi-annual reports * Financial reporting of similar projects * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| * Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? | * quality of the accounting and financial system in place * timeliness of financial reporting | * Desk review * Interviews | * Financial reporting documents * Project coordinator * Project Board * Project Board |
| * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) | * Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures * Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations | * Desk review * Interviews | * Financial Audits and reporting * Annual and semi-annual reports * Financial reporting of similar projects * Project coordinator |
| **Q7. To what extent was the M&E plan effectively and efficiently implemented?** | * Were the logical framework and work plan used during implementation as a management and M&E tool? | * Extent of management use of the log frame (number and type of usage) * Extent of management use of the work plans | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator |
| * Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation? | * Proportion of executed M&E budget against planned amount * Degree of adherence of the implementation of the M&E plan to intended timeline * Evidence of external factors that have affected M&E budget or timeline (and extent to which they were addressed in risk management plan) | * Desk review * Interviews | * Planning meeting minutes/review procedures * Monitoring and reporting documents (annual and semi-annual reports) * Project coordinator * Project Board |
| * Are monitoring indicators from the revised logical framework effective for measuring progress and performance? | * Coherence between reported results (activities, outputs) and actual activities and outputs on the ground | * Desk review * Interviews | * Logframe * Project coordinator |
| * Does the project comply with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports? | * Proportion and types of reporting materials submitted a) correctly and b) on time * Quality of M&E/reporting materials | * Desk review | * Monitoring and reporting documents (annual and semi-annual reports) |
| * Were monitoring and evaluation reports discussed with stakeholders and project staff? | * Number and quality of meetings, workshops or other mechanisms used to share M&E materials with stakeholders and project staff * Number of stakeholder and staff aware of M&E materials generated and/or lessons/findings they contain | * Desk review * Interviews | * Minutes and attendance list of project staff and stakeholders for meetings on M&E * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| **Q8. To what extent was UNDP project implementation efficient?** | * Have UNDP placed sufficient resources on achieving project results? | * Differences in actual and planned amount of budget and staff time devoted to the project * Quality of supervision * Suitability of chosen executing agency for project execution * Difference in actual and planned timetable for project execution | * Interviews | * Project coordinator * UNDP gender specialist and focal points, Communication specialist, RTAs, TA for CC * Government partners |
| * Have management teams provided quality and timely inputs/responses to the project team? | * Perceived timeliness of management response to project team members’ inquiries, needs * Perceived quality of management response to project team members’ inquiries, needs * Perceived quality of risk management * Evidence of quality (candor and realism) in annual reporting | * Interviews | * Project Coordinator * National project teams |
| **C. PROJECT RESULTS** |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |
| **Q9. Has the project been effective in achieving its main objective, expected outputs, and outcomes?** | * Has the project been effective in promoting south-south cooperation and enhancing understanding about initiatives that address adaptation to climate change, especially the gender dimensions? (Project Objective) | * Number of exchanges by government and civil society entities, practitioners and policymakers, across countries involved in the Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| * Has the project been effective in developing an operational and visible global coordination of the UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects? (Outcome 1) | * Number of attempts by government and civil society entities, practitioners and policymakers, associated with the Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects to use and adapt approaches and solutions across projects. * Number and type of coordination and communication actions implemented by the project | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| * Has the project been effective in enhancing global knowledge management of climate change adaptation and lessons learned from the Canada – UNDP Portfolio of projects? (Outcome 2) | * Number and type of global online and published knowledge products that integrate experiences and lessons learned across projects, countries, and climate adaptation themes * Evidence of an assessment of adaptation training needs undertaken * Number and types of training on climate change adaptation provided, and number of beneficiaries * Degree of alignment between the adaptation needs and the trainings provided | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| * Has the project been effective in in compiling and disseminating gender-based adaptation approaches and practices? (Outcome 3) | * Extent of gender-based cross-fertilization among Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects * Number of other initiatives that take on gender lessons and results from Canada - UNDP portfolio of climate change adaptation projects * Number and type of trainings/ workshops provided on gender-based adaptation approaches and practices provided, and number of beneficiaries * Number and type of knowledge material on gender and climate change adaptation produced by the project | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| **Q10. How were risk and risk mitigation being managed?** | * How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? | * Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| * What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? | * Evidence of risk mitigation strategies * Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator |
| **Impacts** |  |  |  |  |
| **Q11. Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward its intended impacts?** | * Is the project progressing toward achievement of intended impacts? | * Number and extent of achievement toward achieving **process** indicators (regulatory, policy, coordination changes)[[48]](#footnote-48). * Evidence and extent of barriers *or* enabling conditions toward achievement of each key outcome | * Desk review * Interview | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reporting * Project Coordinator |
| * Have there been any unintended results (positive or negative) and what were they? | * Number and type of co-benefits and/or other unplanned consequences from project activities or outputs to date * Extent and nature of external factors’ influence on project progression toward intended results | * Desk review * Interview | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reporting * Project Coordinator * National Project teams |
| * Have the findings and knowledge products created by the project been used to inform broader initiatives on climate change adaptation? | * Evidence of initiatives that have used the findings of the project | * Interviews | * Project coordinator * National Project teams * Government partners * UNDP RTAs, UNDP gender specialists and focal points, UNDP communication specialist, UNDP TA for CC |
| **Q12. To what extent did the project successfully mainstream other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women's empowerment?** | * Is it possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations? | * Clear links between project’s intended outcomes and (potential) changes in local population socio-economic situation | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| * Is there evidence that the project contributed to improved governance in the 6 national project countries | * Evidence that intended outcomes (could/will) contribute the improvement of governance in the 6 countries | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| * Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters? | * Evidence that intended outcomes (could/will) contribute to communities’ ability to deal with natural disasters | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| * Does the project sufficiently incorporate gender issues? | * Proportion of executing partners, and participants of workshops, trainings or knowledge exchange who are female * Disaggregation of appropriate indicators by gender/sex * Evidence of initiatives that uptake gender issue into their activities as a result of the project | * Desk review * Interviews | * Agendas, attendance lists and other documentation from workshops, planning meetings and trainings * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams |
| **Q13. To what extent did the project play a catalytic role?** | * Did the project contribute to the production of public good (i.e. new technology or approach) | * Examples of public good produced during project implementation * Evidence of no action taken as regards the catalytic effect of the project | * Desk review | * Annual and semi-annual reports |
| * Have any steps been taken to catalyse the public good, for instance through successful information dissemination and training? | * Number and type of dissemination activities implemented * Number of trainings organised and number/type of participants in those trainings | * Desk review | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Workshop and training agendas and attendance sheets |
| * Are any activities, demonstrations, and/or approaches being repeated within or outside the project? | * Examples of activities/approaches used in the project and replicated in other projects/initiatives (other geographical areas and/or funded by other funding partners) | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams * UNDP RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist, UNDP TA for CC |
| * Are any approaches developed through the project taken up on a regional / national scale, becoming widely accepted, and perhaps legally required? | * Examples of laws and regulations inspired by project outcomes * Examples of large scale initiatives building on project outcomes or methods | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams * UNDP RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist, UNDP TA for CC |
| **Sustainability** |  |  |  |  |
| **Q14. To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | * Did the project devise a robust sustainability strategy? Did it include a specific exit strategy? | * Existence of a plan for managing each: Financial risks; socio-economic risk; institutional framework and governance risks; and environmental risks * Number and extent of unforeseen barriers to sustainability that arose during implementation * Existence of an exit strategy | * Desk review * Interviews | * Project document * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator |
| * Did the project implement its sustainability strategy? | * Degree of coherence between actions taken during implementation to avert sustainability risks and intended plan | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator |
| * Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? | * Number and type of financial risks * Evidence of follow-on champions, funding or other sources of continuation | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams * Government partners * Project Board * UNDP RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist, UNDP TA for CC |
| * Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? (i.e. insufficient government and stakeholder ownership and awareness) | * Number and type of social and/or political risks * Use of expertise of trained individuals/ workshop participants/ implementation partners | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams * Government partners * Project Board * UNDP RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist, UNDP TA for CC |
| * Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? | * Number and types of legal frameworks, policies and governances structure and process that pose a risk to, or support the continuation of project activities | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams * Government partners * Project Board * UNDP RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist, UNDP TA for CC |
| * Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? | * Number and type of ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes | * Desk review * Interviews | * Annual and semi-annual reports * Project coordinator * National project teams * Government partners * Project Board * UNDP RTAs, gender specialist and focal point, communication specialist, UNDP TA for CC |

## Annex 3: List of People Interviewed

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Level | Position | | Name |
| Global | Global Affairs Canada | | Amanda Walker  Tara Carney |
| Head - Climate Change  Head and GEF Principal Technical Advisor  Low-emission and Climate-Resilient Development | | Stephen Gold  [Stephen.gold@undp.org](mailto:Stephen.gold@undp.org) |
| CCAF Project coordinator | | Jennifer Baumwoll  [Jennifer.baumwoll@undp.org](mailto:Jennifer.baumwoll@undp.org) |
| UNDP Gender Specialist | | Verania Chao  [Verania.Chao@undp.org](mailto:Verania.Chao@undp.org) |
| UNDP gender focal points | | Ciara Daniels  [ciara.daniels@undp.org](mailto:ciara.daniels@undp.org) |
| UNDP Regional Technical Advisors covering each of the six national projects (Cambodia, Cape Verde, Haiti, Mali, Niger and Sudan) | Asia | Yusuke Taishi  (Cambodia)  [yusuke.taishi@undp.org](mailto:yusuke.taishi@undp.org) |
| Africa | Clotilde Goeman (Mali, Niger)  [clotilde.goeman@undp.org](mailto:clotilde.goeman@undp.org) |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Lyes FERROUKHI (Haiti)  [lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org](mailto:lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org) |
| Other regional and global UNDP staff engaged in the implementation of the project (e.g. gender focal points, communications focal points) | UNDP gender focal points | Kalyan Keo  [Kalyan.keo@undp.org](mailto:Kalyan.keo@undp.org) |
| UNDP communication specialist (consultant) | Andrea Egan  [Andrea.egan@undp.org](mailto:Andrea.egan@undp.org) |
| National | UNDP Country office focal point and project managers | Cambodia | Ratana Norng  [ratana.norng@undp.org](mailto:ratana.norng@undp.org) |
| Cape Verde | Sandra Martins  [sandra.martins@cv.jo.un.org](mailto:sandra.martins@cv.jo.un.org) |
| Haiti | Yves-Andre Wainright  [yves-andre.wainright@undp.org](mailto:yves-andre.wainright@undp.org)  Dorine Jn Paul  [dorine.jn.paul@undp.org](mailto:dorine.jn.paul@undp.org) |
| Niger | Boubacar Issoufou  [boubacar.issoufou@undp.org](mailto:boubacar.issoufou@undp.org)  Mourtala Sani [mourtala.sani@undp.org](mailto:mourtala.sani@undp.org) |
| Sudan | Hanan Mutwakil  [hanan.mutwakil@undp.org](mailto:hanan.mutwakil@undp.org)  Adil Seedahmed  [adil.seedahmed@undp.org](mailto:adil.seedahmed@undp.org) |
| Government Counterparts | Cape Verde | Carlos Monteiro [Carlos.Monteiro@maa.gov.cv](mailto:Carlos.Monteiro@maa.gov.cv)  Filomena Mª Delgado Victoria Fialho |
| Mali | Diarra Aminata  [mineyitou@yahoo.fr](mailto:mineyitou@yahoo.fr) |
| Sudan | Dr. Nadia Hassan  [nadiahassan2004@yahoo.com](mailto:nadiahassan2004@yahoo.com)  Ms. Dalal Ebrahim  [Elhajdalal7999@gmail.com](mailto:Elhajdalal7999@gmail.com) |

## Annex 4: List of reviewed documentation

*Project Documentation*

* TE ToRs
* UNDP CCAF Global Project Document
* Semi-annual reports
* Monitoring and evaluation tools
* Financial reports

*Global projects knowledge products*

* “Filling buckets, fuelling change” Publication
* Gender infographics
* UNDP impact series - Scaling up multi-country adaptation
* Cookbook publication
* Photo essays
* Blog posts
* Videos

*National Canada-UNDP projects documentation*

* Project Briefs
* National Project Documents
* Semi-annual reports
* Evaluation reports

*LDCF Projects Documentation*

* LDCF Project Documents
* LDCF Project Implementation Reports
* LDCF Projects Evaluation Reports

*Methodological documentation*

* UNDP Evaluation Office. 2012.Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects
* UNDP. 2009. Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results

## Annex 5: Rating scales

**RATINGS OF PROJECT OUTCOMES, EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, M&E and IMPLEMENTATION/ EXECUTION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | | Explanation |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The Project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | There were only minor shortcomings |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory | There were moderate shortcomings |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | The project had significant shortcomings |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | There were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The project had severe shortcomings. |
| Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | |  |

Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the Project Outcomes **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a Project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

**RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY**

The UNDP TE Guidance establish four areas for considering risks to sustainability: sustainability of financial resources, socio-political sustainability, institutional framework and governance sustainability, and environmental sustainability. Each area should be separately evaluated and then rated as to the likelihood and extent that risks will impede sustainability.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the Project, outcomes will be rated as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | | Explanation |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on. |
| 1 | Unlikely (UL) | Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained. |
| Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | |  |

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a Project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

**RATINGS ON RELEVANCE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Relevance Ratings | |
| 2 | Relevant (R) |
| 1 | Not Relevant (NR) |
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