

Evaluation and Recommendations for 3SCA

Final Report

1. Introduction

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation's (SDCs) Global Programme Climate Change and Environment (GPCCE) India has been supporting the operationalization of State Action Plans for Climate Change (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

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.

The current phase of the project, which is now in the Fourth year, is drawing to a close (December 2019). A review of the project was undertaken to consolidate the lessons and experiences of the project and capitalize on them in developing a potential next phase of the project. The review was conducted by a team of five experts including:

- Mark Whitton, Global Lead: Agriculture, Food Security and Natural Resource Management at the Aga Khan Foundation
- Prof. Marcus Nuesser, Chair, Department of Geography, South Asia Institute at the University of Heidelberg.
- Dr. P.K. Champati Ray, Head Geosciences and Geohazards Department at the Indian Institute of Remote Sensing (IIRS)
- Dr. Ravi Baghel, an independent consultant : water sector
- Dr. Mustafa Ali Khan, Project Manager, SDC supported Indian Himalayas Capacity Building Project (IHACP).

The review team was expected to come out not only with an objective assessment of the project achievements but also offer recommendations that could help development of the phase 2 of the project.

2. Objective and Scope of the Review

The main purpose of the review was to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of the project benefits and recommend future course of action. The assessment is based on the criteria prescribed by OECD viz. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The review assesses the overall performance of the project, including appraising the project activities and their contribution to the project objectives, by looking at the following key dimensions:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which the objective of the project matches the needs of the target groups, the policies of the partner country and partner institutions, the global development goals and the SDC's strategic framework for the Global Cooperation on Climate Change.
- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the intended direct results (objectives) of the development are being achieved (comparison of actual situation with targets).
- **Efficiency:** A measure of the degree to which the resources invested in the project are appropriate compared to the outputs and results achieved.
- **Impact:** The extent to which the project is contributing to achieving the intended over-arching results and producing other indirect results.
- **Sustainability:** A measure of the probability that the positive results of the development measure will continue beyond the end of assistance.

This report evaluates the achievements of the first phase of the SDC supported project “Strengthening State Strategies for Climate Action (3SCA)” implemented between 1st January 2016 and 31 December 2019 and makes recommendations for a proposed second phase of the project. The report addresses the terms of reference (appended at Annex 1) contracted between SDC and the review team. The field-work and stakeholder meetings that form the basis for the report were carried out by the review team in February 2019 (the review team Itinerary is at Annex 2).

The report is in three main parts, (1) the evaluation, (2) the phase two recommendations and (3) sector specific comments. The evaluation part of the report is structured by first summarising the findings of the review team by each of the 3 project outcomes and their corresponding outputs, and then addressing the project as a whole in terms of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Part two of the report offers recommendations for the second phase of the project. Part Three includes comments of the review team that are neither key points of the evaluation nor major recommendations.

3. Part One - 3SCA Evaluation

According to the TOR the review was based on the OECD-DAC criteria viz. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The evaluation of OECD-DAC criteria has been primarily done in the context of the three outcomes of the project.

With respect to **Outcome 1** (*Capacities of state authorities to plan and implement SAPCCs enhanced in the three states*), there are relatively similar observations across all three states where the project “Strengthening State Strategies for Climate Action” (3SCA) operates (Uttarakhand, Madhya Pradesh and Sikkim). Enhancing the capacities of state authorities to implement State Action Plan for Climate Change (SAPCCs) is a challenging task but there has been considerable progress following a slow start. This is most evident in terms of establishing inter departmental teams and also raising climate funds from various sources. In Sikkim, the State Rural Management and Development Department was able to mobilize financial resources from the National Adaptation Fund for Climate Change (NAFCC) for springshed management project (about CHF 3.5 million). Similarly, in Madhya Pradesh funds were secured from the Climate Change Action Programme for the management of groundwater in Burhanpur district (about CHF 0.7 million).

Most of the results achieved are intangible but it is clear that the project has made a difference in all three states as seen in new institutional mechanisms, training, and new ways of thinking.

The 3SCA planned to develop and implement an M&E framework for the SAPCCs as a core means to build the States’ capacity to monitor and evaluate the SAPCCs. Although the enhanced capacities of State Nodal Authorities (SNAs) in developing an M&E framework will inform the revision process and improve quality of the final product, the delay in the implementation of a functional M&E framework means that even the revised SAPCCs will lack a feasible M&E framework. The ongoing revision of the SAPCCs has brought implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the SAPCC to a standstill.

An M&E framework was proposed by the project but not adopted by the States. In the Uttarakhand the M&E framework was shared with various departments but progress could not be made. In MP, the M&E framework was shared with the EPCO. However, the Madhya Pradesh (MP) state government expects a broad architecture for the framework and not the specifics. In Sikkim the M&E framework was developed but the adoption of the same was not taken up. A common narrative in all three States was that the State Action Plan on Climate Change (SAPCC) was being revised and that therefore the M&E was found to be of little use currently and that the same may be considered once the new SAPCC is in place. The new SAPCC may take one to two years to be formulated.

In the case of **Outcome 2** (*SAPCCs operationalized and communities benefit from climate actions in the three states*), there are great disparities in the pilot projects, with many outliers in all states. The mix and match style of interventions make it difficult to form a coherent picture. Due to delays in the initial stages, many projects are still incomplete. As a result no conclusive statements regarding impacts can be made. There is a high risk that at least some pilots will be unable to fulfill their potential. This outcome would have been easier to measure had the logframe been used consistently. The utility of pilot projects to drive replicable change is promising but inconsistent, however they can be considered as incubators for the development of future projects.

The scrutiny of potential pilot project suggestions primarily took place at the SPMU level. In the absence of clear guidelines, their climate change specificity, additionality, innovation and potential replicability are not always clear. For example, Uttarakhand integrated forest development pilot, though laudable in terms of achieving convergence, lacks specificity and is not in line with stated objectives of 3SCA. Sikkim springshed pilot lacks innovation and additionality, leading to a duplication of previous efforts. Also, limited progress was made in making the State Governments understand the process by which the climate relevance of interventions may be ascertained. This resulted in various pilots being adopted in Outcome 2 of the project for which it is difficult to ascertain the climate relevance.

Helvetas was not involved in the selection of pilots as the pilots had already started by the time it became associated with the project. Helvetas has influenced the policy in Uttarakhand through the inclusion of a chapter on climate change in the Forest Department Working Plan for Chakrata Division. However, this was achieved without taking support of the pilot project on forest being undertaken in Uttarakhand. There is a need for better quality assurance on the process of selection of suitable pilot projects.

There has been sporadic action under **Outcome 3** (*Approach and experiences of the project gained national and international visibility*), there is considerable scope for improvement here. The approach of the project has been well received in international fora. The organisation of a workshop of North-Eastern states on Glacial Lake Outburst Floods (GLOF) is a welcome effort and has the potential to improve understanding of GLOFs and sensitise relevant parties regarding risk and vulnerability. The project participated in the UN Conference on Climate Change in 2017 and 2018 and in the World Mountain Forum 2018 to share its lessons and exchange knowledge. Maintaining a consistent presence at the Conference of the Parties (COP) is welcome and can be developed further for networking and knowledge exchange with interested parties.

Context and Relevance

The overall goal and design of the project is perceived to have been highly relevant by stakeholders to needs of the 3 states during its implementation period. Expectations that the SAPCCs would enhance access to external Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) funding have now shifted, due to external factors beyond the project's control, to making better use of existing department budgets and government schemes.

The design of the project implies that doing (Outcome 2) is a great way to learn, and build capacities (Outcome 1). In practice this has turned out to be true, and while some of the actions may still require significant follow-up before being replicable and impactful, it is apparent that these activities have been an incentive and focus giving traction to the more strategic and generic capacity building activities of the project. Surprisingly, given the small size of the project, the project actions have been cited by the smaller states as being the highlight of reporting on SAPCC to national government.

The relevance of the water sectors remains very high, both in the context of climate change adaptation and broader development. The other sectors are also perceived as highly relevant. In the view of the review team the disaster risk management activities are highly relevant, if not always perceived as the highest priority by all stakeholders. In the case of the forest actions the relationship to climate change specific actions needs to be more clearly articulated. It is possible in one case that applying a climate change approach within a general poverty reduction strategy to increase resilience has led to possible distortions in the selection of the most relevant activities from the perspective of communities. The climate change mitigation activities (energy) while clearly a priority for Uttarakhand were an outlier to the project which was otherwise focused on adaptation approaches.

Efficiency

The individual actions of the project, once started, have generally been efficiently implemented at a reasonable cost, but the project as a whole has struggled to utilise the overall time available to show impact. The range of sectors and geographies involving a considerable number of stakeholders have very likely contributed to the delays as has the late signing of the TA contract.

The project efficiency, and the number of stakeholders the project needs to engage with, is also influenced by the level, intensity and type of engagement with stakeholders at state capital, district and community scales. To date the main capacity building gains have been at the state capital level. The deepening of training to district level and community levels is foreseen, but it is too early to judge the project's approach.

Effectiveness

The project has been notably effective in facilitating a constructive engagement between a large number of state-level actors in the consultations, during 2016 and 2017, on selecting

project actions and in trainings. Sikkim stands out as an example of a collegiate approach between departments.

The wide scope of the project has resulted in a trade-off between efficiency and effectiveness. Given nature of the project design and the level of climate change capabilities and awareness the broad scope of the project does appear to have been a reasonable approach as stakeholders grappled with a new and complex topic that cuts across sectoral boundaries.

Financing the SAPCCs has rightly been a general capacity building topic, and there are also examples of the project's direct engagement with successful applications for project funding from national government climate change schemes (NAFCC and CCAP) and for utilising non climate change specific schemes for addressing climate change specific needs (MGNREGA). Nevertheless even in MP, with its competent and experienced EPCO leadership, it is accepted that there is still a long way to go.

SAPCC M&E is still at a formative stage and no clear consensus exists on the most appropriate way forward. Possibly there is an opportunity to use some of the projects learning and studies to inform the SAPCC revision process, but it might already be too late to do this. Other opportunities to either develop a generic IT architecture, or to develop sector, or indicator, specific approaches do not appear to have been considered in depth. The general approach to build generic M&E capacities is, in the context, a reasonable approach, but inevitably a slow one.

A large proportion of the actions (pilot projects and studies) indicate the potential to be highly effective. But critical work still remains to be done in almost all areas before the effectiveness can be demonstrated. For example documents (such as technical guidelines) are not yet available summarising the potential for replicating pilot projects. In addition the pilot projects even when completed may not be over a long enough timescale to generate the evidence required to scale-up.

It is now appropriate to consider whether a narrower focus would both accelerate and allow increased technical focus and concentration of resources on the most promising opportunities (see *Recommendations* section)

Impact

We can with some confidence say that climate change capacities at the state-level have been enhanced. But given that some of the most promising work of the project is still to prove its effectiveness the project is inevitably yet to translate these gains into significant impacts on communities.

A provisional assessment of the available evidence and context suggests that the Disaster Risk Management activities in both Sikkim and Uttarakhand have high potential and are relevant climate change adaptation specific actions – but with somewhat varying degrees of buy-in at the highest levels of the states depending on perceptions of hazards occurring. The spring rejuvenation activities are highly relevant action responding to a high priority state level issue that it is highly likely will be negatively impacted by climate change. The project approach is appropriate and ready to be scaled up (and were largely already ready for scale-up in Sikkim at the beginning of the project). The water sector initiatives in MP are a potentially cohesive body of innovative work and climate change specific work that is a high priority to the state because of its centrality to rural incomes. The work in the Disaster Risk

Management sector lags behind but this might be related to the remote location such as in the case of South Lhonak lake, or the innovative nature of the actions which could have caused some delay in implementation and impact is not yet visible. The forestry actions have been the most difficult to assess, and neither initiative, as things stand today, has a clear pathway through to impact. The energy sector reports in Uttarakhand are a self contained set of work that require little further project involvement. The tendering pathway forward for the pine needle initiative is straightforward.

Sustainability

The structures and processes initiated by the project at the state level, notably the CC working groups, and training capacity have created enhanced sustainable capacities. Inevitably sustainability of these capabilities are hard to pin down in terms of objective and verifiable indicators. The sustainability of the community level impacts are at this stage extremely hard to judge, nevertheless we can possibly predict that it is reasonable to expect that public funding will be available to support DRM, providing the approaches are technically robust and sustainable. For the water sector activities similarly it is likely that their economic and human development gains are so significant that they will attract funding providing the technical solutions advocated are robust and socially relevant.

4. Part Two - Second Phase Recommendations

Based on the evaluation, the project should be extended to a second phase to leverage the work already conducted and to intensify its efforts in focus areas. We offer the following recommendations for optimising the second phase of the project. The first set of recommendations is focused on strategic reorientation for the second phase; the second set focuses on M&E and the third set is about project implementation

Strategic Reorientation

1. In order to build synergies with other ongoing SDC projects (notably IHCAP) the project should **reorient its geographical focus to the Himalayan states of Sikkim and Uttarakhand**. This allows the project to build upon lessons learnt, avoid duplication of effort, and benefit from existing relationships.

There are costs associated with removing MP from the next phase, such as the loss of potentially successful pilot projects and visibility; such a move may affect relationship with MP state leadership, there may be a reduced impact on national policies (as SDC might get pigeonholed as being relevant only to mountain states).

However there are significant benefits as well. SDC energies can be focused; reduction of State PMUs to two (from three) would result in improved oversight, lower personnel costs and increased replicability of interventions due to the similar ecological setting of Sikkim and Uttarakhand.

On balance we believe that the benefits of coherence outweigh the costs of excluding MP from the second phase. MP has a very cohesive and innovative programme with a focus on water. However, when considering 3SCA as a whole, the proposed basin approach for the 2nd phase, and the proposed strong focus on Disaster Risk (see *below*), would make MP an outlier. It would still be feasible to keep working in MP, but this would not be in line with the broader strategic shift that is needed to ensure coherence.

2. The **sectoral focus of 3SCA should be narrowed to Disaster Risk Management** (including Disaster Risk Reduction) and **Water**. Of these DRR focused on Early Warning System (EWS) for GLOFs in Sikkim and Landslides in Uttarakhand would be ideal and climate change specific. IHCAP can be used for outreach to other Himalayan states as well as to gain inputs from VRAs that have already been conducted. While the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change is the nodal agency for climate change related activities in India engagement with the National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA), Ministry of Home Affairs, may also be enhanced to maintain diversified set of country partners. The role of NDMA would be critical also for the scaling out of the early warning system from Sikkim to other states of the Indian Himalayas and for policy influence.

3. **Socio-hydrology** should be used as a comprehensive framework to ensure coherence and to support integrated solutions at the intra-state basin-level. Decreasing water availability and precarious water access conditions as a result of climate change are critical issues in many mountain regions and drylands. At the same time, construction of dams for hydroelectricity, flood protection, and irrigation continues apace on a global scale and has led to a massive transformation of river systems with significant environmental and socioeconomic outcomes. Against these characteristic trends, the research field of socio-hydrology emerged recently as an attempt to better understand the interactions and feedback loops within water management systems. The complete set of environmental conditions and development trajectories in both, Uttarakhand and Sikkim, calls for an integrated socio-hydrological approach. Using this scientific approach in development planning helps to cope with diverse challenges ranging from food security over water-related hazards to insufficient water quality and associated health issues.

Socio-hydrology offers novel entry points for integrated engagements between the natural and social sciences across different scales ranging from the plot level to entire watersheds, and from rural to urban areas. Socio-hydrological interactions are highly spatially and temporally dynamic, having been shaped by the interplay of fluvial runoff, sediment loads, water distribution mechanisms, socioeconomic conditions, and external development interventions. Integrated approaches are emphasized on the international agenda, as e.g. the forthcoming 2019 IPCC Special Report on Climate Change Adaptation focuses on both the Physical Science basis and the **socioeconomic dimensions of impacts, adaptation, vulnerability and resilience**. The set of development challenges in Sikkim and Uttarakhand invites to couple social and environmental aspects in SAPCCs.

4. The scale of the project should be at **intra-state basins on the watershed level**. In the case of Sikkim it could be the Teesta Basin from the upper tributaries down to

Gangtok and in the case of Uttarakhand, it could be a basin such as Bhagirathi or Alaknanda. This would help integrate upstream communities with urban agglomerations, in this case the two state capitals. The inclusion of state capitals would ensure political buy-in and the inclusion of upstream towns and villages will help to ensure coherence as these are part of the same system. For example, the GLOF risk for Gangtok is interconnected to those of upstream communities.

5. We recommend that the focus of 3SCA in the second phase should be strategic and integrational in nature. As pilot projects have generally been individually tailored to specific priorities of state governments, they may distract from the holistic vision and lead to a disjointed development of the project. However, they have been effective in serving as “hooks” for ensuring the participation of State governments. To make the optimum use of pilot projects, **the process of selection of pilot projects should be redesigned** in the second phase (*see Recommendations 16 and 17*).
6. **Restructuring the chain of command to bring the project directly under the SDC** with backstopping support provided by Helvetas.
 - a. It is feasible to continue with the current structure of having the National PMU and the State PMU with UNDP. The advantage is that UNDP has good working relations with the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEFCC). However, this is suboptimal as it would lead to a continuance of support to non-strategic interventions. Also, the visibility to SDC will be low if the project is implemented with UNDP. The UNDP national leadership appears to have some reservations about giving the 3SCA a higher priority, as it is not part of their intended focus area. This would only add to the difficulty of a continued working relationship with the UNDP.
 - b. It would be preferable to have the National PMU at MoEFCC with employment contracts directly issued by SDC. Similarly, State PMUs may be placed with the Departments with direct employment contracts with SDC. This approach would be easier with a MoU in place between SDC and MoEFCC. This approach has the advantage of giving higher visibility to SDC and also provides much more direct control over the project activities.

Monitoring & Evaluation

7. The contribution of the second phase of the project to **operationalising the M&E of the SAPCCs should be contextualised within the core themes of the project**. Two important implications flow from this recommendation
 - a. There will be no project goal to explicitly operationalise M&E for the entirety of SAPCC, but only those parts of the SAPCC which are covered by the 3SCA's core themes.
 - b. The M&E work undertaken by the project (M&E of the 3SCA itself and support to the M&E of the SAPCCs) will be consolidated into one framework.

A consolidation of 3SCA's internal M&E framework with the M&E of the SAPCCs is intended to lead to a demonstration effect, the identification of shared indicators common to both internal and SAPCC M&E and to become a major contribution of the 3SCA.

8. It is recommended that a project **Performance Measurement Framework (PMF)**, consistent with point (b) in the paragraph above is prepared and formally approved by SDC once the proposed second phase goals and results are agreed. It is suggested that the PMF for the second phase follows standard practice and includes indicators for both higher and lower level achievements (from objectives to outputs) and a description of the tools to be used to collect the data for each indicator. It is further recommended that
 - a. At the beginning of phase 2 the project identifies indicators within the PMF which are of sufficient relevance and quality to be potential long term climate change indicators adopted by the state for use beyond the end of the second phase (and ideally adopted by the SAPCCs).
 - b. At the end of phase two the project undertakes a dedicated review of the progress made to measure the potential long term indicators identified under point (a) in the paragraph above and prepares technical guidelines for measuring climate change indicators within the core themes of the second phase and
 - c. The project facilitates a process with principal stakeholders in each State to select key performance indicators (KPIs) from amongst the indicators included in the technical guidelines under point (b) above. The project may wish to consider limiting the KPIs to 2, at least initially.
9. The **rationale for the M&E recommendations** in the above two paragraphs are based on the lesson learned during the first phase that operationalisation of a comprehensive M&E framework for the SAPCCs is beyond the resources of the project. In addition it is judged that the SAPCC M&E framework, and its subsequent operationalization, can be achieved in a more coherent manner within the context, and timeframes, of the work being undertaken to revise the SAPCCs.
10. It is recommended that during the process to identify high level **climate change indicators** the project considers the work already done by 3SCA and IHCAP on Vulnerability Risk Assessments (VRA). The combined experience gained by the two projects in developing the VRAs, and the VRAs themselves, can provide insight on how to measure the impact of interventions to reduce the vulnerability of mountain communities to climate change. This recommendation is based on the principle of first exploring the potential of existing data sources and capabilities to meet information needs before creating new demands on the already stretched data gathering capacities of State Governments.
11. It is recommended that resources are allocated at the beginning of the second phase for a study recommending pathways for introducing **technical platforms** that facilitate the collection, analysis and distribution of climate change specific indicators in general and specifically those included in the PMF that have potential to be used beyond the end of the project.

12. The general recommendation to focus the bulk of the project's M&E effort on to the core themes should not prevent the following;
 - a. The continuation of work by the project during the first phase to support line departments provide information on achievements relevant to the SAPCCs,
 - b. The participation in generic M&E training and capacity building events of line department staff involved in climate change related activities that are not directly part of the second phase core themes or
 - c. The development of technical platforms for managing data that have the potential to be used beyond the needs of the core themes.

Project implementation

13. As the Joint Steering Committee meetings could not take place as originally envisaged due to the lack of involvement of the MoEFCC, it is advisable to have an additional system in place to ensure effective steering. This may include the constitution of a **National Advisory Group** to provide guidance on strategic interventions and possible policy traction for various activities.
14. It would be useful to have an **Expert Group at the state level**. This would serve the purpose of ensuring quality of various reports and documents being produced. The group of experts would also provide inputs in terms of the relevance of the pilots to the climate change adaptation agenda.
15. With specific reference to point (a) in the paragraph above, it is recommended that the effective and efficient support provided by the project in Uttarakhand to line departments and the state climate change cell to **identify and consolidate reporting on existing expenditure** related to climate change should be (a) expanded to the other State(s) and (b) developed to include indicators of what has been achieved with this expenditure.
16. Implementation of a robust system of **quality assurance through independent external scientific review** (separate from the SDC and the proposed state level expert group) of proposed interventions, including pilot projects. This should be done to ensure interventions are climate specific, coherent and in line with overall project goals. This can be implemented through an international panel of experts or a single scientific reviewer to be consulted, as required. This is necessary as IPCC guidelines, global best practices and emerging scientific evidence should inform these interventions in order to ensure that:
 - a. SDC resources are invested to ensure maximum additionality in terms of climate change.
 - b. State governments and local expert groups have access to the most advanced climate change knowledge.
 - c. Interventions from comparable international geographical settings, for example on GLOFs in the Andes are drawn upon.

- d. Lessons drawn from 3SCA are scientifically robust, internationally replicable and credible. As an additional benefit, this would improve Outcome 3.
17. Any **pilot projects taken up should be highly collaborative** and have a focus on the learning process. Pilot projects should not be seen in terms of a wishlist of interventions that can be approved or not. Rather any pilot project should emerge through a collaborative exercise where the essential (must have) aspects of a pilot project are identified, and there is a focus on *iterative* and continuous improvement of the deliverables. It should be clear to all stakeholders that the success of the pilots is to be seen in terms of the learning generated and not specifically in terms of desired outcomes. To create space for the kind of intensive collaborative working style this requires, suitable personnel resources would need to be provided. A *Prince2 Agile* project management method would be ideally suited for this purpose.
18. If possible, there should be an involvement of an independent third party in the **quality assurance process for the 3SCA** as a whole. This process should take place regularly at predefined intervals of around 4-6 months and the timeline should be clearly communicated to all stakeholders. The necessary documentation, especially the log frame should be in place and used consistently.
19. A kick-off workshop at the beginning of the next phase should be used to generate a **vision document** through the participation of all stakeholders. This document typically answers questions such as: Why are we carrying out this project? Who is it for? What would a successful project look like? Such a document is useful in giving the team a shared vision, take ownership of the project and is something to refer back to when important decisions need to be taken: Would a given action be in line with our vision? Distinct from performance measurement and indicators, this is more informal, collaborative and generated organically by the team.
20. **Clearly documented guidelines** on best operating practices, necessary documentation and a basic framework of activities considered strategically relevant to ensure coherence. The existence of clear guidelines also ensures that there is minimal disruption due to personnel changes. The guidelines should be clearly communicated to all internal stakeholders and external stakeholder should be informed as necessary.
21. **Project Management by exception.** Norms should be clearly defined at the beginning of the phase and any deviations or problems with meeting them should be escalated to the NPMU and SDC. This will ensure that management resources are used effectively and changes can be made on the go, before a formal review is conducted. Project deliverables such as the creation of technical guidelines, on ground activities, deadlines should be clearly stated and the acceptable deviations should be stated. For example, say a delay of upto 2 months on a given target can be addressed by the state PMU, more extreme foreseeable delays would lead to an involvement of the proposed National Advisory Group, etc.
22. **Capacity enhancement of states on climate finance** should be emphasised. States should be sensitised about the availability of climate funds through centrally

sponsored schemes, multilateral and bilateral initiatives as well as international climate finance. But the emphasis should be on utilisation of existing and already budgeted funds.

23. **Capacity building trainings** for stakeholders on the Climate, Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction Integration Guidance (CEDRIG) tool developed by SDC or other similar tools by development sector agencies.

Part Three - Sector specific comments

Water

There is unanimity amongst state officials that water is the number one priority sector for all three states. Despite the diverse climate sensitive geographical contexts, all three states will be affected by Climate Change in the water sector and any action must take their specific climate vulnerabilities into account. The project is focused on springshed revitalisation in Uttarakhand and Sikkim and on groundwater recharge as well as the development of a Decision Support System and water policy for medium-scale schemes in Madhya Pradesh.

Due to the importance given by all states, this sector is likely to have a high degree of buy-in and should therefore continue to be a focus area of the project in the following phase.

The Decision Support System (DSS) for reservoir catchments and command areas in MP has the potential to be a very useful tool for 5 year planning. The DSS integrates climate change and is clearly required by the Department of Water Resources. However, for the tool to serve a larger purpose it would be necessary to have the tool being used not just by the water resources department but also other stakeholders such as agriculture and forest departments and farmers.

Aquifer recharge using shafts in MP is an innovative approach and is relevant from the both the state requirements and as well from a climate change perspective. The supply side management has also been matched by demand side management as well such as the promotion of System for Wheat Intensification.

The work on springs in Sikkim with focus on better measurements is unlikely to add value to the climate adaptation strategy or action on ground and would only provide better evidence that the spring shed management approaches works. This evidence is of limited value as at the national level spring shed rejuvenation is already recognized as a key activity in the Himalayas for climate change adaptation, making this effort superfluous.

Disaster

In order to respond to the increased frequency and severity of landslides in Uttarakhand resulting from torrential rainfall events, the project focused on an integrated technological approach which includes real-time weather data with high temporal resolution to capture rainfall intensity and spatial-temporal pattern of potential occurrence. The implementation of an effective Early Warning System depends on the integration of Automatic Weather Stations in the existing IMS network together with landslide susceptibility maps and community awareness campaigns. This project component is climate change specific and innovative (High relevance) in supporting state capacities to adapt to climate risks. The combination with risk sensitive awareness campaigns and appropriate mechanisms to secure maintenance of related infrastructure are required for the sustainability of project measures.

The formation and rapid increase of proglacial lakes in Sikkim increases the danger of devastating outbursts and calls for an effective Early Warning System. This project component is highly climate change specific and relevant for all stakeholders. So far the project focuses on South Lhonak lake, located in an upper valley head of northern Sikkim. Efforts to reduce the lake level by syphoning and widening of the lake outlet have been carried out. The installation of an effective permanent monitoring system coupled with an Early Warning System is planned. While such interventions are seen as relevant amongst all stakeholders, the remote location and harsh climatic conditions are regarded as main obstacles for successful implementation. An integrated GLOF risk concept needs to address the large number of existing glacial lakes, the diversity of potential outburst mechanisms and an effective Early Warning System, which strongly depends on agreed alarm signals and evacuation procedures. In this context, the involvement and participation of all stakeholders, including the Army and ITBP is necessary for the implementation of robust risk reduction measures.

Work on South Lhonak GLOF Disaster Risk Reduction is promising. However, the challenge will be to capture the lessons from the related activities and to replicate the scheme in other sites in Sikkim and beyond in the Indian Himalayan Region. The community preparedness part is being taken up by the State's Disaster Management Authority (SDMA). However, the pace at which it is being done and the prioritization of the locations for the training is a matter of concern. While the Chungthang town is widely recognized to be most vulnerable to a GLOF event, the SDMA prioritized Singtam to take up community sensitization exercises. Capacity building support for the SDMA needs to be continued. The involvement of the District Disaster Management Authority (DDMA) seems to be limited as of now and needs to be enhanced.

Forests

Sikkim Forest Corridor activity does not have a clear objective and appears to be a solution in search of a problem. If the objective is to reduce human animal conflict than the

current approach with a major focus on forest as a habitat for the black bear is unlikely to be sufficient. Although the use of forest corridors for biodiversity conservation is well established, and also climate change specific, this does not appear to be an aim of the SNA.

Energy

This sector was seen as relevant only by the state of Uttarakhand. There already has been a report by Helvetas which is sufficient for the requirement. The impact or effectiveness cannot be estimated at present, however if forest pine needles are pursued as an energy source, this report could form basis for further action.

Considering the low relevance for the other two states and the lack of clearly identified climate specific action areas, this sector can be scaled down. This sector is ideally suited to public-private partnerships, therefore SDC can at best play an advisory role, with very low returns on project resources.

Annex 1: 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.

State	Ecosystem	Key Sectors
Madhya Pradesh	Semi-Arid	Water
Sikkim	Himalayan Ecosystem	Forest, Water and Disaster Management
Uttarakhand	Himalayan Ecosystem	Forest, Water, Energy and Disaster Management

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.

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 Uttarakhand 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”

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.

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.

Steps / Action Items	Period
Contracts with Review team (International and National Expert)	December 2019
Kick-off meeting (review team with SDC in Bern and New Delhi) (via Lync/video conferencing)	Third week of January 2019
Desk review of relevant project documents, review reports, minutes of meetings, workshop details, media coverage and all other materials related to the project	21.01.19 – 30.01.19
Meeting with SDC Bern and Helvetas	Fourth week of January 2019
Meeting with GPCCE India, UNDP team, 3SCA PMU and MOEFCC	04.02.2019
Field visits, Stakeholder interactions and interviews	05.02 – 10.02.19
Report preparation (draft) + additional interviews	11.02 – 17.02.2019
Debriefing session and Presentation to SDC	18.02.19
Draft Report	07.03.19
Final report after incorporation of comments	05.04.19
Financial Accounts and closure of contract	30.04.19

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.

Annex 2: Review of the 3SCA Project: Meeting and Travel Schedule

S. No.	Steps / Action Items	Proposed dates	Time	Steps / Action Items
1	Arrival in Delhi	Sunday, 3rd Feb, 2019		Arrival in Delhi
2	Inception meetings in Delhi SDC, UNDP, MoEFCC	Monday, 4th Feb		Meetings organized in Delhi with SDC, UNDP, MoEFCC
3	Travel to Dehradun	Monday 4th Feb		Travel to Dehradun (evening flight Indigo - 4:45 P.M.)
4	Meetings at Dehradun	Tuesday 5th Feb	10:00 am-12:00 pm	Meeting with State PMU. Progress Update on project LFA/ Presentations on pilots etc.
5			12.00-1.00 pm	Meeting with SNA R N Jha
6			01:00- 02:00 pm	Lunch
7			02:00-03:00 pm	Interaction with climate working group officers chaired by Mr RN Jha, Nodal Officer. Participating Officers: Mr Vineet Mall/Mr. Tyagi, CPO, UREDA (Energy), Mr. Nileema Garg, GM, Jal Sansthan; Namita Tripathi, Executive Engineer, Pey Jal Nigam, Mr. N. K. Yadav, Chief Engineer, Irrigation Dept (Water), Mr Krishna Sajwan/Dr Piyoosh Rautela, USDMA (Disaster Management) , Neeraj Sharma, ACF, Mr. Prasanna Patro, CF, Yamuna Circle (Forest), Mr PS Yadav, Animal husbandry, Dr Latika, Deptt of Agriculture , Dr Manoj, Scientist (geoinformatics) FRI, Mr Mahendra Pal, Horticulture, Mr DC Arya, DFO, Chakrata
8			03:00-05:00 pm	<i>Individual meetings -</i> 1. Mr. Jai Raj - PCCF-HoFF 2. Mr. DJK Sharma, Addl. PCCF (Forest)
9	Field Visit to Forestry Sector Pilot site, Feri-Kimora, Tehri Garhwal	Wednesday 6th Feb	9.00 am	Start from Dehradun
10			10:30 am-2:00 pm	Walk through the forest pilot village (Pheri-Khimoda), and community interaction
11			2:00 pm- 3:00 pm	Lunch

12			3.00 - 4:00 pm	Interaction with Block and District Level Officers, Chief Development Officer, Block /development Officer and sectoral officers
13			4.30 pm	Travel back to Dehradun
14	Meetings at Dehradun and return to Delhi	Thursday 7th Feb	10.00 am -12.00 pm	<i>Individual meetings -</i> 1. UREDA (Mr Tyagi) 2. USDMA (Dr Routela) 3. Peyjal Nigam (Chief Engg)
			12:00 - 13:00	Summary/ debriefing with SPMU
15			1.00-2.00 pm	Travel back to Delhi (Flight) and fly onwards to Bhopal
17				
18	Travel to Bhopal, MP	Friday 8th Feb	10.00- 11.00 am	Meeting with SPMU
19	Meetings at Bhopal		11:00am-12:00 pm	Meeting with SNA, EPCO
20			12:00-1:30 pm	Meeting with Water Resources Deptt officials
21			1:30-2:30 pm	Lunch
22			2:30-3:30 pm	Meeting with DHI for DSS
23			3:30-6:30 pm	Leave from Bhopal-Indore by Road/Rail. Night Stay at a Hotel in Indore
24		Saturday 9th Feb		
25	Field visit at Ratlam- Participatory Ground Water Management	Saturday 9th Feb	8.00 - 11.00 am	Travel - Indore to Ratlam (by road)
26			11.00 am - 1.00 pm	Field visit and interaction with community
27			1.30 - 2.30 pm	Lunch at Ratlam
28			3.00 - 6.00 pm	Travel to Indore (by road)
29			After 6.00 pm	Travel to Delhi (flight)
30	Travel to Gangtok, Sikkim	Sunday 10th Feb		Travel Delhi-Bagdogra-Gangtok
31	Meetings at Gangtok	Monday 11th Feb	10:30-12:30 pm	SNA: DSTCC (Mr. Dhiren Shrestha: Additional Director - Discussion on overall Project achievements and Ice Stupas)
32			1:30-3:00 pm	RM&DD (Ms. Sarika Pradhan: Additional Secretary & Dr.S.Dhakal OSD Spring-shed Prog RMDD) - Discussion on Spring Shed Management
33			3:00-4:30 pm	FEWMD (Mr. Bhuwan Pradhan; CCF - Discussion on Pilot on Forest Corridor)

34	Meetings and travel to Ice-Stupa pilot	Tuesday 12th Feb	10:00am-12:00 pm	SSDMA/LRDM (Mr. Rinzing C Bhutia, Sp Secy, Mr. GC Khanal Addl Director -Discussion on GLOF DRR pilot)
35			12:00-6:00 pm	Gangtok to Lachen
36	Field visit - Ice-Stupa pilot	Wednesday 13th Feb	7:00-09:00 am	Lachen to Thangu (Pilot Project Site for Ice-Stupa)
37			9.00-10.00 am	Thangu; Presentation by DSTCC at Pilot Site
38			10.00am-1.00 pm	Thangu to Chungthang for DRR - GLOF
39			1.00-2.30 pm	Interaction with communities
40			2.30-6.00 pm	Chungthang to Gangtok (Stay at Gangtok)
41	Travel to Delhi	Thursday 14th Feb	Travel to Delhi	Travel Gangtok-Bagdogra-Delhi
42	At Delhi	15th Feb--17th Feb		Report writing up and preparing for debriefing
43		Monday 18th Feb		Debriefing in SDC Delhi, Departure From Delhi