

Inception Report

Interim Evaluation of “Improving the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to Climate Change Related Impacts in Viet Nam” Project

Project ID : 00088033
PIMS : 5708
GCF ID: FP013

UNDP Viet Nam – December 2019

Dr. Arun Rijal (Independent International Consultant)
Mr Pham Quang Nam (Independent National Consultant)

Inception Report

Interim Evaluation of “Improving the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to Climate Change Related Impacts in Viet Nam” Project

UNDP Viet Nam – December 2019

INTRODUCTION

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has two overarching objectives, namely to promote accountability for the achievement of GEF/GCF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance of the partners involved in GEF/GCF activities; and to promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF/GCF and its partners, as basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, programme management, and projects and to improve knowledge and performance. With this in mind, this Interim Evaluation (IE) has been initiated by UNDP Viet Nam as the GCF Accredited Entity for the Interim Evaluation of “Improving the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to Climate Change Related Impacts in Viet Nam” project, to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of Project activities in relation to the stated objectives and to collate lessons learned. This inception report outlines the proposed methodology, issues, milestones, work tasks and schedule for the IE in order to

- inform relevant stakeholders to the project that UNDP is conducting this evaluation; and
- have a common understanding on the evaluation approach, methodologies, work plan and key milestones.

BACKGROUND

Vietnam is a country in South East Asia with a total 331,212km² of landmass and population of 91.7million and population density of 276.03/km. The elongated roughly S shaped country has a north-to-south distance of 1,650km and is about 50km wide at the narrowest point. With Coast line of 3,260km, excluding islands, Vietnam claims 12 nautical miles as the limit of its territorial waters, an additional 12 nautical miles as a contiguous customs and security zone. The country is divided into the highlands, and the Red River Delta in the north; and the central mountains or the Chine Annamitique, the coastal lowlands, and the Mekong Delta in the south. Vietnam is one of the twenty-five counties considered to possess a uniquely high level of biodiversity. It is ranked 16th worldwide in biological diversity, being home to approximately 16% of the world’s species. 15,986 species of flora have been identified in the country, of which 10% are endemic.

The country’s diverse geography means it is hit by typhoons, landslides, flooding and droughts, weather events expected to worsen in coming years. Vietnam is among the most vulnerable nations to climate change impacts according to a recent International Panel on Climate Change report. A new report released by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) on the potential impacts of a 1.5C rise in global temperatures above pre-industrial averages. The report found that massive, destabilizing climate events could start impacting global society as soon as 2040, within the lifetime of most people alive today. Within the report, presented to the Vietnamese government in Hanoi on October 10, Vietnam was named among nine countries where at least 50 million people will be exposed to impact of rising sea levels and more powerful storms, among other dangers. The most serious threats facing Vietnam over the next couple of decades is that Vietnam is among

the top countries vulnerable to climate change. More extreme weather events may come faster than anticipated and more frequently.

Vietnam's geography leaves it vulnerable to a number of calamities. Most of its 1,800 mile-long coastline faces the East Sea, which numerous tropical storms and typhoons traverse every year. The mountainous far north is prone to landslides and flash flooding, while the flat Mekong Delta in the Deep South is among the most vulnerable regions in the world to raising sea levels. Vietnam's agricultural development not only support food security of this country but also contributes to global food security. With climate change and sea level rise, the projection is that if sea levels increase by up to 3.3feet then 40 percent of the Mekong Delta will be inundated, so we would lose 40 percent or even more of agriculture and aquaculture production. Poor communities living in coastal regions of Viet Nam are adversely impacted by frequent flooding. Each year approximately 60,000 houses are destroyed or damaged by floods and storms in coastal provinces. Effect of climate change on economy make it increasingly difficult for vulnerable families to escape the cycle of poverty.

The objective of GCF project "Improving the resilience of Vulnerable coastal communities to climate change related impacts in Viet Nam" is to reduce vulnerability of communities to the adverse impacts of climate change through improving Resilience of vulnerable Coastal Communities to Climate Change related impacts by scaling up interventions that are already tested in increasing the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities. Building on ongoing social protection programmes related to housing for the poor and marginalized, the project will incorporate storm and flood resilient design features in new houses benefitting 20,000 poor and highly disaster-exposed people. As part of an integrated response to managing flood and cyclone risks, 4000 hectares of mangroves will be rehabilitated and/or planted to function not only as storm surge buffers, but also to provide ecosystem resources that can support coastal livelihoods. Moreover, to support and sustain both the impact of this project as well as future requisite government policy adjustments that strengthen the resilience of coastal and other communities, resources will be used to systematize climate and economic risk assessments for private and public sector application in all 28 coastal provinces of Viet Nam.

Project aims to address these problems by:

- designing and building houses of vulnerable communities resilient to flood and storm.
- improving and making effective management of land or forests to contribute to disaster risk reduction as well as to CO₂ emissions reduction.
- supporting to establish disaster database and to make climate policy/regulatory frameworks evidence based.

Because it believes that:

- Houses designed to resist flood and storm will protect lives and properties of vulnerable communities.
- Improving status and management of mangrove forests will decrease damage caused by floods and storms.
- Enhancing capacities of the communities helps to improve monitoring and management of forest and land.
- Evidence based policy and programs will help to decrease damages caused by disasters or climate risks and also enhance resistance to such events.

APPROACH

1. The IE or Mid-term Review is an independent review and the team will, wherever possible, try to evaluate issues according to the criteria listed in the *UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*, namely:
 - Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organisational policies, including changes over time.
 - Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
 - Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

- Coherence – coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
 - Results – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
 - Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.
2. The evaluation will be undertaken in keeping with the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement as outlined in the *Guidance for Conducting Interim Evaluation of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects (2014)*.

METHODOLOGY

The Interim Evaluation will commence on 26th November 2019 and will be completed as soon as possible after the end of the current field mission that starts on the 13th December 2019. The draft final report will be submitted to UNDP Vietnam by 15th January 2020. Comments will then be invited by UNDP on the report who will coordinate the process, and the evaluators will provide a final version shortly thereafter (typically within a few days, but making allowance for possible other work commitments). The evaluators' contracts stipulate 30th March 2020 as the date of the final milestone.

The Evaluation will be evidence-based wherever possible and will be conducted through the following participatory approach:

- a thorough review of project documents and other relevant texts, including all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline funding proposal submitted to the GCF, the Project Document, project proposal, project reports including Annual Performance Report, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environment & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).
- extensive face-to-face and if necessary Skype interviews with the project management and technical support staff, including some members of the Project Implementation Units. Throughout the evaluation, particular attention will be paid to explaining carefully the importance of listening to stakeholders' views and in reassuring staff and stakeholders that the purpose of the evaluation is not to judge performance in order to apportion credit or blame but to measure the relative success of implementation and to determine learnt lessons for the wider GEF/GCF context. The confidentiality of all interviews will be stressed and will be paramount. Wherever quotes from interviews are used in the final report, they will be unattributed to an individual unless they wish otherwise. Wherever possible, and within time constraints, information collected will be cross-checked between various sources to ascertain its veracity.
- face-to-face interviews with local stakeholders, DNA, project team, task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, project steering committee, government staff, local government, community members, UNDP CO, UNDP-GEF/GCF Regional Technical Advisors, other NGOs and the beneficiaries. IE team will conduct field missions to project sites in at least 3 project provinces in the north, centre and southern areas of Viet Nam.

Unlike some evaluations, interviews will not be carried out using a set of interview guidelines which the lead evaluator finds too inflexible. Instead, interviews are carried out informally, perhaps focussed on certain key points, thereby allowing the evaluator to pick up on certain issues and draw vital information

out from what often starts as a seeming “throw-away” answer to a question. Long experience has proved the efficacy of this method. Preparation is not required by the interviewee and there are no “right” or “wrong” answers. It is people’s experiences, insights, reflections, and suggestions with or on the project that are important. An opportunity will be given by all interviewees to ask questions of the evaluators.

IE team will review progress towards results. This is to be assessed based on data provided, amongst others, in the project document, project work plan as well as results verified in the course of the IE mission.

i. Project Strategy and/or design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF Financed Projects for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future, catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved resilience etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?

- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the project’s M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project applied adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii. **Progress Towards Results/ Outcomes Analysis:**

- IE team will populate the Table 1 below to summarize the progress. IE team will complete the column “End of the project Level and Assessment” and conclude whether the end-of-project target: a) has already been achieved (coloured the “final level & Assessment” green); is partially achieved or on target to be achieved by the end of the project (coloured yellow); or c) at high risk of not being achieved by the end of the project and needs attention (colour red). When possible, the IE team will review the indicator-level progress reported in the most recent PIR. Any deviations from the results reported in the PIR will be noted and explained.

Table 1: Progress towards results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against Mid-of-project Targets)

Project strategy	Indicators	Baseline level	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target	End of the project Target	End of the Project level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator :							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator4:							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key: **Green**= Achieved **Yellow**= On target to be achieved **Red**= Not on target to be achieved

In accordance with UNDP/GEF evaluation requirements, the overall project performance, project results, implementation, stakeholder participation, and M&E systems will be rated according to the criteria given in Table 2 while sustainability will be evaluated as per Table 5.

TABLE 2: CRITERIA USED TO EVALUATE THE PROJECT BY THE END-TERM EVALUATION TEAM

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major objectives, and yield substantial benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major objectives, and yield satisfactory benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major objectives or yield some of the expected benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve some of its major objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major objectives or to yield any satisfactory benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Management Arrangements

GCF Accredited Entity (UNDP) execution factors will include:

- Whether there is an appropriate focus on results
- The adequacy of UNDP support to the Executing Entity and Project Team
- Quality and timeliness of technical support to the Executing Entity and Project Team
- Candor and realism in annual reporting
- The quality of risk management
- Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any)
- Any salient issues regarding project duration, for instance to note project delays, and how they may have affected project outcomes and sustainability
- Adequate mitigation and management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP Environmental and Social screening procedure.

Executing Entity's execution factors will include:

- Whether there is an appropriate focus on results and timeliness?
- Adequacy of management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement
- Quality of risk management
- Candor and realism in reporting
- Government ownership (when national execution)
- Adequate mitigation and management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP

Work Plan

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been solved.
- Identify if work-planning process are results-based. If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since the project start.

Finance and Co-Finance

- Whether strong financial controls have been established that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time and allow for the timely flow of funds and the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Variances between planned and actual expenditures.
- Whether the project demonstrates due diligence in the management of funds, including annual audits.
- Any changes made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Project level M&E Systems

- The quality of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan's implementation: Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation thus far? Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- The appropriateness of the M&E systems to the project's specific context.
- Do the monitoring tools provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
- The extent to which the Project Team is using inclusive, innovative, and participatory monitoring systems
- The extent to which follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, were taken in response to the PIRs
- The extent to which development objectives are built into monitoring systems: How are perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed? How are relevant groups'

(including women, indigenous peoples, children, elderly, disabled, and poor) involvement with the project and the impact on them monitored?

- Adequate mitigation and management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP Environmental and Social screening procedures.

Stakeholder Engagement

MTR will include Stakeholder involvement in regard to:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: How have stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? Are there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities? Is there invested interest of stakeholders in the project’s long-term success and sustainability?

Reporting

The findings section of the MTR report on reporting will include:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the Project Team and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs?) and suggest trainings etc. if needed.
- Assess how the PIRs have been shared with the Project Board and other key stakeholders.
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners and incorporated into project implementation.

Communications

The MTR report section on communications will include:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and long-term investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?).
- Discuss possibilities for expansion of educational or awareness aspects of the project to solidify a communications program, with mention of proper funding for education and awareness activities.
- Suggest aspects of the project that might yield excellent communications material, if applicable.

Project Implementation Rating

Based on the above-mentioned assessment of the categories above, the MTR team will assign one overall Project Implementation and Adaptation Management rating from the 6-point scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):

Table 3: Project Implementation & Adaptation Management Rating Scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Sustainability

The sustainability will be analysed for four GEF categories of sustainability (financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance, and environmental). Sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. At the End of the project-term evaluation, the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes will be assessed.

TABLE 4: SCALE USED TO EVALUATE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE PROJECT

Likely (L)	There are negligible risks affecting this dimension of sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future.
Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained.
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are substantial risks that affect this dimension of sustainability such that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.
Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability such that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained.

vi. Country Ownership

- To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- Is the project as implemented responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

vii. Gender equity

- Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

- What role has the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

x. Replication and Scalability

- What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

Conclusions & Recommendations

- The evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁷ Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The evaluation team in total will not make more than 15 recommendations.

A report will be produced largely in keeping to the format provided in Annex I. The delivery status of each of the project's indicators will be rated using the scale outlined above (Table 1). All recommendations made will provide details of who is responsible for carrying out the action, what the task and its timeframe are, and what the deliverable should be. Where a formal recommendation is inappropriate, a suggestion may be made instead. Appropriate lessons learned extracted from the evaluation will be included.

As indicated above, comments will be sought from stakeholders on the draft final report. The period for this is usually around two weeks but this period will be determined by the UNDP CO, not by the evaluation team. Since the evaluation report is an independent view, the only changes that will be made to the text will be those pertaining to factual errors. However, to ensure complete transparency of views and to ensure that all parties' views are fully reflected, all other comments received on the draft will be added verbatim as attributed footnotes in the final report. The evaluators reserve the right to respond to these comments, also as footnotes. The efficacy of this method has been proven on numerous previous evaluations and is now encouraged by many Regional Technical Advisors.

MILESTONES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

13. As indicated above, there are six milestones that the evaluation will meet:

- Signing of the contract documents and initiation of review of the project document (26th November 2019)
- Inception Report where the consultant clarifies objectives and methodologies of Interim Evaluation and further feedback on the review of project document (9th December 2019)
- Interim Evaluation mission to Vietnam (14th November - 28th December 2019)
- Stakeholder consultation workshop/sharing of initial findings (27th December 2019)
- Submission of draft final report (15th January 2020 or as close as possible)
- Submission of Final report (to be determined by the UNDP CO and the consultation process, but no later than 15th March 2020 but it may change based on the date of the receipt of the comments)

KEY ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

Elements of the project design that the MTR must review include:

- The extent to which lessons from other relevant projects were incorporated into the project design.
- The extent to which the project addresses country priorities and is country-driven. Is the project concept in line with national development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Are activities of the project appropriate to address the issues of Coastal communities of Vietnam?
- The sustainability and viability of the project. Externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, change in national situation etc.) relevant to the project strategy.
- Whether thorough environmental and social risks identified through the UNDP Environmental and Social screening procedure and adequate mitigation and management measures outlined in the Project Document?
- Decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- The extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- Overall effectiveness of project in meeting its targets
- Have anticipated impacts been observed?
- Effectiveness of implementation arrangements between government institutions and other stakeholder, and lessons learned
- Effectiveness of improved capacity and institutional arrangement
- Efficiency in implementation of activities and management
- Has project been able to address problems related to disasters along the coastal areas?
- Are arrangements made to make outcome of the project intervention sustainable?
- What difference compared to previous attempts was made by this project?

Key Questions

1. What percentage of target houses (vulnerable to storm and flood) from the target coastal sites are designed following the flood and storm-resistant design?
2. What different types of resilient livelihoods introduced in the project sites?
3. How many hectares of mangrove regenerated/planted?
4. What management arrangement is made to monitor and manage mangrove habitat?
5. What capacity enhancement programs conducted to enhance capacity of community groups to manage the mangrove habitat?
6. What knowledge products developed based on the lessons learned for the policy makers and communities?
7. Has disaster database updated and also is risk data repository with mechanisms for sharing/disseminating information done?
8. Has policy support for planning of line ministries staffs at the national and sub-national levels to apply disaster/loss information to influence climate resilient planning done?
9. Has analysis of risk transfer mechanisms for insurance, including for cases of large scale coastal climate related disaster done?

Institutional Arrangement

- a) The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's IE is UNDP Vietnam in coordination with the project office.
- b) The Commissioning Unit will contract consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangement within the country for the IE.
- c) The Project Management Unit (PMU) will be responsible for liaising with IE to provide all relevant administrative and financial support to provide documents, set up stakeholder interviews and arrange field visit for the completion of the work.

- d) The expected frequency of the reporting is as stated in the Expected Deliverable mentioned in the contract document, but dates will vary as it may be delayed due to delayed in hiring of national consultant and also due to delay in initiation of IE.

Report Format

i. Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)

- Title of UNDP supported GCF financed project
- UND Evaluation time frame and date of report
- Region and countries included in the project
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Table of Contents

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)

- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

2. Introduction and overview (2-3 pages)

- Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, approach and data collection methods, limitations to the Evaluation
- Structure of the Interim Evaluation report

3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)

- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Steering Committee, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Findings (12-14 pages)

4.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design
- Results Framework/Logframe

4.2 Progress Towards Results

- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4.4 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic impacts to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)

5.1 Conclusions

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Evaluation's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2 Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- The Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- Evaluation mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed

- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form
- Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim evaluation report.

Annex 1: The Interim Evaluation ToR.

Annex 2: Draft Evaluation Criteria

Below are some of the possible questions to be asked during the IE. However, some of the questions may be modified based on feedback from stage one and part of stage two of the IE process.

Evaluation Criteria/Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Relevance: How does the project related to the main objective of the GEF focal area, country priorities and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project objectives and activities related to objective of GEF focal area and priorities at national, local and regional level • Consistency and contribution to GEF focal area objectives and to national development strategies • Stakeholder views on project significance and potential impact related to the project objective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents, report vs GEF document and Government development plans • Interview with authorities at different level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project report review in the light of GEF document and government's national development priorities • Interviews with relevant personnel
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Achievements: Are there indications that the project has completed its Mid-term targets that contributed to, or enabled progress towards reduced damage to live and property of vulnerable communities, reduction in CO ₂ emission and also reduction in intensity of storm or flood due to mangrove forests and plans are evidence based?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies/strategies formulated/amended based on evidence of climate risks and disaster loss or damage. • Improved monitoring mechanism • Technical capacity of relevant institution and communities strengthened. • Regular monitoring helped to generate updated information which helped National Communication and also evidence-based planning exercise. • Improved level of awareness made activities sustainable. • Measurable improvements from baseline levels in technical knowledge and skills of targeted staff/other stakeholders. • Measurable improvements from baseline levels in the emission and improvement in environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Reports • Interview with stakeholders. • Observation in the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of project reports/documents. • Interaction with local to national level stakeholders. • Field observation.
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently in-line with international and national norms and standards?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonableness of the costs relative to scale of outputs generated • Efficiencies in project delivery modalities Consistency and contribution to GEF focal area objectives and to national development strategies • Changes in project circumstances that may have affected the project relevance and effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial statements • Project structure and function • Project document and annual reports • Experience of project staffs and other relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of financial statements. • Analysis of project structure and functionalities • Analysis of project circumstances in project document (past and present) • Interaction with relevant stakeholders
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of achievement of expected outcomes or objectives to date • Long term changes in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in the ground situation observed. • Policy/strategy or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report with information on effective implementation of

achieved?	<p>forest/mangrove management processes, practices and awareness that can be attributable to the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced capacity of relevant institutions • Favourable management option and effective implementation of efficient and sustainable forest production and utilisation • Participation of women in every activities of the project 	<p>program formulation activities included women and their issues incorporated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies/strategies/ programs effectively implemented • Institutions strengthened 	<p>activities and strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on intuition setup • Interaction with the policy level people to ground level communities and field staffs. • Polity document review report. • Field verification of activities
<p>Impacts: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress towards reduced emission of greenhouse gases and stress on the natural resources and/or improved environment status?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Favourable policies/strategies formulated/amended • Improved monitoring mechanism • Technically capacity of relevant institution strengthened. • Regular monitoring helped to generate updated information which helped National Communication and also evidence-based planning exercise. • Improved level of awareness made activities sustainable. • Measurable improvements from baseline levels in technical knowledge and skills of targeted staff/other stakeholders. • Measurable improvements from baseline levels in the emission and decrease in intensity of flood and storm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Reports • Interview with stakeholders. • Observation in the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of project reports/documents. • Interaction with local to national level stakeholders. • Field observation.
<p>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</p>			
<p>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree to which outputs and outcomes are embedded within the institutional framework (policy, laws, organizations, procedures) • Implementation of measures to assist financial sustainability of project results • Observable changes in attitudes, beliefs and behaviours as a result of the project • Measurable improvements from baseline levels in knowledge and skills of targeted staffs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project report • Observation in the field • Interview with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of project reports. • Observation in the field to see impact on the ground • Interaction with stakeholders

Annex 3: Draft Schedule

Mission starts from 14th December and end on 27th December 2019. (Meeting dates may change)

Date	Agenda	Key partners	Venue	Remarks
14 Dec 2019	International Consultant departure from Kathmandu	Airlines	KTM-BKK-HNA	
15 Dec	International consultant arrives in Hanoi Meeting with National Consultants	Airlines/Hotel	Hanoi	Working with the national consultant and also meeting with two consultants involved in the project.
16 Dec	Meeting with various stakeholders in Hanoi	UNDP Project Team Government Counterparts		
17 Dec	Working in Thanh Hoa province	Provincial agencies Communities and households		
18-19 Dec	Working in Quang Ngai	Provincial agencies Communities and households		
20 Dec	Working in Hanoi	Project stakeholders in Hanoi		
21 Dec	Preparation for consultation workshop			
23-24 Dec	National consultant working in Ca Mau International consultant working in Hanoi	Provincial agencies Communities and households Project stakeholders in Hanoi		
25 Dec	Preparation for consultation workshop			
26 Dec	Consultation workshop			
27 Dec	International consultant departs			
28 Dec	Arrive Kathmandu			

Note: Efforts is being made by the National consultant and project team to arrange meetings with stakeholders in provinces and also Hanoi so more detail schedule (work plan) will be available soon.

Annex 4: Deliverables Schedule

Deliverables	Time frame
Desk review of documents, preparation of Work Plan and Inception Report (home-based)	TL: 04 days and TM: 02 days
Stakeholders Meeting and interviews/field visits	TL: 12 days and TM: 12 days
Meeting with PMU, internal presentation on initial findings, preparation presentation	TL: 01 day and TM: 01 day
Workshop presentation- debriefing/handout key findings presented to stakeholders	TL: 01 day and TM: 01 day
Preparation of the draft MTR report	TL: 06 days and TM: 04 days
Revision of the draft MTR report to address comments/suggestions from stakeholders and inclusion of audit trial.	TL: 04 days and TM: 01 day
Total number of man days	28 days/25 days