**Terms of Reference (ToR) for Review of Strengthening State Strategies for Climate Actions (3SCA)**

**1. Introduction and Context**

Climate change is a major challenge for developing countries like India that face large scale climate variability and are exposed to climate risks. With large parts of its population dependent on climate-sensitive sectors such as agriculture and forests, any adverse impact on water availability due to changes in precipitation levels and falling groundwater tables are likely to adversely affect livelihoods and food security, thereby affecting India’s developmental prospects. To address this issue, the Government of India developed the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) in 2008 outlining existing and future policies and programmes addressing climate mitigation and adaptation. Further, Government of India requested all the States and Union Territories to prepare State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCCs) in line with the state specific issues. Although, these SAPCCs are in various stages of implementation, States are encountering difficulties in operationalizing activities envisaged in respective SAPCCs due to inadequate institutional capacities for identifying priorities and developing appropriate strategies, compounded by lack of dedicated funding provisions for climate actions.

To address some of these gaps that Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation’s (SDCs) Global Programme Climate Change and Environment (GPCCE) India has been supporting the operationalization of SAPCCs in Uttarakhand, Sikkim & Madhya Pradesh. This involves strengthening capacities in planning and implementing relevant climate actions across select sectors including water, disaster management, forest and energy. The “Strengthening State Strategies for Climate Action” (3SCA) project was launched in 2016 in the three states which were selected in consultation with the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate change, Government of India (MoEFCC), based on SDC’s longstanding experience in mountains and semi-arid areas.

The overall goal of the project is to integrate climate change actions into sub national planning, benefitting local communities in India. The goal is to be achieved by strengthening capacities of state level departments and relevant institutions to plan and undertake specific interventions in climate sensitive sectors impacting large sections of vulnerable communities in these states. The outcomes of the project are as follows:

● Capabilities of state authorities to implement SAPCCs are enhanced;

● SAPCCs are operationalized in Madhya Pradesh, Sikkim and Uttarakhand; and

● Experiences and approach of the project gained national and international visibility

Rather than solely focusing on the implementation of specific sectoral strategies, the project seeks to institutionalize procedures helping to identify and select relevant climate strategies. These approaches are in line with the global discourse on risk assessment and selection of appropriate strategies as reflected in internationally agreed documents. The interventions under this project includes mobilization of appropriate expertise, capacity building of resource persons/institutions, support to strategy implementation and knowledge sharing amongst states and across other countries embarking on sub-national planning for climate change.

The project is in line with the objectives outlined in GPCCE’s 2014-17 Strategic Framework and the GPCCE India Strategy 2014-2017. Following the three-pronged approach (policy-action-knowledge), the project focuses on GPCCE’s priority themes - water security, hazard and risk management, forests and renewable energy. The total financial outlay for the project is CHF 4.5 million, which includes funds for activities undertaken in India and for Swiss experts.

Another GPCCE India project, Indian Himalayas Climate Adaptation Programme (IHCAP) is also active in two of the three partner states (Uttarakhand and Sikkim) and supporting capacity building of state nodal agencies on climate change adaptation. Right at the start of the 3SCA project it was agreed that the two project will ensure certain synergies in terms of capacity building, i.e. IHCAP will raise awareness on climate change aspects and build capacities of state nodal agencies on broader climate vulnerability assessments, while 3SCA project would build capacities on sectoral vulnerabilities and adaptation measures.

**2. Project Steering and Implementation structure**

SDC is implementing the project through UNDP that has also developed the project “Strengthening State Strategies for Climate Action” in consultation with the SDC, MoEFCC and the three partner States. The SDC – UNDP partnership is assisting the state nodal agencies on climate change and focus sectoral departments in the implementation of activities in water, disaster management, forests, and energy sectors. The project is managed by the Project Management Units (PMUs) at the National and State levels. The National Programme Management Unit (NPMU) is housed in UNDP and comprises of a project manager, and a finance-cum-admin assistant. The NPMU is responsible for coordinating the activities across the three states, and between MoEFCC, UNDP and SDC.

The State Programme Management Units (SPMU) are integrated with the State Nodal Agencies on Climate Change to ensure close interactions on a daily basis for smooth implementation of project activities. SPMUs comprise of a State Project Manager, a Project Associate and domain experts based on the focus sectors in the state. SPMUs are responsible for the preparation of the state level annual work plans, preparation of the terms of reference for each of the identified activities/interventions and regularly report to the NPMU on progress. For smooth operation of project activities and delivery of project outputs, inter-departmental working group comprising of nodal officers from sectoral departments and nodal agencies have been constituted.

Relevant sector-specific international expertise has been made available to the state governments through a consortium of Swiss and Indian experts led by HELVETAS Swiss InterCooperation.

For Project Management, the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) co-chaired by the Joint Secretary Climate Change, MoEFCC and the Director of Cooperation, SDC India has been set-up. The PSC includes representatives from UNDP and the nodal agencies of the states. The Committee meets at half yearly intervals and review the progress of the project and provide strategic direction for the project implementation in order to maximize the success of the project initiatives.

**3. Project Status**

**In the first phase (2016-191**), the 3SCA project has been driven by the need to support the implementation of prioritized strategies of key focus sectors in each of the partner states. This involves supporting select departments to 1) systematically identify climate vulnerabilities and risks of climate change to their sectors; 2) shortlist appropriate climate actions; and 3) implement the feasible actions. Through this process, the departments are expected to be strengthened towards identifying and implementing robust climate actions.

1 The project was approved for implementation from January 2016 – December 2018. In 2017, the phase was extended by six months to conclude by June 2019.

**Capacity Building:** The project focused at developing human and institutional capacities through a detailed capacity building plan for the implementation of SAPCC. The capacity building plan was developed through a training need assessment exercise and in consultation with nodal agencies and focus sectoral departments in three States.

200 (approx) Government officials from State Nodal Agency and sectoral departments sensitized on climate change impacts, vulnerabilities and adaptation planning in three States.

Technical support was provided to the State Government of Sikkim on conducting Hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment (HRVA) for Mangan, Gyalshing and Namchi towns of Sikkim. The State government has replicated the HRVA for Chungthang and Gangtok towns.

The sensitization and technical assistance to the state nodal agency and Rural Management and Development Department (RMDD), Government of Sikkim resulted in the formulation of a project proposal on “Addressing Climate Change vulnerability of water Sector at Gram Panchayat Level in drought prone areas of Sikkim” and approval of the same under National Adaptation fund on Climate Change (NAFCC) with an allocation of INR 2470 lakhs (CHF 3.6 million).

Additionally INR 500 lakhs (CHF 0.73 million) is under approval from MoEFCC under the Climate Change Action Programme (CCAP) for implementing a project on “Enhancing Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change through Conservation of Traditional Water Supply Sources (Wells and Bawadies) in Burhanpur District, Madhya Pradesh’’.

**Policy level impacts:** The Himalayan state of Uttarakhand has allocated 1% of its annual budget for the implementation of climate change related activities identified in the Uttarakhand State Action Plan on Climate Change (USAPCC). State Government of Uttrakhand has created a budget head for climate actions and provided budgetary allocation of INR 50 lakhs to the State Climate Change Centre in 2017. In Sikkim, the “Well-being of Generations Act”

for achieving sustainable development goals and improving quality of life of future generations which was drafted through project support is awaiting cabinet approval.

**4. Objectives of the Review**

The objective of the review is to assess the overall performance of the project, including the impact, outcomes, outputs, partnerships, processes, and opportunities for potential scaling-up (replication or broadening the scope of engagement) and to make recommendations for a potential next phase. The review is expected to provide insights into the **impact achieved, effectiveness and efficiency of results, relevance and sustainability of the programme, together with lessons learnt** and experiences gained in:

● Building capacities of the state nodal agencies and sectoral departments in systematic identification of climate vulnerabilities and risks of climate change to their sectors;

● strengthening of capacities on adaptation planning and implementation at the state level;

● supporting development of identified climate adaptive actions;

● documentation and dissemination of the process and approaches adopted by the project;

● synergies with other SDC projects, i.e. IHCAP

Further, the review will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of project management, particularly assess advantages of institutional anchorage within UNDP and partner states; synergies with the backstopping mandate; whether or not project plans have been, or will be, fulfilled; the capacities available for coordination, monitoring, planning, reporting, learning and resource management and the extent to which the project’s resources have been used in a responsible and effective manner.

In terms of sustainability, the review shall answer to what extent the project activities covered financial, institutional, and socio-economic aspects to sustain the impact and results of the project benefits beyond completion of the project.

Assess how the project relates (relevance) to the main objective of the GPCCE strategy and development priorities at the national level. Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress towards the national development priorities and GPCCE objective?

**5. Scope/Focus of the Review**

The specific objectives of the mid-term review are as follows:

● Evaluate the outputs, and any outcomes of the project already delivered, and determine and assess their contribution to delivery of the overall project’s overall aims and objectives;

● Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation in terms of i) institutional anchorage within UNDP and partner states; ii) partnerships established; iii) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E); and iv) risk management;

● Assess the long term sustainability of project interventions;

● Identify key ‘lessons learnt’ to date, particularly with regard to strategic processes and the mechanisms chosen to achieve the project’s objectives to date;

● Make clear, specific and implementable recommendations to improve the project in its last year and provide guidance on the scope of future work.

● Provide guidance on aspects or specific issues that will be useful in undertaking the planned project impact assessment to be done at the end of the project through the use of scenario thinking, i.e. how would the situation look like on the ground without this project;

Within this framework, specific issues (and questions) to be assessed will include, but not be limited to, the following:

**5.1 Context/Relevance**

Determine the extent to which the project and its associated actions are relevant to the existing and likely future needs of its stakeholders and the environment/s in which it is being implemented;

▪ Relevance of strengthening capacities at the state level in climate adaptation planning and implementation in context of India’s national and state level policies and programmes (e.g., NAPCC, SAPCC).

▪ Relevance of the strategy and approach followed under the project with reference to Government of India policy and GPCCE goals and objectives

**5.2 Outcomes/Impacts**

Evaluate the outputs, and any outcomes of the project already delivered, and determine and assess their contribution to delivery of the project’s overall aims and objectives, at the level of project stakeholders.

▪ What have been the main contributions (including transfer of knowledge) and impact of 3SCA on the aspect of capacity building and institutional strengthening at sub-national level, catalyzing implementation of SAPCCs, and facilitation of knowledge exchange and policy dialogues?

▪ What are the impacts and learning from the project in terms of capacity development of partners institutions in operationalizing SAPCC implementation?

▪ How has the project addressed policy or contributed towards policy processes and with what impact at the sub-national/national/international level?

▪ What are the innovations, which were effectively addressed under the project and with what results?

▪ What was the outcome and learning of the knowledge exchange and management effort?

▪ Was the project engaged with the right mix of stakeholders?

▪ Has the project adapted its strategies adequately in Phase 1 keeping in view the changing external policy and implementation environment?

**5.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Strategy**

Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation, including assessing the institutional arrangement, partnerships, risk management, M&E and project implementation;

▪ Is the process of selection of sectors robust and approaches adopted for capacity building appropriate?

▪ Are the activities implemented in accordance with the project plans? If not, why?

▪ Are the project results of the phase 1 in alignment with the originally defined objectives and were these outcomes and outputs achieved?

▪ How effective has the project been in linking implementation actions with policies?

▪ How effective are the monitoring instruments used at different levels for project implementation?

▪ Was the institutional set-up (PMUs, Swiss Consortium, and implementing partners) effective and cost-efficient?

▪ Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project set-up in terms of i) institutional anchorage within UNDP and partner states and ii) geographical focus.

▪ Assess how the synergies with the backstopping mandate to a third party pan out? Could there have been another approach?

▪ Was the project efficient and effective related to use of SDC funds (cost effectiveness and financial sustainability)? Are the funds being spent in accordance with project plans and using the right procedures? Have there been any unforeseen problems in terms of resources (technical and financial) allocation and utilization? How well were they dealt with?

**5.4 Sustainability**

Assessment of the project in terms of its sustainability and potential for up-scaling and replicability.

▪ How sustainable are the strategies adopted for capacity building of state level officials, followed under Phase 1? Do these strategies have the potential for up-scaling and replication?

▪ How sustainable is the capacity building component of the project?

▪ How sustainable is the strategy of involving Swiss experts for support on specific areas of intervention?

▪ What strategies does the project need to adapt for mainstreaming its activities with national and sub-national priorities?

▪ How can the project engage more closely with the government (national and state)?

▪ What would be the most suitable/required levels of intervention (state, national, regional across Himalayan Region?

▪ What is the potential for further enhancing North-South and South-South knowledge cooperation?

**5.5 Recommendations for future orientation**

Identify key ‘lessons learnt’ to date, particularly with regard to strategic processes and the mechanisms chosen to achieve the project’s objectives to date, and; make clear, specific and implementable recommendations to improve the project in its last year and provide guidance on the scope of future work.

▪ Should the project consolidate its existing sectoral focus or limit its attention on some specific sectors, expand to new orientation? Are there certain thematic focus areas that need to be continued and further strengthened, and focus areas which need to be expanded for cooperation and long-term sustainability?

▪ Suggestions on how strategies/approaches adopted under 3SCA project can be mainstreamed at the national level?

▪ How can experience under 3SCA contribute to regional outreach and /or global dialogue (adaptation capacity building and policy) and suggestions for partnership/alliances that the second phase of the project needs to enter into to achieve the desired results?

**6. Methodology and Approach**

The detailed methodology and approaches related to the review will be developed by the team and therefore the approach suggested below should be taken as indicative and provisional.

As a first step, it is expected that the team will engage in a Desk Review by studying key documents including the project document, project log frame, operational and financial reports, end of phase report, minutes/ proceedings of the project steering committees and joint working group, Detailed Project Reports/project progress reports of interventions designed under the project, documentation related to the project including back to office reports, minutes of meetings held in connection with the project, etc. The review team will also go through the various knowledge products (reports, papers, web postings, etc.) generated out of the project. SDC/GPCCE India through the implementing partners will ensure that all the requisite documentations are made available to the review team.

As second step, on the basis of interactions with SDC/GPCCE India, the staff of the UNDP and the National PMU project, team from Helvetas, the reviewers will come out with a brief inception report outlining their detailed methodology and work plan for organizing the review, after due consideration of the available time, resources and data/ information. The team members will also agree on the indicators, questions and hypotheses related to the review and their respective roles and responsibilities in discharging various tasks associated with the review including writing of the reports.

In the third step, the review team will visit ongoing project activities (such as pilots being implemented at the state level), meet the with project partners (interaction with State level nodal agencies, relevant sectoral departments in each state) and have detailed discussions/interviews/workshops with project stakeholders. Review team will also interact with the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEF&CC), Government of India at the National level.

In the fourth step, the review team will have a debriefing session with GPCCE India to share their preliminary observations and seek necessary clarifications. In the final step, the team, will draft the report. It is expected that once the final report is prepared, the Team Leader will

make a presentation to SDC/GPCCE India. The Team Leader will revise the report based on comments from SDC/GPCCE India and submit the final report.

**7. Expected Outcome and Deliverables**

The review is expected to provide an objective assessment of SDC’s engagement in building capacities of the State level agencies in identifying relevant climate change adaptation strategies and implementing them as part of their SAPCCs. It is intended that the outcomes of this review will provide useful and relevant information to the on-going work; explore why implemented actions and interventions have been successful, or not and to provide guidance on improving the intervention strategy in the on-going phase keeping in view. The outcomes of the review should assist GPCCE and its partners in assessing the sustainability (or otherwise) of the activities, approaches, and structures initiated or supported by the project, and crucially, should also provide recommendations for the future. Further, the review will provide strategic inputs into the formulation and design of the second phase of 3SCA Project and to SDC/GPCCE India’s engagement in climate change adaptation within the context of GPCCs strategy.

The review team will initially submit a draft report. Based on consideration of the feedback received, the team will submit the final report. The main part of the final report of the review will not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes. The final report will be shared with all concerned, including UNDP, MOEFCC, State Nodal Agencies and other interested stakeholders. SDC will provide a management response to the final report.

**8. Documentation**

The following documents/ material will be made available by 3SCA / SDC-GPCCE India to the members of the review team prior to/ during the evaluation.

● Project Document and log frame /updates/sub-project proposals and contracts

● Fact Sheet

● End of Phase Report

● Annual Operational Reports/ Financial reports

● Progress Reports from HELVETAS

● Minutes of the Project Steering Committee meetings

● Reports/DPRs submitted by consultants

● Proceedings of State Advisory Group meetings/ interactions

● Proceedings of key workshops/seminars organized or supported by the project

● Key knowledge products/documents/reports/briefs coming out of the project

● Back to Office Reports/Field visit reports

● Any other key documents/films/reports related to the project

**9. Duration of Review**

It is estimated that the total number of person-days required for the review could be 70 (30 days for the team leader, 20 days for the national expert, 10 days for SDC representative, and

10 days as reserve). This will include preparation, briefings, consultation, travel, field visits, workshops, debriefing, report writing, etc.

**10. Time Period**

|  |
| --- |
| The review is proposed to be carried out during January – February 2019 in accordance with the convenience of all concerned. All the steps in the review process should be completed latest by 31st March 2019. The operational and financial closure of the contracts will be completed by 30th April 2019. |



**11. Funding**

The cost of review will be borne by SDC.

**12. Programme for Conducting Review**

The programme for the review will be planned in consultation with the Review Team and concerned stakeholders.

**13. Support and Facilitation**

3SCA PMUs will extend logistic support for travel, hotel bookings, etc. during the review activities and field visits in India. The PMU will also make available all documents and other material related to the project and help in organising various meetings with the project partners and relevant stakeholders. The PMU will facilitate the field visits and meetings, stakeholder interactions in field and provide necessary support to the review team. The members of PMU may accompany the review team during field visits to facilitate meetings with project partners/stakeholders; however, they will not be present during the course of such interactions.

**14. Proposal Submission**

Proposal can be submitted either as an individual international/national expert or as a joint team of international and national expert.

**Note**: SDC India would reserve its right to finally choose the regional or national expert.

**15. Documentation Required for Proposal**

1. A short appreciation (not exceeding two pages) on the ToRs, especially on methodologies and approaches.

2. CV of the international/regional or national expert. In case of a joint team, proposal should show organisation of the review team and CVs of proposed international/national expert.

3. Confirmation of availability during the period of review, as indicated in the ToRs and the timelines.

4. Financial Proposal containing daily professional fee.

Note: SDC India will directly meet all costs related to travel and other out of pocket expenses, as per SDC’s existing travel norms and guidelines for consultants.