



Government of Malawi



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*



Interim
Evaluation
Report

SAVING LIVES AND PROTECTING AGRICULTURE-BASED LIVELIHOODS IN MALAWI: SCALING UP THE USE OF MODERNIZED CLIMATE INFORMATION AND EARLY WARNINGS SYSTEMS

GCF ID: FP002
UNDP ID: 5710

International Evaluator and Team Leader: Dr. Amal Aldababseh
National Evaluator: Dr. Judith Kamoto

November 2020

Cover photo credit: National IE consultant.

i. Table of Contents

i. Table of Contents	2
iii. Acronyms and abbreviations	4
Executive Summary	7
Project Description	7
Project Progress Summary.....	7
Interim Evaluation Rating and Achievement	10
A concise summary of conclusions.....	11
Recommendations Summary	12
1. Introduction.....	14
1.1 Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and Objectives.....	14
1.2 Scope and Methodology	14
1.3 Limitations	15
1.4 Structure of the Interim Evaluation Report	15
2. Project Description and Background Context.....	17
2.1 Development context.....	17
2.2 Problems that the project sought to address threats and barriers targeted	17
2.3 Project Description and Strategy	17
2.4 Project Implementation Arrangements.....	18
2.5 Project timing and milestones	18
2.6 Main stakeholders	19
3. Findings.....	21
3.1 Project Strategy	21
3.1.1 Project Design	21
3.1.2 Results Framework/ Logical framework.	23
3.2 Relevance	25
3.3 Progress Towards Results.....	26
3.3.1 Progress towards outcomes analysis.....	26
3.3.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective	32
3.4 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management.....	34
3.4.1 Management Arrangements	34
3.4.2 Work planning	37
3.4.3 Finance and co-finance	38
3.4.4 Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities ..	42
3.4.5 Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems	42
3.4.6 Stakeholder engagement.....	44
3.4.7 Reporting.....	45
3.4.8 Communications.....	45
3.5 Project Progress against GCF Criteria.....	46
3.5.1 Impact potential	46
3.5.2 Paradigm shift potential	47
3.5.3 Sustainable development potential	48

3.5.4 Needs of the recipients and Country Ownership	49
3.5.5 Efficiency and Effectiveness	50
3.6 Sustainability	51
3.6.1 Financial risks to sustainability.....	52
3.6.2 Socio-economic to sustainability	52
3.6.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability	52
3.6.4 Environmental risks to sustainability	53
3.7 Innovativeness in results areas.....	53
3.8 Environmental and social safeguards and progress concerning the gender action plan.	53
3.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative.	54
3.10 Replication and Scalability.	54
4. Conclusions and recommendations	56
4.1 Conclusions.....	56
4.2 Recommendations.....	56
4.2.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project.....	57
4.2.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce the initial benefits of the Project.....	57
4.2.3 Proposals for future directions underlining the main objectives.....	58
4.2.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success.....	58
5. Annexes.....	59
5.1 Interim Evaluation ToR	60
• Fluency in written and spoken English is essential. Ability to write reports, make presentations	69
5.2 List of documents reviewed	72
5.3 Example Questionnaire used for data collection	76
5.4 Interim Evaluation Agenda.....	78
5.5 List of persons interviewed	80
5.6 Interim Evaluation Rating Scales	83
5.7 Interim Evaluation matrix	84
5.8 Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form	92
5.9 Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form	93
5.10 Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft IE report.....	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Interim Evaluation Ratings and Achievement Summary Table for M-CLIMS Project	11
Table 2. Overview of the Interim Evaluation of the Project's Log Frame	24
Table 4. Matrix for Rating the Achievement of Outputs.....	27
Table 5. Annual Work Plans versus Actual Expenditures	38
Table 6. UNDP GCF Project Funds Disbursement Status (June 2020 in US\$).....	40
Table 7. UNDP resources disbursement status (June 2020 in US\$)	40
Table 8. Co-financing Status	41

iii. Acronyms and abbreviations

ACPCs	Area Civil Protection Committee
ADCs	Area Development Committees
AEDC	Agriculture Extension District Coordinator
APRs	Annual Performance Reports
AWPs	Annual Work Plans
CI	Climate Information
CDRs	Combined Delivery Reports
CO	Country Office
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease- 2019
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
AEDO	Agriculture Extension Development Officer
DAES	Department of Agriculture Extension Services
DCCMS	Department of Climate Change and Meteorology Services
DEC	District Executive Committee
DoDMA	Department of Disaster Management Affairs
DoF	Department of Fisheries
DRM	Disaster Risks Management
DWR	Department of Water Resources
EEC/ EOC	Emergency Evacuation Centre/ Emergency Operation Centre
EWf	Early Warning and Forecasting
EWS	Early Warning System
EPA	Extension Planning Area
FAA	Funded Activity Agreement
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoM	Government of Malawi
IA& EA	Implementing Agency and Executing Agency
IE	Interim Evaluation
IR	Inception Report
IW	Inception Workshop
LDS	Light Detection System
MACOF	Malawi College of Fisheries
MUST	Malawi University of Sciences and Technology
NDA	National Designated Authority
NASFAM	National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi
NDRPRC	National Disaster Risks Preparedness and Relief Committee
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
NIM	National Implementation Modality
ORTs	Other Recurrent Transactions
PICSA	Participated in Integrated Climate Services for Agriculture
ProDoc	Project Document
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
TOC	Theory of Change

SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
VCPCs	Village Protection Committee
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Project Information Table

Project Title:	Saving Lives and Protecting Agriculture-based Livelihoods in Malawi: Scaling Up the Use of Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems		
UNDP Project ID #:	5710	FAA Effectiveness	28 June 2017
GCF project ID:	FP002	GCF First disbursement date:	23 Aug 2017
UNDP ATLAS Business Unit, Award # & Project ID:	Business Unit: ATLAS Award ID: 00104333 ATLAS Project ID: 00102187	ProDoc Signing Date (date project began):	8 August 2017
Country(ies):	Malawi	Date PM hired:	
Region:	Africa	Inception workshop date:	25 Dec. 2017
Focus	Climate Adaptation	IE Completion Date:	November 2020
Results areas	Increased resilience of most vulnerable people and communities	Planned closing date:	30 June 2023
Trust Fund	GCF	If revised, proposed operational closing date:	N/A
Executing Entity/ Implementing Partner	Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA)		
Project Financing	<div> <div>at <u>GCF endorsement</u> (US\$)</div> <div>at <u>IE (June 2020) US\$</u></div> </div>		
[1] GCF financing:	12,294,545	5,674,005.5	
[2] UNDP contribution:	1,800,000	1,105,354.5	
[3] Government:	2,170,000	361,668	
[4] Other partners:	-	-	
[5] Total co-financing [2+3+4]:	3,970,000	1,467,022.5	
PROJECT TOTAL COST [1+5]	16,264,545	7,141,028.5	

Executive Summary

This report presents findings of the Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-Funded “*Saving Lives and Protecting Agriculture-based Livelihoods in Malawi: Scaling Up the Use of Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems Project*”. The evaluation was conducted by two independent evaluators, Dr Amal Aldababseh (International Evaluator and Team leader) and Dr Judith Kamoto (National Evaluator) on request of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Office in Malawi.

Project Description

Malawi is highly vulnerable to climate-induced hazards, including flooding, drought, and extreme weather events. It is continuously experiencing the impacts of climate variability and change. According to the Funding Proposal, Malawi has experienced several climatic variations over the last four decades. In 2015, a once-in-500-years flood occurred and had affected more than 1 million people, displaced around 230,000 people and 106 people lost their lives, in addition to causing damage and losses amounting to S\$ 335 million.

The project was designed to support the Government of Malawi (GoM) to take steps to save lives and enhance livelihoods at risk from climate-induced disasters. It is supposed to address technical, financial, capacity and access barriers related to CI by enhancing national and local hydro-meteorological capacities for early warning and forecasting (EWF). The project seeks to achieve this by developing and disseminating tailored CI products targeting smallholder women and men farmers in addition to fisherfolk by strengthening the capacity of communities to respond to climate-induced disasters. However, several barriers constrained the development and dissemination of CI, those barriers were identified, analyzed, and addressed in the Project document.

The Project main objective is to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts on the lives and livelihoods of women and men, boys and girls, from extreme weather events and climate change, by scaling up the use of modernized early warning systems and climate information to enhance lives and livelihood in vulnerable communities. To achieve the Project's objective, three project outputs were envisaged:

- (i) Expansion of networks that generate climate-related data to save lives and safeguard livelihoods from extreme climate events,
- (ii) Development and dissemination of products and platforms for climate-related information/services for vulnerable communities and livelihoods; and
- (iii) Strengthening communities' capacities for use of EWS/CI in preparedness for response to climate-related disasters.

These three main outputs are supposed to be achieved by implementing seven activities that were supposed to help in lifting five barriers that were identified during the project development phase.

Project Progress Summary

The project supported the expansion and scale-up of the hydro-met infrastructure through procurement and installation of 33 automated weather stations, a lightning detection system including 8 sensors spread across Malawi, 2 lake-based weather buoys and a weather data integration and processing system. 5 AWSs were installed by the supplier in partnership with DCCMS that capacitated the DCCMs engineers to install and commission the equipment, following which the rest of the AWSs were installed by DCCMS engineers. All the AWSs are operational and sending weather data to the central server located at the DCCMS headquarters. The LDS comprises of 8 sensors, a server, and a visualization system. The 2 lake-based weather buoys were also installed in collaboration with the number of agencies (DDCMS, DOF, DWR and Marine Police) and following community sensitization. The weather data integration and processing system include 2 servers, 6 monitors, software, and other peripherals. Following the installation of the system, DCCMS staff were trained to operate the system as a weather information processing tool, more specifically to enable the integration of numerical weather products with satellite-based information and local observations for accurate and timely prediction of weather forecasts and warnings.

A series of training was conducted to build the capacity of hydro-met staff on O&M, data modelling and forecasting. 24 technical staff from DCCMS and DWR were 'factory-trained' in the assembly and installation of hydro-met equipment. Following which in-country training on operation and maintenance were conducted for staff of DCCMS and DWR. A total of 13 staff from DCCMS were trained in the production of the seasonal forecast by using R-Insta statistics package which facilitates the generation of summaries such as the start and length of the rainy season or the duration of the dry spell using data from weather stations. This has facilitated DCCMS to produce downscaled seasonal forecast at district and sub-district level for the use of various sectors. A 25 KW solar standby power system was procured to support the seamless operations of DCCMS which houses several servers and critical systems that require an uninterrupted power supply.

PICSA approach was scaled out to 10 districts. Information about crops grown and livestock was gathered and entered a database, taking the total number of farmers profiled to 18,980 out of which 40% are women. A total number of 27 officials that included 7 women staff drawn from the districts were trained as expert trainers in the PICSA approach taking the number of expert trainers to 60. Training courses were conducted in different districts on the interpretation of historical climate data, seasonal forecast and short-term forecast information and facilitated planning sessions with farmers to develop management options in the context of the seasonal forecast covering 264 extension workers (28% are women) who in-turn trained 16,702 lead farmers (53% are women). The lead farmers disseminated the information to 167,020 number of small-holder farmers in their communities for making farm decisions based on the projected seasonal weather forecast for their area. The PICSA training manual was translated from English to Chichewa language and used in the training programs. Short term weather forecasts were provided to 10,527 farmers in 10 districts through mobile text messaging services (SMS). DCCMS was supported to downscale seasonal forecast for all the 28 districts in Malawi. Besides, disseminating the seasonal forecast to the small-holder farmers in 10 districts the project supported the dissemination of the information to district officials and stakeholders in 14 districts and facilitated the development of sector-specific plans in light of the seasonal forecast.

A profiling exercise was successfully conducted to establish a database of around 9000 of fish traders and processors. The information collected through the exercise will help DoF to design strategies to reach fishermen, fish processors and fish traders with weather information/alerts tailored to their needs.

A lightning detection system was installed that detects thunderstorms and lightning strikes in real-time. A dissemination system is being designed to link the LDS system with an SMS based dissemination systems to alert fishers and lakeshore. 2 lake-based weather buoys were procured and installed in Lake Malawi to collect weather, wave and wind information in the lake which is vital for developing weather advisories for lakeshore communities. Besides, the buoys collect water quality data including salinity, turbidity and dissolved oxygen that influences the fish population in the lake.

Drafting of the weather advisories for fishers and fish-processors was completed and an SMS based platform is being set up to provide regular weather updates/advisories to the target audience. DOF conducted an awareness campaign to educate the fishing communities about hazardous weather and promote safety in the lake. 26 staff from DoF that includes staff from the community outreach unit were trained in climate change, its implications on the fishing sector and safety of fishers. IT and communication equipment were provided to the unit which will be used for developing campaign materials to promote safety in the lake and relevant products for the fishing communities. A boat to support the operation of DOF was procured and will be used for maintenance of weather/wave buoy installed on lake Malawi and implementation of fishing regulations.

The Project works on improving monitoring of river levels in the northern and central regions of Malawi. Procurement of the 37 hydro-met systems was completed following which, a tender was launched for the construction of data collection platforms (DCPs) to host the systems. 15 DCPSDCPs were constructed and 15 systems were hosted in the DCPs to monitor water levels of major flood-prone rivers in the Central region of Malawi. 6 staff from DWR were 'factory-trained' in the assembly and installation of hydro-stations in Germany. The supplier of hydro-stations also conducted training in Malawi on installation, O&M and commissioning of the

equipment and associated telemetry system which was attended by 51 number of DWR officials that included staff from the districts.

The project has made some progress in the use of existing mobile platforms for dissemination of agro-met advisories by supporting NASFAM to use FRONTLINE SMS services. NASFAM agro-met advisory to thousands of farmers through the Frontline platform. DAES used the ESOKO platform to disseminate agro-met advisories to farmers and reached 6150 number of farmers in 5 districts. Two new SMS platforms are being established to disseminate lightning/thunderstorm alerts and weather advisories/warnings to fish processors and fishers. The engagements with telecom sectors will be strengthened for cost-effective dissemination of climate and weather advisory. The expansion of infrastructure has enhanced the confidence of DCCMs to produce and package tailored advisories for the private sector.

Several radio and television programs and skits were developed in local languages and English on climate and flood risk management and broadcasted throughout the country. DOF produced IEC materials on weather hazards and safety that was used extensively in the awareness campaign conducted by DOF in 4 lakeshore districts. Staff capacity building of the DCCMS progressed well with providing training to staff on how to manage, access and use weather/climate information and in the statistical analysis of these data. The downscaled seasonal forecasts were produced by DCCMS and then translated in a local national language (Chichewa), printed, and disseminated widely.

Climate forecasts including historical rainfall information, rainfall projections for the 2019-2020 farming season and farming and livelihood options for farmers based on the projections were jointly developed and disseminated to extension workers and smallholder farmers in 10 districts as part of the PICSA initiative. The PICSA manual was translated from English to Chichewa and used extensively in the training of extension workers and lead farmers. Three tailored courses were developed for frontline disaster managers a DRM training manual was translated from English to Chichewa, printed and disseminated widely. The project supported the review and finalization of the DRM communication strategy to create awareness of disaster risks and promote positive behaviours to mitigate the risks.

A team of 6 officials visited Kenya, to understand how climate information is packaged and disseminated to farmers and other stakeholders to help them in their farming decisions. The team learnt best practices, experiences, and challenges from a diverse group of experts how to bring together different tools and systems in disseminating weather and climate information that could potentially help farmers to manage weather risks to maximize productivity. A government to government exchange visit was supported through the project. A team comprising of 10 senior officers from DoDMA was hosted by the National Disaster Management Centre of South Africa.

A technical team comprising of experts from DCCMS, DWR and DODMA conducted a comprehensive assessment covering 8 districts that identified flood-prone rivers and communities, potential locations for the instalment of flood alert systems. The team also drafted specifications for a low-cost, easily maintainable, and reliable telemetry system for monitoring the river levels and the dissemination flood alerts.

To enhance the awareness of communities on hazard and vulnerability a range of radio and TV programs and skits were developed that includes 18 radio jingles/skits, 5TV jingles and skits. A nationwide awareness campaign was conducted using TV and Radio that reached millions of people across the country.

The project partnered with Malawi University of Science and Technology (MUST) for the development of tailored short courses for frontline disaster managers and train cadre of government officers as expert trainers to impart the training. As a result, a one-week course containing 3 modules was developed. A team comprising of 20 officials from various departments were trained as expert trainers by the MUST. The expert trainers conducted a series of training for selected members of area and village civil protection committees who are responsible for managing emergencies and coordination of DRM initiatives at that level. A total number of 208 people were trained under this initiative to effectively lead risk reduction initiative in their communities.

Under the school DRM programme, 20 school staff from selected districts were trained in the DRM and climate change, following which an exposure visit was organized to schools that are

already implementing DRM activities that include afforestation programs, and awareness-raising of communities on climate change, sanitation and hygiene through songs and music. A prototype of an emergency operation centre was designed following consultations with various stakeholders. Procurement was completed to construct the prototype in one of the hazard-prone districts, which will be equipped with IT and emergency communication equipment to enable the district authorities to better coordinate disaster response. The EOC will act as the disaster coordination hub at the district level.

Interim Evaluation Rating and Achievement

The rating for **output 1** is **highly satisfactory (HS)**. The essence of the output is to automate and expand the hydro-met network to enhance the capacity of hydro-met staff to operate and maintain the installed equipment, and also to use data for improving forecasting. The project made good progress towards achieving this output as indicated by the level of achievements for the two indicators under this output as explained in Table 3. The mid-term indicators have been achieved and with the current level of implementation, it is expected that the project will be able to achieve its end-of-project targets for this output.

For **output 2**, the rating is **moderately satisfactory (MS)**. The progress to achieve two indicators under this output is **(MS)**, and the progress to achieve the third one is **(US)**. This output is focusing on the development and dissemination of climate/weather products for vulnerable communities, especially smallholder farmers, fishers, and flood-prone communities. The project is making progress towards the achievement of the output, but it did not achieve all its targets by the mid-time as planned. The evaluators reckon that the last indicator on private sector engagement and the development of tailored products is at lagging at the time of the IE. According to Project LF, the first assessment of private sector engagement and market feasibility for tailored products should be developed by the project mid-term and 2 to be developed by the end of the project. At the time of the IE, the study was not initiated due to constraints associated with COVID19.

For **output 3**, the rating is **moderately (MS)**. This output is focusing on strengthening the community's capacities to interpret and apply weather and climate information. The mid-term target for the second indicator is fully achieved **(S)** while the target for the first indicator is not achieved **(US)**. The work to achieve the first indicator has started as a comprehensive assessment was conducted targeting 8 districts to identify flood-prone rivers and communities. The project is currently working on establishing a community-led flood early warning system that will benefit the target group (100,000 people in 8 districts by mid-term). The project has also achieved several tasks under this output including the launching of a nation-wide flood and disaster awareness campaign by the DoDMA using radio and television. It is estimated that the campaign reached millions of people in Malawi.

The review of the project's documents, meetings with stakeholders, sites visits, and analysis of the project's technical and progress reports indicated that the Project achieved many of its mid-term targets and project objective, it is also expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. The overall rating for the **Progress to the achievement of the project results** is **Satisfactory (S)**.

IE evaluators consider that the management arrangements used for the project support effective and efficient implementation of the project. Consequently, the overall **Project implementation and adaptive management** rating is also **Satisfactory (S)** as shown in Table 1.

The Project is very much acknowledged by the Government of Malawi (GOM), and very relevant to UNDP, GCF, and the Government's plans (at national and district levels). With the confirmed interest and support provided by the UNDP and the GOM prospects for sustainability are certain, and overall sustainability is considered **likely**.

Table 1: Interim Evaluation Ratings and Achievement Summary Table for M-CLIMS Project

Measure	IE Rating ¹	Achievement Description
Progress towards Results	Objective achievement	The project achieved all mid-term targets for output 1, and in the process to achieve other targets under outputs 2 and 3. The Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets with minor shortcoming.
	Rating: 5 (S)	
	Output 1 achievement	All targets under this output are on track and have been achieved at the mid-term point of implementation.
	Rating: 6 (HS)	The work under this output is progressing very well and progress is rated as HS.
	Output 2 achievement	Mid-term targets have not been fully achieved although the work is on progress. The progress has been affected by COVID-19 during 2020.
	Rating: 4 (MS)	
	Output 3 achievement	Mid-term targets have not been fully achieved although the work is on progress but have been affected by COVID-19 during 2020.
	Rating: 4 (MS)	
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	Rating: 5 (S)	The management arrangements used for the project support effective and efficient implementation of the project.
Sustainability	Rating²: 4 (Likely)	The Project is very much acknowledged by the GoM, and very relevant to UNDP, GCF, and the Government's plans (at national and district levels). With the confirmed interest and support provided by UNDP and the GoM prospects for sustainability are certain, and overall sustainability is considered likely.

A concise summary of conclusions

The M-CLIMES Project has achieved a number of its intended mid-term targets for many reasons ranging from good project design, appropriate adaptive management measures such as the involvement of 6 national organizations as responsible partners, and finally the strong government, and Project team commitment to achieve the project results on time. In its partnership arrangements, the Project properly engaged appropriate stakeholders at all levels,

The Project design placed significant emphasis on building the capacity of local beneficiaries (farmers and fishers) as well as responsible government agencies and stakeholders to adapt to the changing climate. This was highly beneficial as concerned groups were trained and capacities have been enhanced.

The project provided timely assistance to the GoM to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts on lives and livelihoods, particularly of women, from extreme weather events and climate change. It is helping the Government in increasing resilience and enhancing livelihoods of the most vulnerable people.

Despite the events that have effectually set-back project implementation during the first year of implementation, the Project managed to deliver many results by the mid-term point of its implementation.

The Project responsible parties and the Implementing partner have provided **satisfactory to highly satisfactory** support to project implementation. The Project facilitated the

¹ ¹ The IE team included its rating of the Project's results and descriptions of the associated results following the [UNDP's evaluation methodology for mid-term review](#) using a 6-point scale to the project's progress toward the objective and each project outcome: Rating Scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), or 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

² The 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), and 1=Unlikely (U).

implementation of a successful and comprehensive capacity building programs reached local beneficiaries in vulnerable communities.

The installation of the equipment establishes an important step towards the development of a nation-wide architecture for generating science-based climate information to improve its early warning system (EWS). Furthermore, the coordination among all partners facilitated the establishment of this architecture.

The Project has strongly invested in addressing technical, financial, capacity, and access barriers related to weather and climate information by enhancing national and sub-national hydro-meteorological capacities for early warning and forecasting, by developing and disseminating tailored climate information products targeting smallholder farmers as well as fisherfolk, and by strengthening the capacity of communities to respond to climate-related disasters.

Recommendations Summary

Ref	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
1	Recommendation 1: UNDP CO to put more attention on project monitoring and evaluation. Specifically, the management of risks, mitigation measures, and update at UNDP ATLAS system on quarterly bases.	UNDP CO
2	Recommendation 2: Due to COVID-19 and its implication on the Project, the PCU – with the support of the IP and EA, revise and update the outdated project timeline, and develops clear adaptive management mechanisms for project implementation. A set of concrete actions need to be defined and agreed upon by all partners to be achieved on yearly bases to ensure the achievements of the end-of-the project targets. The LF to provide more details on how to measure the targets.	PCU with the support of UNDP, RPs and DODMA
3	Recommendation 3: The implementing partner and the responsible parties facilitate the involvement of all stakeholders in the project implementation. The IE recommends establishing effective partnerships with identified NGOs, the private sector companies, <i>agro-dealers</i> , and academia.	DODMA and UNDP CO
4	Recommendation 4: To ensure the sustainability of the Project's outcomes (as it relates to the GCF Objective) it is necessary to document the project success stories. This can be supported by the production of seasonal calendars that portray seasonal CI with warning messages and advice to CI users. Also, PICSA should be mainstreamed in the agriculture sector so that it can be financially supported through yearly government financial allocation.	PCU with the support of DODMA and UNDP CO
5	Recommendation 5: IE recommends expansion and intensification of safety on sea training to fisherfolk, who have not been trained yet. For example, the IE found that out of 23 BVCs at Namaso stream in Mangochi, only 11 BVCs have been trained on "Safety on Sea". The IE also found out that some VCPCs were revamped and the new members were yet to receive training on reducing disaster risks. The project should consider training all subject matter specialists on the use of CI about agriculture and disaster risks reduction intensification and the training should be accompanied by frequent refreshers and review meetings.	DODMA and UNDP CO
6	Recommendation 6: Although the project's interventions are addressing the problems that were identified to be addressed, M-CLIMES project should also consider taking a step further by providing operational resources for the monitoring and supervision of implemented activities until that level where knowledge absorption on use of EWS and CI in their agriculture activities, disaster risk management and other livelihood activities is adequately rich. Although the project is addressing the challenges that were identified,	UNDP CO and DODMA

	Field Officers should be provided with resources for monitoring and supervision of implemented activities until the time when for example, PICSA farmers can independently make decisions based on CI. For example, PICSA training has 12 steps; before the season, on the season, during the season, and after season. After implementing activities under each stage, M-CLIMES project should provide resources to supervise and monitor farmers' adoption of PICSA interventions	
7	Recommendation 7: Project activities' plan and procurement of locally available resources can easily be done at the district level with the adequate engagement of district representatives and officers at field level. For example, project stationery for training farmers, VCPCs, ACPCs, and BVCs should be procured at the district level. This is viewed as a tool to enhance the sustainability of the project in addition to promoting project national ownership and reducing some crucial delays in procurement processes.	PCU
8	Recommendation 8: DCCMS should widen the use of mobile operators to disseminate climate information through mobile phone messages. The project should increase the number of CI users such as farmers and flood-prone area residents who receive CI through mobile text messages. To some extent, climate information should be disseminated earlier (in September) and should be area specific.	DCCMS with the support of the PCU
9	Recommendation 9: Project should consider the use of decentralization structures such as DCPCs, ACPCs, VCPCs, ADCs in disseminating climate information as these platforms are viewed as strong and much respected in the communities.	PCU

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and Objectives

As per the Terms of Reference (ToR, **Annex 1**), this Interim Evaluation (IE) was a mandatory requirement for the GCF financed project titled: Saving Lives and Protecting Agriculture-based Livelihoods in Malawi: Scaling Up the Use of Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems (hereafter called “Project”), implemented by the Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA) as the UNDP’s National Implementing Partner following the National Implementation Modality (NIM). Several documents including Project Documents, project implementation and progress reports including Annual Performance Report (APRs), project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other relevant materials formed an important source of information for IE. Other documents that were reviewed for this IE exercise were UNDP risk log, gender action plan, social and environmental screening procedure, and management, annual work plans (AWPs), financial reports, co-financing tables, national documents relevant for the project and project technical deliverables. This document presents independent evaluator’s understanding of the objectives of the IE, the methodologies that were employed for the evaluation, the findings and recommendations.

In line with the UNDP and the GEF evaluation policy, the Interim Evaluation was undertaken to achieve the following:

- (i) Assess the implementation of the project and its alignment with FAA obligations and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document,
- (ii) Assess early signs of project success or failure to identify the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results, and
- (iii) Review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability

1.2 Scope and Methodology

The IE covered all activities undertaken in the framework of the Project. The IE covered the following four categories of project progress: Project strategy, Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency; Progress towards results, Project implementation and adaptive management, and Sustainability. This Interim evaluation followed the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF Financed Projects and the GCF Evaluation Policy³ which were outlined in the TORs.

Criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact were employed. According to the Guidelines, the IE provides evidence-based credible, useful, and reliable information. These guidelines set-up collaborative as well as participatory approaches to ensure close cooperation with the project team, government counterparts in Malawi and the project’s implementation sites with a focus on Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisors and other key stakeholders. Involving stakeholders was crucial in ensuring that this IE is successful.

Stakeholders interviewed in this IE include the executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and subject matter specialists, project stakeholders, local government officials, project beneficiaries that included farmers trained on PICSA and Village Civil Protection Committees. A mission to Malawi was planned for the international evaluator to meet with the project’s stakeholders and visit project’s sites, however, the mission was not possible due to travel restrictions because of COVID-19. The methodology of this IE composed of several methods with an analysis of qualitative data. The IE included the following:

³ “At the time of writing, the GCF Evaluation Policy had not yet been posted by the GCF Independent Evaluation Unit - <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluations/policy> . The TOR for this report applied informal evaluation guidance from the GCF.”

1. **Data collection.** To the extent possible, focus group discussions and key informant interviews were used to collect data from project participants. These participants included project partners, project stakeholders and targeted beneficiaries. Sets of questions were prepared and used to facilitate data and document collection (**Annex 2**) and knowledge sharing. The questions were arranged around the evaluation criteria (**Annex 3**).
2. **Desk Review included amongst others:** Reviewing Funding proposal, UNDP Project Document, UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results, Project Inception Report, Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, annual work plans (AWPs), audit reports, mission reports, monitoring reports prepared by the Project, financial and administrative guidelines used by Project team, minutes of the project Board/steering committee, Project combined delivery reports (CDRs), technical deliverables, Lessons learned reports, and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.
3. **Consultations with the project's stakeholders via virtual interviews and meetings.** Project target beneficiaries, district project staff and field front line personnel were engaged through focus group discussions. A total of 3 FGDs with Beach Village committees, 5 FGDs with PICSA farmers, and 3 FGDs with VCPCs were held in the six districts (Salima, Dedza, Mangochi, Zomba, Blantyre and Chikwawa) sampled for data collection (**Annex 4**, IE agenda for virtual meetings and field visits). This helped in getting the perspective of both women and men beneficiaries and stakeholders (**Annex 5**, list of people interviewed).
4. **Observations:** Participant observations were made based on the FGDs and interview meetings with stakeholders to understand their comprehension of the project activities. The information collected through the interviews conducted, and data gathered was compiled, summarized, and organized according to the questions asked in the evaluation. Also, field observations were recorded through pictures and videos. This was particularly on AWS installations, lightning detection installations among other equipment for climate/weather forecasting.

1.3 Limitations

A major limitation to this IE was mainly the COVID-19 outbreak as all international travels were suspended. The in-country mission was a challenge as the international evaluator could not visit Malawi for the IE exercise. However, the international evaluator relied on virtual meetings, questionnaires, and Skype call to collect data, interview stakeholders and check and validate findings. A national evaluator was hired by UNDP to support the international evaluator and visited six districts among the 21 targeted districts. In each district, different sites were visited. The work of the national evaluator was guided by the international evaluator.

1.4 Structure of the Interim Evaluation Report

This IE report includes the following components as per the UNDP/GEF mid-term review guidelines and the GCF evaluation guidance:

- i. Basic Report Information
 - ii. Table of Contents
 - iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
-
1. Executive Summary
 2. Introduction
 3. Project description and Background context
 4. Findings
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - 4.2 Relevance
 - 4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency
 - 4.4 Progress Towards Results
 - 4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - 4.6 Project Progress against GCF Criteria

- 4.7 Sustainability
- 4.8 Needs of the receipt and country ownership
- 4.9 Innovativeness in results areas
- 4.10 Environmental and social safeguards and progress concerning the gender action plan.
- 4.11 Unexpected results, both positive and negative.
- 4.12 Replication and Scalability.
- 5 Conclusions and Recommendations
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - 5.2 Recommendations
- 6 Annexes

2. Project Description and Background Context

2.1 Development context

Malawi is highly vulnerable to climate-induced hazards, including flooding, drought, and extreme weather events. It is continuously experiencing the impacts of climate variability and change. The Country thus needed to strengthen its national systems for generating science-based Climate Information (CI) to provide its Early Warning System (EWS). According to the Project Document, Malawi has experienced several climatic variations over the last four decades. In 2015, a once-in-500-years flood occurred and had affected more than 1 million people, displaced around 230,000 people and 106 people lost their lives, in addition to causing damage and losses amounting to S\$ 335 million.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address threats and barriers targeted

The project was designed to support the Government of Malawi (GoM) to take steps to save lives and enhance livelihoods at risk from climate-induced disasters. It was supposed to address technical, financial, capacity and access barriers related to CI by enhancing national and local hydro-meteorological capacities for Early Warning and Forecasting (EWF). The project seeks to achieve this by developing and disseminating tailored CI products targeting smallholder women and men farmers in addition to fisher folk by strengthening the capacity of communities to respond to climate-induced disasters. However, several barriers constrained the development and dissemination of CI, those barriers were identified, analyzed, and addressed in the Project document.

2.3 Project Description and Strategy

The Project main objective is to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts on the lives and livelihoods of women and men, boys and girls, from extreme weather events and climate change, by scaling up the use of modernized early warning systems and climate information to enhance lives and livelihood in vulnerable communities. To achieve the Project's objective, three project outputs were envisaged:

- (iv) Expansion of networks that generate climate-related data to save lives and safeguard livelihoods from extreme climate events,
- (v) Development and dissemination of products and platforms for climate-related information/services for vulnerable communities and livelihoods; and
- (vi) Strengthening communities' capacities for use of EWS/CI in preparedness for response to climate-related disasters.

These three main outputs are supposed to be achieved by implementing seven activities that were supposed to help in lifting five barriers that were identified during the project development phase.

The Project is being implemented by the Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA) in collaboration with Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS), Department of Water Resources (DWR), Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES), Department of Fisheries (DoF) and the National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi (NASFAM) and its implementation is in accordance to UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM), as per the NIM project management implementation guidelines agreed by UNDP and the GoM.

The inception report (IR) indicated that some very minor changes were made to the project but overall project's framework, project objective, outputs and budget remain the same. Furthermore, it was confirmed during the inception workshop (IW) that there have not been any significant changes in policy and institutional environment that might affect the project implementation. The Project has faced some delay during the project's commencement phase some of which included delayed signing of the Project document and the coordination across the implementing partner and RPs to finalize the annual work plan and commencing of activities was protracted, again owing to start-up delays. The project became effective almost two years after the official approval. The project was approved by the board in November 2015, and the first disbursement received in September 2017. The Project was able to make considerable progress and achieved many of its targets in 2019.

2.4 Project Implementation Arrangements.

The project is implemented following UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM), according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement which was signed between UNDP and the Government of Malawi. The project's budget and work plan, including the broader outputs and activities, remain the same as the approved proposal. The implementation modality for the project remains the same as originally proposed. A letter of agreement (LOA) was signed between DoDMA and UNDP to agree on which support services UNDP should provide.

The project management structure also remains the same as approved by the GCF Board, including the structure and responsibility of the Project Board/Steering Committee and Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The Malawi Government provided a gender expert to support the implementation of the gender analysis and action plan. Key milestones beyond the recruitment of PCU included sensitization of the project with targeted beneficiary districts. The project was also presented to the technical and steering committees where the work plans were endorsed, and letters of agreements were agreed between the IP and RPs which specified roles and responsibilities. Ministry of Finance approved the opening of Project Bank Accounts, and the IP opened the holding and operating accounts and the project was successfully implemented.

By June 2020, the project has completed key activities; installation of hydro-met equipment and capacity building of hydro met staff on operation and maintenance, data modelling and forecasting, which contribute to the development and dissemination of tailored products for vulnerable communities. The project also has sensitized local communities on the use of disseminated climate tailored products. UNDP and DoDMA monitor the budget closely to ensure that it complies with GCF requirements throughout the life of the project to ensure that any reallocation across outputs remains within the 10% threshold.

2.5 Project timing and milestones

Project Activities	Project Milestones
<p>Output 1 Expansion of networks that relates climate-related data to save lives and safeguard lives from extreme climate events.</p> <p>Activity 1.1 Expanding coverage of Meteorological and hydrological infrastructure to be completed by 2020</p> <p>Activity 1.2 Capacity building of hydro-met staff on O&M, data modelling, and forecasting to be completed by 2020</p>	<p>Development of Technical Specifications for the hydro-met equipment to be completed in 2018</p> <p>Finalization of sites for installation of hydro-met equipment to be completed in 2018</p> <p>Community mobilization and Social & Environmental impact assessment before equipment installation to start in 2018</p> <p>Competitive bidding for installation of hydro-met equipment to be completed by 2018</p> <p>Installation of meteorological and hydrological infrastructure will be completed by 2020</p> <p>Capacity needs assessment of hydro-met to be completed in 2018</p> <p>Data digitization to be completed by 2019</p> <p>Procurement of software for streamlining weather forecasts and warning 2018</p> <p>Capacity building to improve weather forecast and flood EWS will be a continuous activity from 2018 to 2022.</p>
<p>Output 2 Development and dissemination of products and platforms for climate-related information/services to communities engaged in agriculture-based livelihoods</p> <p>Activity 2.1 Develop tailored weather/climate-based agricultural</p>	<p>Assessment of climate/weather information needs of smallholder farmers to be completed by 2018</p> <p>Development of crop and season-specific weather and agriculture information packages for smallholder farmers for a range of media to be completed by 2019</p> <p>Outreach strategies and systems developed for dissemination of weather information and</p>

<p>advisories for 14 food-insecure districts and disseminate through ICT/mobile, print, and radio channels to be completed by 2022</p> <p>Activity 2.2 Develop and disseminate tailored warnings and advisories for fishing communities of Mangochi, Salima, Nkhata Bay and Nkhotakota around Lake Malawi</p> <p>Activity 2.3 Develop and deploy the flood and water resource modelling and decision support system to enhance coverage for disaster risk and water resource management</p> <p>Activity 2.4 Enable a demand-based model for climate information and services stimulating private sector engagement</p> <p>Activity 2.5 Knowledge sharing and management for development and Dissemination</p>	<p>receiving feedback from smallholder farmers 2019</p> <p>Continuous engagement with farmers, DCCMS staff and external consultants through to 2020.</p> <p>Tailored agricultural management products based on engagement and new forecasting products from DCCMS available and disseminated through radio/mobile in 2020.</p> <p>Revised products available and disseminated in 2022</p> <p>Assessment of climate/weather information needs of fishers to be completed by 2018</p> <p>Development of crop and season-specific weather and agriculture information packages for fishers for a range of media to be completed by 2019</p> <p>Outreach strategies and systems developed for dissemination of weather information and receiving feedback from fishers 2019</p> <p>Continuous engagement with fishers, Beach village committees, DCCMS staff and external consultants through to Q2, 2020. Severe weather advisories based on engagement and new forecasting products from DCCMS available and disseminated in 2020.</p>
<p>Output 3: Strengthening communities' capacities for use of EWS/CI in preparedness for response to climate-related disasters</p> <p>Activity 3.1: Scale-up community-based EWS in flood-disaster prone areas of Karonga, Salima, Dedza, Nkhotakota, Nkhata Bay, Rumphi, Phalombe and Zomba</p> <p>Activity 3.2: Capacity development of national, district and community level actors on disaster and climate risk Management</p>	<p>Continuous engagement of DCIC staff and district level government staff. Equipment through to 2021</p> <p>Development of impact evaluation and M & E Framework</p> <p>Development of knowledge products throughout the project from 2018 to 2021</p> <p>Assessment of the existing community-based flood EWS system inform the next stage of CBEWS project and develop national standard guidelines for CBEWS to be completed by 2018</p> <p>Identify and assess flood EWS needs of the communities (mapping of sites, appropriate content and format of the flood EWS message, models and timing of flood EWS etc.) by 2019</p> <p>Installation of community-based hydrological equipment by 2019.</p> <p>Identify NGOs/CBOs to support the implementation of CBEWS projects to cover 33 flood-prone communities in 8 target districts by 2019</p> <p>Refresher training by Q2, 2022</p>

2.6 Main stakeholders

The key agencies participating in the project include DoDMA, DCCMS, DWR, DAES, DOF, and NASFAM. The project engages various stakeholders (government agencies, NGOs, private sector, and communities) extensively during implementation to establish the sites for hydro-met infrastructure, design and deliver tailored products, and undertake community sensitization and disaster preparedness and response. The IE noted that several initiatives complementary to the scope of M-CLIMES project are already on-going and there is a need for greater synergy among these projects through a stakeholder mapping and letters of agreement to outline

coordination actions. These existing INGOs and NGOs working on a similar initiative include WFP and Goal Malawi in Chikwawa.

The participation of various stakeholders in this project indicates their interest in the project and reaffirms the need to continuously engage with PMU in the implementation of the project. It was also noted that the project is being implemented in 21 targeted districts of the country. A suite of activities was implemented at the district level that includes installation of hydro-meteorological equipment, upgrading of district EOCs and capacity development of district officials on disaster and climate risk management. The districts are closely involved in community resilience building and delivery of last-mile early warning messages to vulnerable groups, making the success of the project very much dependent on its level of ownership by the district officials and their understanding of the project.

Districts sensitization meetings for District Executive Committees (DEC) and other stakeholders that have an oversight role in the implementation and monitoring of the project at the district level was conducted.

The application of M&E requirements, and social and environmental safeguards, enables continuous engagement with beneficiaries and other stakeholders at all stages of the project. Partnership opportunities with the telecommunication and agri-business sectors are also been explored to promote sustainability of climate information systems through partnerships that yield positive returns on investment for the private sector.

3. Findings

3.1 Project Strategy

According to the UNDP/GEF Mid-Term Review (MTR) Guide, the IE team assesses and analyzes whether: the Project objective and components were clear, well-written, practical and feasible within the proposed timeframe and with the allocated budget; the ability and capacities of the Project's executing agency to implement the project's components in line with the proposed design; what lessons learned from other relevant projects were incorporated into the project design; needed partnerships to implement the project were properly incorporated in the project design; financial resources (including co-financing) were adequate or not; the Project's assumptions and risks identified during the project preparation with the proposed mitigation measures, and the Project's outcomes and the proposed indicators were SMART⁴.

3.1.1 Project Design

The Project goal is to “*provide timely and more reliable climate and weather information to targeted users*”⁵. The Project objective is to “*scale up the use of modernized early warning systems and climate information to enhance lives and livelihoods in vulnerable communities*”.⁶

The Project was designed to strengthening the adaptive capacity and reduce exposure to climate-induced risk through the enhanced capacity for early warning and forecasting, improving decision making of agriculture and fishing communities, and strengthening community capacities to prepare and respond to climate-induced disasters. Thus, the project contributes to increase resilience and enhance the livelihoods of the most vulnerable people affected by climate-induced disasters and variability in Malawi.

Malawi has been experiencing climatic variations which have resulted in the occurrence of extreme weather events over the last few decades. These extreme weather events affecting the country include floods, flash floods and droughts. The 2015- flood killed 106, displaced 230 thousand people, impacted more than 1.1 million people, caused damage amounting to US\$ 286.3 million, and losses of US\$ 48.4 million. In 2016, a devastating drought hit the country, with loss and damage totaling US\$ 365.9 million and requiring recovery interventions estimated at US\$ 500.2 million.

Hence, this M-CLIMS project was designed to support the GoM in addressing existed barrier through the following: expanding coverage of the physical climate and weather observations network by enabling the use of weather and CI by vulnerable communities, enhancing the capacity of the hydro-met staff to generate timely and reliable climate and early warning information, supporting development and dissemination of climate and associated information relevant for stakeholders, increasing awareness and sustainable use of disseminated information by enhancing communication, outreach and Knowlagent sharing, facilitating policy and regulatory support for private-public partnerships (PPP) and enhancing the market scope for use of CI, by engaging private enterprises and service providers, in climate-sensitive sectors, and finally establishing EWSs to build the capacity of district and community level actors on disaster risk management.

The Project was designed to contribute to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2012-2018) **Outcome 1.3:** By 2018, targeted populations in selected districts benefit from effective management of the environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk. More specifically with the following outputs: **Output 1.3.1** Environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk reduction mainstreamed in policies, programmes and plans implemented in 14 disaster-prone districts; **Output 1.3.2.** Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environment and natural resources and disaster risk management made accessible to decision-makers and government, private sector and civil society; and **Output 1.3.3** coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for climate change, environment and natural resources and disaster risk management established and used at the national level and disaster-prone districts.

⁴ SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time- bound.

⁵ UNDP ProDoc. Sub-Section ii. Partnerships. Paragraph 95. Page 34.

⁶ UNDP ProDoc. Section: Results and Partnerships. Sub-section i. Expected results. Page 24.

It also contributes to the current UNDAF (2019-2023). Mainly to **Pillar 3**: Inclusive and resilient growth. **Outcome 7**: Households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to WASH and healthy ecosystems and resilience livelihoods. **Outputs 1, and 4**: Sub-national Government Capacity for Resilience Programmes, and Disaster risk management and early recovery from shocks.

The project also contributes to UNDP Strategic Plan **Output 1.3**: Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented. It is also aligned with the **UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD-2019-20123)**. **Outcome 3**: Strengthening resilience and shocks to crises, linked to UNDAF outcome #2. Mainly to **Outputs** Scaled-up action, finance and partnerships for climate change adaptation, mitigation, and disaster risk management across sectors, and Adaptive capacity of rural households and reduced exposure to climate risks strengthened.

It is also in line with several key national plans, strategies, and frameworks. Those include Malawi's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Framework (2020), Malawi's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and its associated Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), The [National Disaster Risk Management Policy of 2015](#), [National Climate Change Management Policy](#) – NCCMP (2016), the National Resilience Strategy (NRS), and the [Malawi Growth and Development Strategy \(MGDS III\)](#) (2017-2022): "*Building a Productive, Competitive and Resilient Nation*".

The project is very relevant to Malawi. It contributes to Malawi's NAPA project priorities 3, 4 and 5 as follows:

- *NAPA Project priority 3*: "Improving agricultural production under erratic rains and changing climatic conditions" features improved EWSs.
- *NAPA project priority 4*: "Improving Malawi's Preparedness to cope with droughts and floods" features the implementation of both flood and drought EWSs. The project includes priority activities for strengthening the "Forecasting and Early Warning system" including "Capacity building (training staff to man the systems)."
- *NAPA project priority 5*: "Improving climate monitoring to enhance Malawi's early warning capability and decision making and sustainable utilization of Lake Malawi and lakeshore areas resources" features climate monitoring and an EWS on Lake Malawi and lakeshore areas for pre-disaster preparedness to rural fishing and farming communities.

The ProDoc linked to the SDGs in the Project log-frame (LF) as the project is contributing to SDG 1, 2, 11 and 13 and linked to SDG indicators 11.b.1 *proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015- 2030* and 13.1.2 *Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people*.

The project is also addressing two out of the five NAP-2020 new mandates. During the NAP Framework stakeholder consultation process, the mandates for the NAP process that were established in 2016 (in the NAP Road Map) were updated to (i) *improve community resilience to climate change through enhanced agricultural production, infrastructure development and disaster risk management*, (ii) *enhance sustainable utilization of natural resources especially forest, water, fisheries and wildlife resources*, (iii) *improve environmental management especially soil and land management*, (iv) *enhance conservation and/ or restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems*, and (v) *provide climate change adaptation advocacy to policy-makers and other stakeholders to enact, update, and enforcing laws and by-laws on climate change as well as environmental and natural resource management*.

The ProDoc analyzed climate change variability and associated risks in Malawi and have identified financial, economic, social, and institutional needs. It provided, under the baseline analysis and scenario and the project objective against the baseline, barriers to achieving the project objective and how the project is designed to address these barriers. These barriers include i) limited financial, technical and human capacity available for hydro-meteorological services, which has resulted in reduced capacity of DCCMS, DoDMA and DWR to fulfil their core mandates; ii) limited availability of tailored, sector-specific climate information and early warning products relevant for public and private sector actors; iii) lack of access to and awareness of the use of early warning and climate information by vulnerable populations for urgent responsive action and adaptation planning; iv) limited demand and markets for generation and use of climate information at scale across public and private sector actors, and

v) limited accessibility to early warnings and low capacity at the community level to prepare for and respond to climate-related disasters.

The ProDoc correctly demonstrated critical financial, policy, regulatory and capacity barriers for saving lives at risk from climate-related disasters and enhancing the resilience of the vulnerable population. At the time of proposal development, there was an urgent need to scale up the use of modernized early warning systems (EWSs) and climate information (CI) and to enhance disaster risk management at national, sub-national, and local levels. The need for intensifying coverage of the hydro-met observational systems in Malawi and capacity to generate CI that are not only timely and reliable but also geographically relevant to support in EWSs is thoroughly justified in the ProDoc. The Project design effectively articulated critical activities to save lives at risk from climate-related disasters and enhance the resilience of vulnerable populations. This to be achieved by enhancing capacities to use the generated CI for disaster response and adaptive planning as well as mainstreaming climate risk management across national, sub-national, and local levels to ensure that urgent responses are in place to climate-induced disasters.

Based on this, the project is fully relevant for Malawi. It is well-aligned with key national policies and strategies. It supports the government to address key barriers to save lives at risk from climate-induced disasters and enhance the resilience of vulnerable populations, by enhancing capacities to use CI, early warnings and weather forecasting information to increase vulnerable population's adaptive capacity and enhancing agricultural productivity, safety and well-being, soil and water quality, and livelihoods of women and men in vulnerable areas.

3.1.2 Results Framework/ Logical framework.

The Project's LFA is a key monitoring and evaluation tool used as a base for the planning of detailed activities defined during the project development phase. The project team must review the LF during the inception workshop (IW), update if necessary, and agree on the new LF.

The ProDoc established a well-rounded strategy that broadly addressed the apparent threats to save lives at risks from climate-induced disasters and enhance vulnerable populations resilience. The strategy, as a well-presented plan, correctly identified barriers (financial, policy, regulatory and capacity)⁷, and risks and issues that might hamper the project implementation and hence consistently set the basis for a plan of action. Furthermore, the strategy survived through till the mid-point of the project implementation period and effectively remained the strategy for the Project. The targets achievement per the mid-term Project as formulated during project development-are generally realistic.

The LF formulated during the project design phase is clear. The LF in the FAA followed the GCF format (Outcome, Outputs, Indicators, Means of Verification (MOV), Baseline, Target (at mid-term and final) and Assumptions). During the inception workshop, the Project framework was discussed but remains the same *“Overall the project's framework, project objective, outputs and budget remain the same and there have not been any significant changes in policy and institutional environment that will affect the implementation of the project”*.⁸

The Project's Theory of Change (TOC), illustrated how project allocated resources have been used to implement (9) planned activities, which would contribute to achieving (3) expected outputs. Collectively, these outputs would contribute to achieving the GCF outcome *“Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks”*. This TOC also includes barriers to be overcome to achieve the desired impact. . The LF includes for the project's outcome and each one of the outputs the needed indicators, MOV, baseline, targets, and assumptions.

As stated in the project IR, *there have not been any substantial changes in the policy and institutional environment that will affect the implementation in the project*⁹ and hence the Project's LF, objective, outputs and budget remained the same. The project strategy confirmed during the inception phase of the project as no changes were made to the activities, inputs, and

⁷ FAA. Section C.2. Project/Programme Objective against Baseline. Page 12.

⁸ Project Inception Report. Submitted on 25 December 2017.

⁹ Project Inception Report. Submitted on 25 December 2017.

outcomes, including at the inception workshop held in Mzuzu during the period of 26-28 September 2017.

The IE Team confirms that the Project remains a key priority for the GoM to improve the resilience of vulnerable communities to climate change impacts and enhancing their resilience to climate change.

The project documents are well structured and follow the GCF (AFF) and UNDP (ProDoc) formats. Essentially the LF followed the GCF and UNDP formats. It provides, to some extent, SMART indicators that allow for proper adaptive management and monitoring of progress. However, it was noticed that targets for Output 3.1 are missing for the *indicator: 3.2. The number of district and community level actors in targeted communities that show increased knowledge and use of EWS/DRM*. The mid-term and end of project targets are listed in the LF in the FAA while missing in the LF in the UNDP ProDoc.

Regarding the set of indicators and their respective targets to measure the performance of the project, a total of 10 indicators were identified to measure the progress made in achieving its expected outcomes and objective. 2 indicators were identified to measure the project progress toward its fund-level impact; 1 indicator to monitor the progress under the outcome, and 7 indicators to measure the progress made under outputs. The evaluators consider that some of the indicators and targets contained in the LF are designed well to facilitate the end of the project evaluation, however, some indicators need to be reviewed and updated as explained in Table 2.

The IE team performed a detailed analysis of the LF and TOC to establish whether it has the necessary elements and whether it enables measurement of success and progress to success. For the TOC, the IE considers the TOC coherent and realistic. For measuring the achievements of the project, the LF contains indicators and targets¹⁰. Table 2 provides an overview of the IE assessment of the project's LF and how "SMART" the achievements are compared to the defined mid-point and end-of-project targets.

Table 2. Overview of the Interim Evaluation of the Project's Log Frame

Criteria	IE comments
Specific	<p>Indicators are specific and target-oriented in general. However, two main issues were noticed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Targets used a very abstracted language in many cases (either a number or a percentage with no details). For example, for indicator 13.1.2: <i>Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people</i>. The mid-term target is 60/100,000 and the end of the project target is 40/100,000. While the target is very clear (decreasing the number from 80 to 60 to 40/100k) it is not specifying the targeted number of deaths? The number of missing persons? The number of affected people. Another example is the targets for Indicator 2.3: <i>Assessments of private sector engagement and market feasibility for tailored products developed</i>. Indicators are "1" and "2" for mid-term and end of the project, respectively. It is unclear what is meant by 1 and 2. In the baseline column, it says reports on market feasibility studies and associated dialogues. So, are we looking for studies? Dialogues? Assessments? Further, what exactly we are expecting; an approved, drafted, implemented studies? - Some targets are not corresponding to the indicators. For example, for Output 1.4/ UNDP Strategic Plan Indicator: <i>Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which are funded and implemented</i> (1,000,000 direct beneficiaries). The mid-term and end of project targets are 1 and 3 million(s), respectively. It is not clear how to measure this, or if these are direct or indirect beneficiaries or both, the number of males and females

¹⁰ The indicators together with the targets serve two main purposes: facilitate monitoring and eventual conduct of remedial actions and facilitate end of the project evaluation to determine delivery of outputs and progress made in achieving goal and purpose.

	reached. Mainly that the target for this indicator is not in line with the target under the Fund level impact: Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (50% of whom is female). The targets are 238,000 and 500,000 at mid-term and end of the project, respectively.
<u>Measurable</u>	Indicators have measurable aspects making it possible to assess whether they are achieved or not.
<u>Achievable</u>	Targets and associated indicators seem realistic to be achievable.
<u>Relevant</u>	All indicators are relevant since they address national development priorities and linked to the project's fund-level impact, outcome, and outputs.
<u>Time-bound</u>	Indicators are linked to targets that are linked either to mid-term or to the end of project timeframe.

3.2 Relevance

The Project is highly relevant to the GoM and addressed a highly important topic. Based on the review of the project documentation, and the discussion with all stakeholders interviewed during the IE, all stakeholders highlighted the role of the project to save human lives and articulated how important it is in enhancing resilience and adapting to climate change. Below is a summary of the main elements of strategic relevance:

alignment to UNDAF (2012-2018) and (2019-2023): The Project was designed to contribute to **UNDAF 2012-2018 Outcome 1.3:** By 2018, targeted populations in selected districts benefit from effective management of the environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk.

Output 1.3.1 Environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk reduction mainstreamed in policies, Programmes and plans implemented in 14 disaster-prone districts.

Output 1.3.2. Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environment and natural resources and disaster risk management made accessible to decision-makers and government, private sector and civil society.

Output 1.3.3 coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for climate change, environment and natural resources and disaster risk management established and used at the national level and disaster-prone districts.

It also contributes to the current **UNDAF (2019-2023)**. Mainly to **Pillar 3:** Inclusive and resilient growth.

Outcome 7: Households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to WASH and healthy ecosystems and resilience livelihoods.

Outputs 1, and 4: Sub-national Government Capacity for Resilience Programmes, and Disaster risk management and early recovery from shocks.

alignment to the UNDP Country Programme. The project contributes to UNDP Strategic Plan **Output 1.3:** Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented.

It is aligned with the **UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD-2019-20123).**

Outcome 3: Strengthening resilience and shocks to crises, linked to UNDAF outcome #2. Mainly to **Outputs** Scaled-up action, finance and partnerships for climate change adaptation, mitigation, and disaster risk management across sectors, and Adaptive capacity of rural households and reduced exposure to climate risks strengthened.

relevance to the GCF Readiness Programmes. The project is relevant to GCF result area: *increased resilience of most vulnerable people and community.*

relevance to national environmental policies, plans and priorities. The project is fully relevant to Malawi. It contributes to It is also in line with several key national plans, strategies, and frameworks. Those include Malawi's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Framework (2020), Malawi's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and its associated Sustainable

Development Goals (SDGs), The [National Disaster Risk Management Policy of 2015](#), [National Climate Change Management Policy](#) – NCCMP (2016), the National Resilience Strategy (NRS), and the [Malawi Growth and Development Strategy \(MGDS III\)](#) (2017-2022): “*Building a Productive, Competitive and Resilient Nation*”. It also contributes to Malawi’s NAPA project priorities 3, 4 and 5. Malawi is also a signatory to several multilateral agreements covering environment, including the three major Rio1992 agreements of Conventions on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the convention on Combating Desertification (UNCCD).

complementarity with existing interventions. The project was designed to complement several existed initiatives and is currently complementing key ongoing interventions, among those:

- [Programme Support to Disaster Risk Management](#) (UNDP, DRM, 2012-2018, \$5,666,156) focuses on undertaking capacity development at a national, district and community level to reduce disaster risks and shocks to vulnerable communities, contributing to (c) above.
- [The Climate Proofing Local Development Gains in Rural and Urban Areas of Machinga and Mangochi Districts](#) (UNDP, Global Environment Fund, 2014-2020, \$5,918,327). The project aims to secure the development and food security gains from the baseline programs by empowering communities to integrate climate risk considerations in the development policies, plans and projects.

[Adapting to Climate Change Through Integrated Risk Management Strategies and Enhanced Market Opportunities for Resilient Food Security and Livelihoods Project](#) (WFP, Adaptation Fund, 2020-2024, \$9,989,335). The project seeks to “*enhance climate adaptation and food security of households through access to integrated climate risk management strategies and structured market opportunities, with a focus on the most vulnerable*”.

3.3 Progress Towards Results

3.3.1 Progress towards outcomes analysis¹¹

The information presented in this section has been sourced from the Project documentations shared with the IE team. Those documentations include Annual Performance Reports (APR) 2017, 2018, and 2019, Annual Workplans (AWPs) 2018, 2019 and 2020 and 6 Quarterly Progress Reports covering January 2018 until June 2020, and review of the Project’s partners activity reports complemented with information collected during the IE interviews and the findings and observations of the IE virtual and in-person meetings organized with key stakeholders, and beneficiaries, and interviews with the project stakeholders in the project pilot sites.

An assessment of the progress at the output level is presented below (Table 3). Many of the mid-term Project’s targets achieved. The Project made noticeable progress during its last 3 year of implementation.

Overall results of the Project are rated as **Satisfactory**.

The key used for indicator assessment (Color Coding):

Green = completed, the indicator shows achievement
Yellow = On target to be achieved by the end of the project
Red = Not on target to be achieved by project closure

¹¹ According to the UNDP/GEF Mid-term review guidelines, the achievements of expected results were evaluated in terms of attainment of the overall objective as well as identified outcomes and outputs. For this the performance by components is analyzed by looking at: general progress towards the established baseline level of the indicators, actual values of indicators by the end of the Project vs. designed ones, and evidence of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the results as well as how this evidence was documented.

Table 3. Matrix for Rating the Achievement of Outputs¹²

Progress update on Fund-level Impact, Outcome, and Outputs indicators of the logic framework							
Indicators	Baseline	Value as of 31 December 2019 (latest APR)	Target (mid-term)	Target (final)	Status at IE (<i>data extracted from APR 2019</i>)	IE Rating	Justification
<i>Fund Level Impact: Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions,</i>							
A1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions: Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (% of whom is female)	Total (912,600) of which 30% female)	1,678,552	Total (1,500,000 of which 40% female)	Total (3,000,000 of which 50% female)	About 1,678,552 reached. The number includes people those are indirectly benefitting from improved forecasting system due to enhanced hydro-met coverage and direct beneficiaries of PICSA. The number also includes people reached through various awareness campaigns.	S	the indicator shows the achievement of mid-term targets.
	238,000 (direct)	421,702(direct)	500,000 (direct)	1,600,000 (direct)	421,702 reached.		
	675,000 (indirect)	1,256,850 (indirect)	1,000,000 (indirect)	1,400,000 (indirect)	1,256,850 reached.		
A1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions: Percentage of	6%	10.3%	9%	18%	10.3% was achieved.	S	the indicator shows the achievement of mid-term targets.

¹² See annex 6 for details on interim evaluation rating scales.

beneficiaries relative to total population in Malawi							
Outcome A7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks							
The number of males and females reached by climate-related early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/strengthened.	238,000 (of which 30% female)	238,000 (of which 30% female)	500,000 (of which 40% female)	1,600,000 (of which 50% female)	421,702 (of which 30% female).	MS	On target to be achieved by the end of the project

Indicators	Baseline	Value as of 31 December 2019 (latest APR)	Target (mid-term)	Target (final)	Status at IE	IE Rating	Justification
Output 1: Capacity of hydro-met networks and staff enhanced to generate climate-related data and forecast extreme weather and climate change							
Percentage of national coverage of climate monitoring network (fully operational)	AWS– 21% <i>National coverage</i> <i>Hydrological stations– 28% national coverage</i> <i>Number of lightning detection sensors (5) - 71%</i>	AWS– 38.5 % <i>national coverage</i> <i>Hydrological stations– 65%</i> <i>Number of lightning detection sensors (8) 100%</i>	AWS– 32% <i>national coverage</i> <i>Hydrological stations– 49% national coverage</i> <i>Number of lightning detection sensors (7) - 100%</i>	AWS– 32% national coverage Hydrological stations– 49% national coverage Number of lightning detection	33 (out of the 34 targeted) Automated Weather Stations were installed. 8 lightning detection sensors were installed. 2 lake-based weather buoys were installed. Weather data integration and processing system were installed. The procurement of the 37 (49% national coverage) hydrological stations was completed. 15 hydro stations were installed.	HS	Completed, the indicator shows achievement

	<i>Number of lake-based buoys - 0%</i>	<i>Lake buoys- 40% coverage.</i>	<i>Number of lake-based buoys (2) - 40%</i>	sensors (7) - 100% Number of lake-based buoys (2) - 40%			
Number of trained personnel that are proficient with the generation of EWs/CI and related activities	0	13 officials trained in EWs/CI 92 officials trained in O & M	105	50	13 staff from DCCMS (3 women staff) were trained in data modelling and forecasting. 105 hydro-met staff (included 14 women) were trained in the operation, maintenance, and calibration of the newly acquired equipment.	HS	Completed, the indicator shows achievement
Output 2: Tailored climate information/products and decision-support platforms developed and disseminated for agriculture, fisheries, and flood risk management							
Percentage of population with access to tailored climate information and early warnings for agriculture, fisheries, and flood risk management in the 21 target districts (disaggregated by sex)	2% (of which 30% of women)	3% (of which 30% of women)	6% (of which 40% of women)	12% (of which 50% of women)	An exercise was conducted in 6 districts to profile lead farmers, resulting in the establishment of a database of 13,707 number of farmers (that including 6,4218 women farmers), that takes the total number of farmers registered since the launch of the project to 18,980 in 10 districts.	MS	On target to be achieved by the end of the project
Percentage of population in targeted	0	8%	10%	25%	A total number of 291 officials in 10 districts	MS	On target to be achieved by

districts that are satisfied by level and quality of services provided by DCICs and other district-level information sources					<p>were trained as experts and intermediary trainers to develop tools, products and deliver climate services to smallholder farmers.</p> <p>Seasonal forecasts were provided to 183,702 farmers (50,000 women farmers) in 10 districts through the PICSA approach.</p> <p>Monthly agro-met and livestock advisories were developed and disseminated to 10,527 smallholder farmers in 10 districts through mobile short messaging services.</p> <p>A database of 2,329 fish traders (includes 754 women) engaged in fish trading was created which is in addition to the database that was created in 2018 for 6,066 fishermen and fish processors.</p> <p>Majority of the extension workers and 80% of the lead farmers who were trained by the district agriculture officers expressed satisfaction with the PICSA training.</p>		the end of the project
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	------------------------

					Majority of the people who were trained by DoDMA in DRM and CC expressed satisfaction with the training. Majority of the district officials who received seasonal forecasts by the Project team expressed satisfaction with the information.		
Assessments of private sector engagement and market feasibility for tailored products developed	0	0	1	2	The first assessment yet to be conducted in late 2020.	US	Not on target to be achieved by project closure
Output 3: Communities capacities strengthened for use of EWS/CI in preparedness for and response to climate-related disasters							
Number of males and females reached by community-based automated early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established	0	0	75,000 (of which 50% are women)	115,000 (of which 50% women)	The CBEWS is scheduled to be initiated late 2020 which will include the establishment of 33 low-cost flood warning system in 8 districts.	US	Not on target to be achieved by project closure
Number of district and community level actors in targeted communities that show increased knowledge and use of EWS/DRM	0	230 (of which 30% are female)	100 (of which 30% are women)	300 (of which 50% are women)	208 members of area and village civils protection committees were trained in DRM, climate change & emergency management. 22 experts from various departments were trained as expert trainers in DRM.	S	Completed, the indicator shows achievement

The rating for **output 1** is **highly satisfactory (HS)**. The essence of the output is to automate and expand the hydro-met network to enhance the capacity of hydro-met staff to operate and maintain the installed equipment, and also to use data for improving forecasting. The project made good progress towards achieving this output as indicated by the level of achievements for the two indicators under this output as explained in **Table 3**. The mid-term indicators have been achieved and with the current level of implementation, it is expected that the project will be able to achieve its end-of-project targets for this output.

For **output 2**, the rating is **moderately satisfactory (MS)**. The progress to achieve two indicators under this output is **(MS)**, and the progress to achieve the third one is **(US)**. This output is focusing on the development and dissemination of climate/weather products for vulnerable communities, especially smallholder farmers, fishers, and flood-prone communities. The project is making progress towards the achievement of the output, but it did not achieve all its targets by the mid-time as planned. The evaluators reckon that the last indicator on private sector engagement and the development of tailored products is at lagging at the time of the IE. According to Project LF, the first assessment of private sector engagement and market feasibility for tailored products should be developed by the project mid-term and 2 to be developed by the end of the project. At the time of the IE, the study was not initiated due to constraints associated with COVID19.

For **output 3**, the rating is **moderately (MS)**. This output is focusing on strengthening the community's capacities to interpret and apply weather and climate information. The mid-term target for the second indicator is fully achieved **(S)** while the target for the first indicator is not achieved **(US)**. The work to achieve the first indicator has started as a comprehensive assessment was conducted targeting 8 districts to identify flood-prone rivers and communities. The project is currently working on establishing a community-led flood early warning system that will benefit the target group (100,000 people in 8 districts by mid-term). The project has also achieved several tasks under this output including the launching of a nation-wide flood and disaster awareness campaign by the DoDMA using radio and television. It is estimated that the campaign reached millions of people in Malawi.

The project objective is to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts on the lives and livelihoods of women and men, boys, and girls, from extreme weather events and climate change in Malawi by Intensifying coverage of the hydrological and meteorological (hydro-met) observational systems and capacities to generate timely, reliable, and geographically relevant early warning and weather forecasting information to inform responses and manage climate impacts, enhancing capacities to package, diffuse, and apply climate and weather information to improve disaster response and adaptive planning and to implement risk transfer mechanisms among public and private sector actors as well as communities, and mainstreaming and implementing climate risk management across national, sub-national, and local levels to ensure preparedness and urgent response to climate-related disasters. It follows from the detailed analysis of outputs that by June 2023 the project objective is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with minor shortcomings. Therefore, the overall rating for progress to the achievement of the project objective at IE time is **Satisfactory (S)**.

3.3.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

The Project was designed to address technical, financial, capacity, and access barriers for development and diffusion of climate information/services in Malawi by investing in enhancing hydro-meteorological capacity for early warnings and forecasting, including the development and dissemination of tailored products for smallholder farmers and fishers, and strengthening capacities of communities to respond to climate-related disasters based on access to early warnings and climate information:

- *Lack of public support, limited human and financial capacity, and resources limitation.* These together resulted in a steady decline in the state of the hydro-meteorological observation networks in Malawi, a limited ability of concerned entities to issue an early warning and CI services and products and limited availability of tailored, sector-specific CI and early warning products relevant for public and private sector actors.
- *The lack of access to climate and early warning information.* The insufficient spatial and temporal scale of climate information, poor accessibility of information by end-

- users, untimely weather/climate warnings, and poor linkages between traditional approaches and scientific information.
- Technical and resource constraints limit the capacity of extension services to provide guidance and support the widespread adoption of information and products by smallholder farmers and fishers.
 - *Limited demand and markets for generation and use of climate information at a scale that bridge public and private sectors.* This has led to several constraints including limited data generation, limited packaging of that data into useful products and services for different end-users, and limited ability to disseminate existing products to the private sector.
 - Decentralized and participatory early warning systems and the capacity to manage them remain limited.

Based on the reported progress of the project implementation, the IE team considers that all above-listed barriers are being addressed by the project activities under the three project outputs and will be removed by the achievement of all outputs by the end of the project as follows:

First, the project is enabling the use of weather and climate information by vulnerable communities by expanding coverage of the physical climate and weather observation network. It already managed to expand the network (*increased AWS coverage from 21% to 38.5%, hydrological stations from 28% to 65%, lightning detection sensors from 71% to 100%, and lake-based buoys from 0% to 40%*).

Secondly, the project is enhancing the capacity of the hydro-met staff to generate accurate and timely climate and early warning information. It provided training in the development of seasonal forecast for 13 staff and on operation and maintenance of the hydro-met equipment to 92 staff.

Thirdly, the project is supporting the development and dissemination of tailored climate and associated information relevant for various stakeholders. It is catalysing 'last mile' access for weather and CI by vulnerable communities using ICT/mobile platforms and community outreach channels. At the IE time, 3% of the population was reported to have access to tailored CI and early warnings for agriculture, fisheries, and flood risk management in the 21 target districts. 30% of the 3% of the population with access to CI are women.

Fourthly, the project invested heavily in communication, outreach, and knowledge sharing to enable increased awareness and uptake and sustained use of diffused information. Around 8% of the population in targeted districts are satisfied by the level and quality of services provided. As reported by the Project, the majority of the extension works, 80% of the lead farmers who were trained by the district agriculture officers, people who were trained in DRM and climate change, and people who received seasonal forecasts expressed satisfaction with the training and information shared. Also, 208 members of area and village civils protection committees were trained in DRM, climate change and emergency management. Twenty-two experts from various departments were trained as expert trainers in DRM.

However, despite the good progress to address many barriers, the project is slowly addressing the engagement of private enterprises in climate-sensitive sectors, as well as service providers such as telecom companies' barrier. The work to address this barrier is still at the earlier stages. It is essential that the project facilitates policy and regulatory support for PPPs and enhance the market scope for use of climate information.

Also, as explained under the sustainability sub-section, financial risk is an area where some questions related to the long-term sustainability of project achievements need some attention.

Finally, the project is also trying to address another key barrier which is related to the absence of decentralized and participatory early warning systems and the limited capacity to manage them. The project is still lagging on establishing the needed EWSs to build the capacity of district and community level actors on disaster and climate risk management. However, with the overall progress made on addressing other barriers, the IE team believes that the project will be able to fully address all barriers by the end of the project.

3.4 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

In this section, the IE discusses the assessment of how the project has been implemented, how efficient the management of the project has been and how effective it is to contribute to successful project implementation. Project management must be an iterative process. That is, it must constantly keep referring to the goal and objectives and critically assessing how the activities are contributing to the outputs and how those outputs are leading to the project objective. Thus, project adaptive management is also discussed and assessed in this section.

3.4.1 Management Arrangements

The Project is implemented following UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM) according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Malawi, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action Plan for Malawi. The national executing entity¹³ responsible for the implementation of the project in compliance with UNDP rules and regulations, policies and procedures is DoDMA. It assumed the overall responsibility for the achievement of the Project results.

The implementation modality for the project did not change since proposal development. As per UNDP and GCF guidelines, a micro assessment¹⁴ was conducted to assess the programme, financial and operations management policies, procedures, systems, and internal controls of DoDMA. The micro assessment defined that the project will be following UNDP's National Implementation (NIM) modality. A letter of agreement (LOA) was also signed between DoDMA and UNDP to agree on which support services will be provided by UNDP.

During the Project's IW, letters of agreements (LOAs)¹⁵ were agreed between UNDP and DoDMA and responsible partners, and the Ministry of Finance approved the opening of Project Bank Accounts.

The management arrangements for this project are as follows:

- UNDP is the Senior Supplier and as the GCF Accredited Entity (AE) provides oversight and quality assurance through its Headquarter and Country Office units in Malawi. A UNDP Programme Officer holds the Project Assurance role on behalf of UNDP. Upon request of DoDMA, the UNDP CO provides Direct Project Services (DPS), including procurement of goods and services, contracting, human resources management, and facilitation of training activities¹⁶.
- The Implementing Partner, Executing Entity as defined by the GCF, for this project is DoDMA. DoDMA is accountable to UNDP for managing the project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.
- Five national partners (responsible parties¹⁷) entered into agreements with DoDMA to assist in successfully delivering project outcomes and are directly accountable to DoDMA as outlined in the terms of their agreement. These are:
 - ✓ Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES)
 - ✓ Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS)
 - ✓ Department of Fisheries (DoF)
 - ✓ Department of Water Resources (DWR)
 - ✓ National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi (NASFAM)
- The **Project Board (PB)**. The project is guided by a PB as the executive decision-making body of the project. It is composed of representatives from the following organizations:

¹³ Also referred to as the Implementing Partner using UNDP terminology.

¹⁴ The micro assessment is part of the requirements under the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) framework. The HACT framework represents a common operation frame for UN agencies' transfer of cash to government and non-government implementing partners.

¹⁵ LOAs specify roles and responsibilities.

¹⁶ UNDP ProDoc and Funding Proposal

¹⁷ are executing bodies for the project and can enter into agreements with other agencies (NGOs and CBOs) in consultation with and endorsement by DoDMA and UNDP.

DoDMA (The Executive¹⁸), UNDP Malawi (Senior Supplier¹⁹), Disaster Risk Management and EWS Committee²⁰, the Environmental Affairs Department (NDA for GCF).

- The PB is responsible for making, by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the National Project Director/Project Manager (NPD/PM). Project Board decisions *are made following standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition*²¹. According to the AFF, the PB should meet three times a year. The Committee met 10 times (7 times in 2019, and trice in 2018) to review the progress under the project and provided necessary guidance and directions for efficient project implementation.
- The National Preparedness and Technical Committee (NPTC) that was established by DoDMA in 2017 was assigned by DoDMA as the Project Technical Committee²² (PTC) to ensure coherence and integrated delivery across the project log-frame. The PTC reports to the PSC/PB and is mandated to ensure quality assurance of AWP; formulation and implementation of strategies and plans related to capacity building, outreach; gender mainstreaming, public-private partnerships, and other relevant issues; complementarity with relevant programmes and partners; inter-ministerial coordination; engagement with districts; and community relations²³. It is headed by Director, EAD and composed of specialists from government and non-government agencies met five times in 2019²⁴ to provide technical guidance respecting to different components of the project.
- As per UNDP NIM modality, a National Project Director/Project Manager (NPD) is appointed by DoDMA provides the general coordination and support to the project on behalf of the DoDMA. The NPD is providing support to the Project on behalf of the DoDMA and has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the PSC within the constraints laid down by the PSC.

District level coordination of project activities is done through the Directorate of District Planning (DPD). Coordination with Civil Protection Committees (CPCs) including District Civil Protection Committees (DCPCs), Area Civil Protection Committees (ACPCs) Village Civil Protection Committees (CPCS). All of which falls under the DoDMA implementation structure. The Project has been working with these committees through DoDMAs activities.

- **A Project Coordination Unit (PCU)** was established at the beginning of the project; it is hosted in a separate building in the Lingadzi house, City Centre. A few kilometres away from DODMA and UNDP. It is headed by the Project Coordinator (PC) and provides project administration, management, and technical support as required by the needs of day-to-day operations of the project. The PCU includes 6 staff members as follows: the PC, an M&E and Knowledge Management expert, ahead of finance, a finance and admin assistant, and 2 drivers. The PCU coordinates activities of the IP and PRs through 3 focal points from DoDMA (the IP), and 10 focal points from the PRs. It was noticed that all PCU staff and 12 out of the 13 focal points (from the IR and RPs) are males.

¹⁸ The Executive: is an individual who represents ownership of the project who will chair the project board.

¹⁹ Senior Supplier: is an individual or group representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project.

²⁰ National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Technical Committee comprised of: Secretary and Commissioner for Disaster Management Affairs, Secretary for Environmental Affairs and Climate Change Management, Director of Meteorological Services and Climate Change, Secretary for Agriculture, Food Security and Irrigation (Both PS' for Water Development and Irrigation and Agriculture and Food Security), Secretary for Economic Planning and Development, Secretary to the Treasury, Secretary for Local Government and Rural Development, Secretary for Lands and Housing, Secretary for Health, Surveyor General, UNDP Resident Representative, Country Representative, DFID - Country Representative, World Bank, Chairperson, Civil Society Network on Climate Change, Secretary General, Malawi Red Cross Society.

²¹ FAA. Management arrangement. Page 24.

²² The technical committee on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management served as the project technical committee.

²³ Project Document. Page 59.

²⁴ Project APR 2019.

- The PCU is technically supported by a group of individual consultants and consultancy firms who are undertaking specific technical tasks. At the time of the IE, 6 national and international experts were providing technical support to the PCU and RPs (5 out of 6 are males), as well as 4 consultancy firms.
- A full-time **Project Coordinator (PC)** was hired by UNDP. The PC manages the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of DoDMA. The PC is responsible for the day-to-day management and decision-making for the project. The PC's main responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The PC is guided by Annual Work Plans, following UNDP Results-Based Management (RBM) standards. The PC prepares Annual Work Plans (AWPs) in advance of each successive year and submits them to the PB for approval.

The review of the current management arrangement indicates that the management arrangements as planned during the proposal development phase are detailed in terms of outlining implementing, executing and responsible partners' responsibilities, project personnel, procurement and recruitments needs, etc. It is detailed for a smooth and effective day-to-day implementation of project activities. The clarity in project management arrangement helped in moving the project ahead despite the delay the project encountered at the project inception phase²⁵.

The Project faced several issues which led to delaying the implementation of all activities at the outset of the Project and in 2019, these issues could be summarized as follows:

- a) Delay in getting the final approval and first disbursement from the GCF: the project was approved in May 2015 (FAA was signed), the AMA was signed in Aug 2016, but the project became effective in June 2017, so the first disbursement was received in September 2017. This long delay required reconvening engagement, and coordination to ensure buy-in and country ownership. The project could not start until all legal milestones were fulfilled, some activities were pre-financed by UNDP and recruitment started before the first disbursement.
- b) The delay in finalizing AWPs and commencement of activities in 2017, as the first year of implementation due to the lengthy coordination between the IP and RPs.
- c) 2019 flooding because of *Cyclone Idai*, which hit Malawi in March 2019, temporarily halted the project implementation as some of the project focal points were temporarily reassigned to respond to the disaster.
- d) Post-election demonstrations following national elections in May 2019 affected the project but with the coordination and support from the EA, IP, and RPs, progress remained mostly on track.

Due to the delay in project implementation at the outset of the project, the project undertook the following adaptive management measures to accelerate project activities implementation and enhance project delivery:

- In 2017, the project worked intensively to deliver a timely inception workshop, fully on-boarded the PCU, and re-engaged and facilitated coordination across IP/RPs, communities, and civil society to ensure project implementation is accelerated during 2018.
- The project established a robust groundwork for implementation and accelerated planning and initiation of activities in 2018.
- The project-initiated development of an impact evaluation framework to facilitate evaluation and learning.
- The project team has been proactive and diligent in convening, coordinating, and ensuring momentum across the RPs and adaptively managing the project

²⁵ APR 2017: the project was approved in 2015, the AMA was signed in Aug 2016. The delay required a lot of work to ensure country ownership and buy-in. Furthermore, the coordination across the IP and RPs to finalize the AWP and commencing of activities was delayed due to start-up delays.

- (providing the needed training, re-validating the context and roles for IP/RPs, ensuring proper planning of project's activities implementation).
- The project is actively tracking and reporting on co-financing, including the UNDP co-financing contributing to the inception and preparatory activities and the government in-kind co-financing reflecting the engagement and staff time of the IP and RPs in project implementation.
- Utilization of the existed mechanisms for the management and oversight of the project. The National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Committee (NDPRC) was assigned the Project Steering Committee (PSC) function, and The National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Technical Committee (NDPRTC) was assigned the Project Technical Committee (PTC) function for the M-CLIMES project.

As a result, the project was able to proceed and made good progress and expected to deliver on the planned milestones and the impact by the time of the project closure, with minor shortcomings. **Against this analysis, and based on collected info and evidence, the rating for this component is Satisfactory (S).**

3.4.2 Work planning

Project Annual Work Plans (AWPs) was developed following UNDP project management guidelines, including the calendar year cycle (January to December for each year). Three AWP's were prepared for this project since 2017 (for 2018 to 2020). The AWP's included, in addition to the work plan and budget, the work plan monitoring tool, and the annual procurement plan.

The PCU prepares AWP that specifies the planned activities for the coming year and lists activities, targets, and budget needed per activity in addition to the quarterly implementation timeline.

Towards the end of the year, and under the overall supervision of DoDMA, the PCU meets with the RPs to review the progress of the project. The RPs present progress of different activities specific to their mandate, present challenges and set out a plan for the upcoming year to meet the overall project goals. This meeting is followed by setting budgets, targets, and activities with a tentative schedule for the upcoming year. Then, the RPs submit draft AWP's to PCU, the process is coordinated by the NPD. The submitted draft AWP is reviewed by UNDP at the CO and Regional level and once cleared presented to the PB/PSC for their final endorsement.

Although the Project was approved in 2015, the 2017 AWP was not prepared earlier in 2017. The delay in preparing and approving AWP for 2017 resulted from the fact that the GCF fund was received in September 2017²⁶, and to commence project implementation, necessary project structure had to be established and staffed, namely PCU. AWP for 2017 was prepared before the IW and was discussed in the IW in September 2017²⁷. Although the draft AWP for 2018 was presented in the IW, it was officially approved in February 2018. The AWP's for 2019 and 2020 were both signed in March. This means that the IP and the RPs face delays in receiving funds as funds should be received no later than the second half of January each year. The interviewed partners indicated that the delay in receiving the funds put a lot of pressure on the team to accelerate activities implementation due to losing a quarter every year waiting for funds.

UNDP transfers funds to project account based on a quarterly work plan. RPs including the IP present their quarterly work plan to PCU, which is compiled, and an advance request is made to UNDP. The funds are received at the project account which is operated by the IP. The NPD coordinates the whole process with support from PCU. Partners without specific bank account (DWR, DCCMS, DoF and DAES) are funded on an activity basis through the project account maintained by IP. While DoDMA and NASFAM with a specific bank account are funded every quarter based on a quarterly work plan. Reporting of the advanced fund is done to UNDP by the IP with the support of the PCU on monthly basis.

²⁶ The project document was signed on 4 August 2017. The signed ProDoc was submitted to GCF on 18 August 2017. The UNDP CO received the first disbursement on 19 September 2017.

²⁷ Project Inception Report. Page 26.

As part of the project review, the IE Team compared the budgeted annual work plans with the actual annual disbursements, the results are presented in Table 4 below:

Table 4. Annual Work Plans versus Actual Expenditures²⁸

Year	AWP Budget	Actual GCF Expenditures as of June 2020	% Spent
2017	0	37,407.71	
2018	3,319,880	1,138,778.03	34.30%
2019	3,651,500	3,780,721.44	103.54%
2020	3,147,720	250,230.33	7.95%
Total	10,119,100	5,207,137.51	51.46%

As per Table 5, the project total expenditures for the last 35 months²⁹ (out of 71 months= around **48%** of the project timeframe) reached **51.46%** of the total planned budgets in the AWP. Although the AWP includes activities to be implemented, tentative timeframe and budget a location per activities.

Figures in Table 5 highlights the role of good planning in advancing project implementation progress. Despite some delays in finalizing AWP, this component led to an effective and efficient implementation of the project activities. To keep the good progress of the project and accelerate the implementation of lagging activities, AWP for next years should be approved by the end of the previous years to allow for earlier fund transfer and smooth implementation of project activities. Based on the above analysis, **the rating for the work planning component is Satisfactory (S).**

3.4.3 Finance and co-finance

The total project budget was **US\$16,264,545**, of which **US\$12,294,545** was GCF grant, **US\$1,800,000** co-financing from UNDP, and **US\$ 2,170,000** co-financing from the GoM.

At the time of this IE, the review of financial records, in particular, the Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs) for the years 2017 to 30 June 2020, and the approved annual work plans for the same years, as recorded in the UNDP Atlas system, indicates that the actual expenditures allocated against the GCF grant for the years July 2017 to 30 June 2020 (35 months out of 71 if we consider the project start date as per the ProDoc, July 2017) represent about **42.35%** (**US\$5,207,137.51**) of the approved budget of **US\$12,294,545** versus an elapsed time of **48%**. **Table 5** present the breakdown of project expenditures by output, by year. It highlights the low spending under components 2 and 3 which are in-line with the progress made to achieve the mid-term targets by these two components. The spending is around **26.29** and **24.35%** for components 2 and 3, respectively. While spending is low in these two components, the spending is high for component 1 as it reached **75.45%** of the total allocated budget. The project management budget is being reasonably utilized with **41.38%** used up until June 2020. As of June 30, 2020, the remaining budget from the GCF grant is **US\$7,087,407.49 (57.65%)**. This amount needs to be utilized by June 2023.

The project was subject to two financial audits during the last 3 years, 2018 and 2019.

Co-financing / Parallel Financing

Co-financing commitments at the outset of the project totalled the amount of **US\$ 3,970,000** as cash and in-kind co-financing (Table 6 and Table 7), which represented about **24.41%** of the total financial resources required in the project document of **US\$16,264,545** (GCF grant + co-financing) for the implementation of the project.

²⁸ Source: Project AWP and UNDP-Atlas CDR Reports

²⁹ The start date is 28 July 2017 as per the UNDP ProDoc signed on August 2017. Planned end date is 30 June 2023.

The review of the CDRs also revealed that the total disbursement as of 30 June 2020 from UNDP resources was **US\$1,105,354.86**, represents about **61%** of UNDP co-financing as shown in table 7. A confirmed **US\$904,167** was additional in-kind financing contributions by the Government of Malawi (GoM) towards activities under outputs 1,2 and 3.

- The expenditure against GCF grant represents a disbursement rate of **42.35% (\$5,207,137.51/\$12,294,545)**.
- Inclusive of the in-kind and cash contributions and disbursements, the project achieved a delivery rate of **44.37% (\$7,216,659.51/\$16,264,545)** against the total project budget inclusive of actual co-financing realized.

All the above disbursement rates reflect a very good rate of disbursement, an indication of smooth progress in project implementation.

Table 5. UNDP GCF Project Funds Disbursement Status (June 2020 in US\$) ³⁰

Project Components	Budget Approved (US\$)	Expenditure as of 30 June 2020					% of budget spent	Committ ed 2020	Total committed and Spent	Difference between actual and planned budget
		2017	2018	2019	2020	Total spent				
Output 1	3,660,000	-	214,972.82	2,485,777.22	60,803.30	2,761,553.37	75.45%	-	2,761,553.37	898,446.63
Output 2	5,087,625	-	478,348.67	766,634.64	92,535.24	1,337,518.55	26.29%	-	1,337,518.55	3,750,106.45
Output 3	2,457,360	-	227,619.61	359,513.13	11,257.42	598,390.16	24.35%		598,390.16	1,858,969.84
Project Management Cost	1,089,560	37,407.71	178,493.98	149,292.12	85,632.42	450,826.23	41.38%	-	450,826.23	638,733.77
Unrealized loss/gain Comm & Audio Visual Equip	-	-	199.16 39,143.76	19,504.3	1.95	19,705.44 39,143.76	-		19,705.44 39,143.76	-19,705.44 -39,143.76
TOTAL GCF	12,294,545	37,407.71	1,138,778.03	3,780,721.44	250,230.33	5,207,137.51	42.35%	-	5,207,137.51	7,087,407.49

Table 6. UNDP resources disbursement status (June 2020 in US\$)

Project Components	Budget Approved (US\$)	Expenditure as of August 2020					% of budget spent	Committ ed 2020	Total committed and Spent	Difference between actual and planned budget
		2017	2018	2019	2020	Total spent				
Output 1	40,000	8,334.4	2,819.7	40,672.39	12,048.80	63,875.30	160%	-	3,875.30	-23,875.30
Output 2	241,000	-	67,463.35	78,113.85	74,407.69	219,984.89	91%	-	219,984.89	21,015.11
Output 3	92,000	2,521.0	30,893.9	30,610.65	27,310.60	91,336.17	99%		91,336.17	663.83
Project Management Cost	1,427,000	291,847.96	178,588.86	192,173.72	64,942.58	727,553.12	51%	-	727,553.12	699,446.88
Unrealized loss/gain		59.5	2,320.49	222.63	2.76	2,605.38	0%		2,605.38	-2,605.38
TOTAL GCF	1,800,000	302,762.87	282,086.32	341,793.24	178,712.43	1,105,354.86	61%	-	1,105,354.9	694,645.14

³⁰ Source: UNDP Atlas CDRs for Tables 6 and 7.

Table 7. Co-financing Status³¹

Sources of co-financing	Name of co-financer	Type of co-financing	Amount confirmed at FAA approval (US\$)	The actual amount contributed at the stage of IE (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
GCF Accredited Agency	UNDP	Cash	1,800,000	1,105,355	61%
Receipt Government	DoDMA	In-kind	2,170,000	240,000	41.7%
	DOF	In-kind		94,583	
	DCCMS	In-kind		222,917	
	DAES	In-kind		180,000	
	DWR	In-kind		166,667	
Total (US\$)			3,970,000	2,009,522	50.62%

³¹ Source: UNDP ProDoc. Letter from the Government of GB, and Project documentation provided by the Project team.

3.4.4 Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

At the time of the M-CLIMES Project development, there were several ongoing climate change adaption projects. The project was designed to build upon their achievements and learn from the gained experiences and how to face the challenges. It is collaborating with several ongoing climate-related projects, among those:

- The project worked with WFP and FAO to down-scale the national seasonal forecast for the 2019-2020 rainfall season at district and sub-district levels³². The three UN agencies; UNDP, FAO and WFP cofounded activities at the district levels and ensured that agency's specific activities do not overlap. FAO is implementing several projects with a focus on climate change adaptation including a national project entitled [Building Climate Change Resilience in the Fishers Sector in Malawi](#), a GEF/LDCF-funded project with a US\$ 5.46 Million grant. The Project aims to improve Lake Malawi and coastal area community resilience to climate change through the development of an early warning system, and sustainable fisheries and aquaculture, to ensure food and livelihood security.
- FAO is also implementing another project in Malawi on [Modelling System for Agricultural Impacts of Climate Change](#). An initiative by the FAO and the European research institutes. It aims at developing an innovative, interdisciplinary approach as an ideal tool to carry out climate change impact assessment at the national level. It includes 5 components: climate, crops, hydrology, forests, and the economy. It covers eight countries including Malawi.

The MCLIMESM project is being implemented under the UNDP Resilience and Sustainable Growth (RSG) Portfolio which is directly responsible for implementing other ongoing UNDP-supported initiatives. The MCLIMES Project is collaborating and benefiting from other initiatives.

3.4.5 Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

The FAA and UNDP ProDoc contained Monitoring and Evaluation Plans and Budgets that would be conducted following established UNDP and GCF policies and procedures, in compliance with GCF indicators. M&E activities, lead responsible parties, budget and timeframe were identified in the Monitoring and Evaluation section of the two documents. The LF for each of the three outputs of the project contains detailed indicators of achievement, means of verification, and assumptions and risks that provide milestones for measuring project implementation progress and performance. The UNDP ProDoc included a detailed monitoring plan (Annex 8), and an evaluation plan (Annex 9).

A total budget of **US\$ 186,000** was allocated to M&E, representing about **1-2%** of the GCF grant³³. The total M&E expenditure up until the IE time is **US\$ 68,068** (about **36%** of the total allocated budget).

Below is a summary of the M&E plan as per the UNDP ProDoc and GCF FAA³⁴:

M&E oversight and monitoring responsibilities:

- **Project Board Meetings (PB/PSC):** The PB/SC is responsible for making, by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Manager. The PB met several times since the project launching. Minutes of the meetings were prepared and shared with members of the PB.
- **UNDP CO support:** UNDP CO provides the needed support to the Project Team and the RPs. Most of the interviewed stakeholders expressed their satisfaction with the level of support received from UNDP CO. A few reports shared with the IE team. The UNDP Regional Office is involved, through the UNDP CO.

³² APR 2019.

³³ As described in the UNDP ProDoc. Page 67.

³⁴ FAA. Section H.2. Arrangements for monitoring, reporting and evaluation.

- **GCF learning missions/site visits:** several missions were conducted by GCF team members and experts to provide support to UNDP CO and the Government in implementing the Project.

Audit:

- **NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies:** Audits are conducted following UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on UNDP projects. The project was subject to NIM audits for 2018 and 2019. The latest audit report, **2019**, concluded that: *“the Statement of Expenses presents fairly, in all material respects, the expense of US\$ 1,265,715.36 incurred by the Project for the period from 01 January 2019 to 31 December 2019 following agreed-upon accounting policies and were: (i) in conformity with the approved project budgets; (ii) for the approved purposes of the project; (iii) in compliance with the relevant UNDP regulations and rules, policies and procedures; and (iv) supported by properly approved vouchers and other supporting documents.”*³⁵

Additional monitoring and reporting requirements:

- **Inception workshop (IW) and Inception Report (IR):** the IW was organized during the period of 26-28 September 2017 in Mzuzu. It brought together all stakeholders on climate information and early warnings to lay a strong foundation for effective and efficient implementation³⁶ of the GCF. The IR was submitted on 25 December 2017.

The project baseline, background, design, and management arrangement were reviewed, including the Project LF, budget allocation per year. Minimum changes were introduced as follows:

- changes in the composition of the steering and technical committees. A Recommendation was made to utilize existing coordination structures for DRM in Malawi as the project steering and technical committees. The National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Committee (NDPRC) was selected as the Project Steering Committee (PSC) for the M-CLIMES project and the National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Technical Committee (NDPRTC) was selected as the Project Technical Committee (PTC) for the M-CLIMES project.
- To facilitate project implementation, a core team comprising of representatives from implementing partner, responsible parties, PCU, UNDP and representative from ministries responsible for gender, environment, and information and communication should be set up and meet once every month to address project-related issues.

The IW represents a key strength in Project management as it sets the foundation for the project:

- AWP was discussed and endorsed by the Project's technical and steering committees.
- letters of agreements were agreed between the IP and RPs which specify roles and responsibilities.
- Ministry of Finance approved the opening of Project Bank Accounts.

Five key recommendations were also made by the stakeholders during the IW as summarized in the IW. These mainly focused on the role of academic and universities, private sector, Environmental Affairs Department (EAD), the district councils and the Department of Buildings in the construction of DCPs in the project implementation.

- **GCF Annual Project Reports/ Annual Performance Reports (APRs):** The NP, the UNDP CO, and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor provide objective input to the APR covering the calendar year for each year of project implementation. The NPM should ensure that the indicators included in the project LF are monitored annually in advance so that progress can be included in the report. The APRs include reporting of environmental and social risks and related management plans, gender, co-financing, and financial commitments, GCF 'conditions precedent' outlined in the FAA, amongst other issues. The Project has submitted 3 APRs those also were shared with the IE team: 2017, 2018 and 2019.

³⁵ Audit Report 2019.

³⁶ IR.

- **Lessons learned, case studies, and knowledge generation:** according to UNDP ProDoc, results from the project are to be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information-sharing networks and forums. The IE team noticed that the work on this M&E tool focused only on documenting lessons learned in *Section 2.5: Implementation challenges and lessons learned* of APRs. The Project team should invest more in generating lessons learned, preparing case studies and manage knowledge and share with relevant stakeholders, and other climate change projects and initiatives at the national and regional level.
- **An independent interim evaluation (IE) and terminal evaluation (TE) reports:** The IE evaluation (IE) is underway (this report); a terminal evaluation will take place no later than three months before operational closure of the project. Project IP and RPs should prepare a management response to the IE and TE findings and recommendations.
- **Final report:** the project's final APR along with the TE report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.
- **Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)** are UNDP/GEF requirements to be prepared for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor provide objective input to the annual PIR. The IE team found that the Project team did not prepare any PIR. The absence of this monitoring tool represents a weakness in the M&E cycle.
- **Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs)** were planned to monitor the progress and record it in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Risks have also been reviewed quarterly and updated in the Atlas system when needed. The IE team found that 6 QPRs were prepared for this project in 2018, 2019 and 2020.

The IE team noticed that the monitoring framework in place is workable and conducive to assess the performance of the project. However, the project targets could be elaborated. Also, PIRs could be prepared and used as a valuable monitoring tool, although the IE team acknowledge that it is a GEF M&E tool.

Based on the above, the evaluators believe that the project level monitoring requires some improvement particularly in the quarterly and annual monitoring of risks and issues that hinder the project implementation. **Accordingly, the rating given for the project level monitoring component is *Satisfactory (S)*.**

3.4.6 Stakeholder engagement

The project development included several rounds of discussions with stakeholders at the national level on the topic of climate information and early warning systems. A comprehensive list of stakeholders is annexed to the FAA (Annex II). The GCF FAA and the UNDP ProDoc listed all stakeholders involved in the consultation processes including government agencies, NGOs, CSOs, and private sector.

The FAA identified the need to shift in paradigm to the demand-based and multi-stakeholder ecosystem of climate information and services³⁷ to ensure the sustainability of the interventions by attracting private sector involvement through new business models, commercialization, and job creation. A detailed stakeholder s management plan is provided in Annex XII to the GCF FAA.

Main M-CLIMES project stakeholders are Department of Agriculture Extension, NASFAM, DCCMS, MACOF, DWR, and Fisheries Research. On the other hand, DoDMA and DAES are projected implementing partners. Department of Agriculture Extension and NASFAM are being engaged to train farmers on EWS. MACOF, specifically community outreach unit (COU), is responsible for training trainers on various project aspects such as disaster risks management and PICSA. Fisheries research and DWR were involved for their involvement in the project needs assessment/ baseline study, and water bodies monitoring and management where

³⁷ Funding proposal. Section E.3. Sustainable Development Potential. E.3.1. Environmental, Social and Economic CO-Benefits, including gender-sensitive development impact. Page 37.

various AWSs have been installed, respectively. For disaster risks management, DoDMA is main project stakeholder. To some lesser extent, funding of implemented activities is done through NASFAM.

So far, and after 3 years of implementation, the Project manages to involve key stakeholders as follows:

- Key lessons learned include the importance of building partnerships with specialized agencies for ensuring timely implementation of project activities, regular engagement with IP/RPs to prioritize focus on project results, and last-mile delivery to ensure that the vulnerable populations are benefitted.
- A partnership agreement was signed with Malawi University of Science and Technology (MUST), as part of which tailored courses were developed for officials responsible for the disaster and climate risk management. The aim was to train a group of DoDMA staff as Training of Trainers for imparting training to district and sub-district level disaster management officials including village civil protection committees.

At the time of the IE, the team noticed the project was able to collaborate with stakeholders' including the academia, media, and the private sector.

3.4.7 Reporting

The main GCF and UNDP M&E reporting requirements have been produced including APRs, QPRs, AWP, and Inception Report. The Project's AWP is reviewed, discussed, and endorsed by the PSC. The IR was prepared and submitted in December 2017. Three months after Project IW. The IE team was able to review 2018, 2019 and 2020 AWP, 3 APRs for 2017, 2018 and 2019, 6 quarterly reports, and the project IR. The Project did not prepare any PIR although it is a requirement as per by the UNDP ProDoc and the GCF FAA.

The project team used the APRs (GCF Project Reporting) to report on the progress made. Implementation progress was given per each activity as a percentage of implementation progress (implementation progress on a cumulative basis as of the date of the report). The 2019 APR provided the implementation progress as a percentage per each activity. This progress ranged between 75% for one activity to 25% for 6 activities, while 2 activities achieved 40% and 50%. The APRs also reported on the progress on the logic framework mid-term targets. According to 2019 APR, 8 mid-term targets³⁸ have been achieved and 7 have not been fully achieved. The APRs included reporting on challenges faced the project during implementation, the environmental and social safeguards and gender and associate plans. The project financial information was also reported on using an excel worksheet attached to the APRs.

It was noticed by the IE team that the project's risks were not monitored quarterly or even annually. Thirteen risks were identified since the start of the project until the IE time. They include operational, financial, political, social, environmental, regulatory, and technical risks. The last update of the risk log was in December 2017. Reviewing the UNDP ATLAS Risk Lo (screenshot) reveals that risks are not updated in the ATLAS system as well.

3.4.8 Communications

In terms of project activities, PMU and DAES are responsible for project activities planning. The project stakeholders are communicated and directed to execute the plans at the time determined by PMU and DAES. The implementing stakeholders are however requested to submit a budget for the planned activities. After the execution of planned activities, reports are sent directly to DAES.

Climate information from DCCMS is taken to district officers where discussions and climate information interpretation is done by DCCMS, DCPC, and all other project stakeholders. This allows district structures and all project stakeholders to build adequate capacity for them to effectively take down climate information to targeted communities. However, DCCMS has been fault for late dissemination of climate information which gives targeted communities less time

³⁸ The Project has 10 targets at the output levels, and 5 targets at the funding-level impact and outcome level targets.

to adequately prepare for the coming rain season. For example, the 2020/2021 season's weather forecasts for some areas were not ready for dissemination when this IE was being conducted. Sometimes DCCMS takes part in the dissemination of climate information with agriculture and NASFAM to communities. This is done to build trust between DCCMS and climate information users. Yearly reviews are an approach that DCCMS takes to get feedback from project stakeholders. For example, through reviews, project stakeholders discuss how the previous season was, what challenges were, and what the right was.

On the internet, the IE team observed many press releases and news coverages related to the M-CLIMES Project. The project was highly visible as UNDP and DODMA keep posting stories, press releases, and information about the project and its activities.

From a branding perspective, the IE Team noted that the project used the UNDP, GoM and GCF logos in its Reports.

3.5 Project Progress against GCF Criteria

3.5.1 Impact potential

The Project was designed to contribute to the Fund level impact of *increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions*,³⁹. Project interventions have been tailored to deliver benefit to 3 million beneficiaries and strengthening adaptive capacity and reduce exposure to climate risks for more than 1.6 million, thus contributing to Malawi's national plan to achieve climate-resilient sustainable development in the long-term.

The impact potential of project interventions remains very relevant and very much needed. The project seems on track to meet the impact of potential targets and indicators due to the following achievements:

- The installation of hydro-met infrastructure and equipment has been completed (33 AWSs, 1 lightning detection and thunder alert system, 2 lake-based weather buoys, 15 automated hydrological water level stations and a weather data visualization and integration system).
 - The lightning detection and thunder alert system covers the whole country and enhanced DCCMS to detect severe weather events. DCCMS uses this to track thunderstorms and lightning strikes in real-time which is crucial to warn communities and people at risk in vulnerable areas. Furthermore, the expansion of the network enhanced DCCMS capacity to improve its national and sub-national forecasts for the benefits of local communities mainly smallholder farmers. According to 2019 APR, the benefited communities comprise almost 90% of the country's population and depend on rain-fed agriculture.
 - The 2 lake-based weather buoys provide data which is vital to develop safety advisories (information on wind and wave for people who are dependent on fishing).
 - Improved DWR capacity to monitor river levels in the Central region of Malawi by installing 15 automated hydro-level stations. Information provided will help in establishing an integrated flood monitoring and forecasting system benefitting millions of people.
- A total of 183,702 small-holder farmers in 4 districts received seasonal weather ahead of the cropping season. Interviewed stakeholders and beneficiaries were happy but have comments and observations about the usefulness of the info received. Examples of feedback from the field are listed below:

District Agriculture Office, Zomba: "It's assisting quite a lot and, as time goes, more farmers are coming forth demanding climate information. We had some farmers who then before this approach could not easily be convinced to go for hybrid seed but with this those farmers have shifted from local to improved varieties. Farmers plan daily activities based on the weather forecasts and they

³⁹ FAA. Section H.1. Logic Framework.

plan and budget on their agriculture activities. I have seen people making resource allocation map that helps them to do farming activities based on resources they have and opportunities they are surrounded with. Some farmers are now venturing into livestock farming.”

DoDMA, Chikwawa: “for each year the DCCMCS releases weather forecasts for the whole country and then the forecasts are downscaled to districts. This helps us to prepare for disasters that may come and how to recover from those disasters. The forecasts predict when rainfall season will kick off and the cessation of rain season. For example, this season we will have normal to above normal rainfall and for shire valley; Chikwawa and Nsanje should expect floods and we tell communities to watch out for floods and that they should move uplands. And if we expect normal rainfall, we should watch out for dry spells as well and we advise farmers to match their fields and make box ridges.”

Fisheries Research, Mangochi: “the incidences of people getting lost have reduced for the past 2 years compared to the past 4 years. Apart from these buoys, we are encouraging them to download weather apps and they can see the intensity of the weather of that week and they advise their friends. We have not developed an app for Malawi but still, they can use other apps.”

District Agriculture Office, Salima: “for livestock, climate information is helping a lot because when it is predicted that rainfall will be below normal, farmers prepare feed for their animals in preparation for long dry seasons when food is scarce.”

Many of the farmers who were trained in the PICSA approach and were interviewed as part of the IE reported increases in farm income, improved food security and making positive changes to their crop enterprises.

- More than 5,000 fishermen and fish-processors in 4 lakeshore districts were sensitized about weather hazards and safety.

The Project is also in the process to establish a system which would benefit around 115,000 people in 8 districts with flood early warnings. Also, the expansion of the flood forecasting system that has the potential to benefit 1.4 million people is on track.

3.5.2 Paradigm shift potential

The project was designed to ensure a paradigm shift and can catalyze impact beyond the project's investment. This is ensured through the creation of a demand-based model for development and dissemination of climate and agriculture-related information and services for vulnerable communities, including small-holder farmers, fishers, and flood-prone communities. At the time of the IE, the progress is on track to contribute towards this paradigm shift. It is on track to induce a paradigm shift in the climate-informed national risk reduction and early warning strategies which will catalyze and scale up the use of climate risk information and approaches across all government sectors.

Based on the interviewed with the stakeholders and responsible partners, there is a better understanding of the role of climate information on disaster risk management, including what kind of information is needed by the community, how to receive, and what to do with it. The information has helped the RPs to devise appropriate strategies to reach the vulnerable communities with the much-needed information.

The Project is focusing on delivering transformative change in how people use climate and weather information in Malawi to make the decision and informed choices that affect their lives and livelihood⁴⁰. Since access to information is a challenge in Malawi due to low penetration of the mobile network, as well as electricity accessibility to charging mobiles. Thus, the Project has designed new tools to disseminate information to these targeted communities taking into consideration the accessibility issues. The approach focused on benefiting from farmers and

⁴⁰ For example, based on weather information, farmers are given choice to choose what to plant in a season given weather information. Also, if extension workers get information that rain will be above normal, they sensitize potato farmers to get ready for diseases because potatoes are susceptible for heavy rains.

fishers who already have access to the network (lead-farmers) so district extension workers trained as expert trainers to provide information to the lead-farmers in the communities, who in turn take the information to fellow farmers in their communities. This approach did not only provide access to farmers and fishers who were unable to get access to information but also enhance and increase the confidence of extension workers to talk about livelihoods and farming with members of their communities. In turn, this resulted in enhancing their social standing in their communities.

Also, it was evident that the institutional coordination among partner agencies has increased through the implementation of the project. While DCCMS took a lead role in training staff from the Department of Fisheries on climate change and weather hazards, the development of weather advisories for fishers and fish-processors was jointly drafted by DOF and DCCM. Besides, experts from different organizations, mainly from DCCMS, DAES and NASFAM, worked together and produced agro-met advisories for farmers in 10 districts. There are several examples of enhancing coordination. For example,

- A joint team comprising of DoDMA, DCCMS and DWR undertook a scoping mission and produced a technical report that informed the development of terms of reference for establishing community-based flood early warning system in 8 districts.
- A team of experts from the partner agencies spear-headed the dissemination of seasonal forecasts in 14 districts and facilitated the development of sector-specific response plans.

Also, coordination between national and sub-national offices and structures has been further strengthened as the project requires the national agencies to work with the sub-national systems. Many documents reviewed by the IE team indicated that many capacity building activities were conducted for the sub-national staff that includes training of district and sub-district level staff on DRM and climate change and training of agriculture extension officers in PICSA approach. This enhanced coordination has established the linkages between DRM and CCA sectors.

3.5.3 Sustainable development potential

The project manages to provide several economic, environmental, and social co-benefits, including gender impacts, to the target communities by providing the means to avoid losses from increased climate variability and climate extremes due to climate change.

Economic benefits. The Project is strengthening national hydro-meteorological infrastructure and forecasting abilities of the hydro-met staff and improving the accuracy and spatial coverage of available climate information. The CI will be used to provide tailored, sector-specific information to sectors and vulnerable communities to the impacts of climate change.

According to the interviewed stakeholders and local communities, the project started to deliver sustainable development benefits to vulnerable communities mainly farmers and fishermen. Farmers who were reached with seasonal forecasts in 2019 reported an increase in agriculture income due to the use of weather data to guide their crop production. The DCCMS Office capacity has been strengthened to generate reliable and area-specific forecasts and to digitize weather data which enable DCCMS to analyze the data and produce needed CI. In 2019, more than 150,000 farmers were reached and have benefited from the use of CI⁴¹. Also, losses by disasters will be reduced because of the expansion of the hydro-met infrastructure which provides flood alerts and extreme weather warnings.

For the fishing sector, weather information helps in improving management strategies linked to fishing and fishing processing and trading. Data transmitted from buoys⁴² installed by the Project to DCCMS will be used for wind and wave modelling. These data along with other weather, wave and current data are essential for EW purposes for lake users. Also, other water-related data such as water turbidity, dissolved oxygen and salinity are used to monitor water quality and define effects on fisheries and health.

⁴¹ APR 2019.

⁴² Lack-based weather buoys.

Also, the light detection sensors and system (LDSS) that are installed by the project track thunderstorms and provide thunderstorms and lighting alerts. The information provided by buoys and LDSS is critical to generating alerts for fishers on extreme weather events. As fish-processors are highly affected by rainy and cloudy weather, weather forecast helps in better planning this target group activities as the processors are depending on the sunny and windy weather, they will not incur financial losses if the on-time weather forecast is provided to them. Thus, providing this target group by weekly forecast is helping in preventing and reducing their economic losses.

The **social benefits** of the project are already visible following the streamlining of climate information service. For example, PICSA farmers in Salima and Dedza districts reported an increase in maize and other crops yields last growing season compared to the past growing seasons before the implementation of M-CLIMES project. Farmers from Dedza, Chikwawa and other PICSA districts also lamented that climate information is aiding their decision making on what crop varieties to grow, hence increased yields were realized last growing season. With climate information, farmers in Dedza, Chikwawa, Zomba and Salima are diversifying crops and preparing animal feed in readiness of dry season, this has improved farmers' wellbeing. Interviewed beneficiaries and stakeholders provided very positive feedback about agriculture extension services. Also, interviewed extension workers reported a good degree of confidence in their capacity to deliver extension services to the farmers. Furthermore, lead farmers to feel very happy about their ability to support other farmers in their communities⁴³. These two categories, the extension workers, and farmers reported that the agro-met forecast that was provided to them was timely and accurate which is a critical indicator of their trust in hydro-met agencies.

It seems that the project is on track to provide **environmental co-benefits**. The expansion of hydro-met infrastructure will help stakeholders in generating information for better management of floods and drought. It was noticed from the interviewed stakeholders that they are happy with the level of progress and have already witnessed the enhanced capacity of DCCMS to monitor the weather conditions. Furthermore, water level monitoring has improved through the installation of hydro-stations. Farmers and smallholder farmers in some districts indicated that they have started using weather information to adapt their practices concerning land, water, and crop management.

When it comes to **gender aspects**. It was noticed that the project has put special focus on women and how to involve them in different training aspects. 2019 APR indicated that 264 agriculture extension workers were trained in the PICSA methodology, out of them were 28% females. Also, 53% of the lead farmers (out of the 16,702 lead farmers), who got trained on how to interpret and use seasonal forecast information in farm decision were female. To the IE team, this is very important as it helps in empowering women farmers to increasingly participate in farm decision making. The review of the list of trainees for various events reveals that female staff were involved in all training programmes organized by the project.

3.5.4 Needs of the recipients and Country Ownership

As climate change impacts on Malawi is evident, many scenarios show an increase in mean temperature and a decrease in total annual rainfall. These indices will have impacts on water availability and rainfall events. The combined effect of increased temperatures and reduced rainfall is most probably to result in a considerable impact on agricultural output, a reduction in the land suitability for rain-fed agriculture production, more frequent and intense droughts, floods, and extreme weather events such as storm surges and strong winds. Furthermore, the vulnerability to climate change is high due to several factors including the unique and highly degraded ecosystems; socio-economic and demographic constraints like the high population growth rates and high poverty levels; limited financial capacity to finance adaptation measures; high dependence on rain-fed agriculture; heavy reliance on natural resources; limited knowledge on climate change and variability at the community level; sub-optimal agricultural productivity and practices, and limited diversification within the household economy both on

⁴³ Some reported that they are trained on how to use the weather data and usually they use social medial such as WhatsApp and Bembeke radio to disseminate the data.

and off-farm; limited access to affordable and sustainable clean energy sources; and limited awareness at local levels⁴⁴.

The natural hazards killed 3.3 million people in Malawi in 40 years (1970 and 2010) as stated in the FAA. About 1/8th of the total agricultural output could be lost due to flooding⁴⁵. Increases in temperatures, droughts, floods, and severe weather will negatively affect crop growth and many aspects of the agricultural value chain including drying, storage and transport to market. Fisheries will be affected, directly and indirectly, by climate change. Thus, the activities proposed under the project are of the utmost priority to the country.

The project is a key intervention as highlighted in the National Climate Change Policy. Malawi is a signatory to several multilateral agreements covering environment, including the three major Rio1992 agreements of Conventions on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the convention on Combating Desertification (UNCCD). It is also a signatory to the Hyogo Framework for action.

The Project is fully relevant to Malawi and shows the Government's high commitment to the adoption and implementation of policies and measures not only to adapt to climate change but also to manage climate-induced disasters. The Project is aligned with the following key national plans, policies, and strategies:

- Malawi's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Framework (2020),
- Malawi's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and its associated Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs),
- The [National Disaster Risk Management Policy of 2015](#),
- [National Climate Change Management Policy](#) – NCCMP (2016),
- The National Resilience Strategy (NRS), and
- The [Malawi Growth and Development Strategy \(MGDS III\)](#) (2017-2022): "*Building a Productive, Competitive and Resilient Nation*".
- It also contributes to Malawi's NAPA project priorities 3, 4 and 5.

The GoM was heavily involved in the development of the project proposal. A series of consultations were organized at different levels; national, districts and community levels. Consultations also included government ministries and departments, civil society, private sector, NGOs, and development partners. The Environmental Affairs Department (EAD) was involved through a series of consultations as it is the NDA. The NDA was actively engaged in the development of the project document as well as in facilitating the consultation process. Those include the preliminary Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting (July 9, 2015) to present, review and endorse the proposal. The national ownership is also evident as the NDA had issued a 'no objection letter' for the submission of the proposal to the GCF. Also, the executing agencies provided co-financing for the project.

Yet, the project is viewed by most of the government officers, except in few cases such as DCCMS, as having a weak and non-sustained national ownership since most project activities and financial expenditure is planned and executed at the central level. For example, time to conduct pieces of training and review meetings, and procurement of project resources are planned and budgeted at the top level and directed to districts for implementation without involving them in the planning process. The Project team needs to pay more attention to ensure the engagement of all stakeholders in the right way in the project's planning.

3.5.5 Efficiency and Effectiveness

Effectiveness: "*Extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it to be achieved*"⁴⁶.

The Project has been effective in achieving many of its mid-term targets. The effectiveness of the project strategy is evidenced by:

⁴⁴ FAA. Section #.4. Needs of the Recipient.

⁴⁵ FAA. Section #.4. Needs of the Recipient

⁴⁶ Effectiveness definition: UNDP GEF Mid-Term Review manual.

- The level of satisfaction with the Project progress expressed by all stakeholders during the IE is high. Stakeholders reported that the level of effectiveness of this Project is high and is acceptable.
- The project was effective during the first three years of implementation. The rate of progress per activities varies between 25% to 75%. The work under all activities has been initiated, while some delay was noticed during this year, 2020, due to COVID-19 breakout.
- The effectiveness of M-CLIMES Project is also evident in the high quality of some of the products and activities delivered by the Project. Such as:
 - The Project's technical reports, assessments, and studies, including the Participatory Integrated Climate Services for Agriculture: Initial Analysis of Quantitative Survey Data, Hydrological Assessment Report, M-CLIMES Baseline final report, Beneficiary Profiling Survey Report for the Fishers Sector in different districts, and also PICSA Field Manual, are all found to be technically rigorous, well written and presented. Also, many of the training manuals included user-friendly figures and graphics to facilitate the learning process.

Considering the above-mentioned facts, Effectiveness was rated as **Satisfactory**.

Efficiency: *“Extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible”⁴⁷.*

The rating for project efficiency is **Satisfactory (S)**. The Project has been able to implement all planned activities completely or partially within the first three years of implementation with the GEF and UNDP resource allocated. Overall, it appears the project has been efficient for the following reasons:

- Involvement of all relevant government agencies through the utilization of the pre-existed coordination mechanisms (Committees) as the Project steering and technical committees.
- In different sites, the IE noticed the right integration with other related initiatives.
- The proposed co-financing resources are being mobilized and correctly tracked by the project team. According to UNDP ProDoc, UNDP cash contribution has been utilized. As of the IE time, more than 60% of the total UNDP cash co-financing has been utilized. The Government of Malawi in-kind contribution has also been mobilized from a different department. Official letters from the different government departments have been reviewed by the IE team. UNDP utilized co-financing was analysed using the CDRs generated from the UNDP ATLAS system.

However, some in-efficiencies were noted. For example, the long delay in recruiting consultants/experts due to the need to comply with the UNDP rules and regulations. However, the project was able to proceed and achieve many of the mid-term targets. Interviewed partners expressed their dissatisfaction of the long and bureaucratic UNDP procurement processes.

Overall, it emerges that the Project has been **Satisfactory** when it comes to efficiency.

3.6 Sustainability

The FAA identified and listed all possible risk factors, including a description of the risk, category, level, and probability of occurring in addition to proposed mitigation measures. The overall rating of the project risk was Moderate. The FAA listed 13 risks; those included technical, operational, and institutional risks. Three risks were rated as high, five were rated as medium and the remaining five were rated as low. The IE team carefully reviewed the risks and believes that all possible risks and needed mitigations measures were proposed in the FAA and the UNDP ProDoc.

First, the IE team did assess whether the risks identified in the ProDoc were the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. It was found out that the risks identified were the most applicable and the rating was appropriate. In the following section,

⁴⁷ Efficiency definition: UNDP GEF Mid-Term Review manual.

the IE team outlines briefly how the following risks apply to project sustainability; financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance as well as environmental risks.

The IE team noticed that A detailed risk log, following the UNDP Risk Log template, was prepared, and annexed to the UNDP ProDoc. The UNDP risk log included 13 risks in total. Most of these risks were medium level and included technical, operational, environmental, financial, organizational, political, regulatory, and strategic.

Based on the review of the risks off-line log, risk ATALS log and the Project reports, the IE team believes that risks were not correctly monitored during the implementation phase. The Project risks were not quarterly/regularly updated, and mitigation measures were not identified as per the UNDP M&E guidelines.

The TE team considers the management of the project's risks needed major improvement and the lack of follow up on the project's risks and potential risks might affect the success of the project.

3.6.1 Financial risks to sustainability

The project is co-financed by the Government of Malawi and UNDP. This co-financing provides the needed financial support along with the GCF grant to the Project.

To the IE team, for such a project with a large component of procurement and installation when reviewing the sustainability of project achievements, financial risk is an area where some questions related to the long-term sustainability of project achievements need some attention. In the Project risk log, one financial risk was identified "Procurement and installation of hydro-meteorological and telemetry equipment, including hardware and software, is delayed because of complications with the release of funds and/or national procurement procedures". However, it was not updated since December 2017. Since the project is supporting the procurement of equipment, once the project will end, financial resources needed to run and maintain this equipment (recurrent costs) and over the medium to long term to replace it is a potential risk.

Equipment will be handed over to Government at the end of the Project, DoDMA and other partners need to commit financial resources to cover the operational cost of the EWS in its regular budget. Based on the meetings with the project's partners, so far, the government is committed to the project objective and has the "instruments" (institutional and legal frameworks) to carry out its program. However, the project should ensure that the government will continue to support the project achievements with the necessary financial resources from the national budget and possibly from other funding sources.

3.6.2 Socio-economic to sustainability

There are no major social or economic risks identified during the IE that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes. Given the project design and the actual implementation, the IE indicated that the project has a high level of both public and private sector stakeholders' ownership and hence project implementation will allow project outcomes/benefits to be sustained even after the end of the project implementation term. From the various interview conducted during the IE, it was evident that various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow. Throughout project design to implementation, there has been sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project.

3.6.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The IE found out that there are no legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that significantly pose risks that may jeopardize the continuity of the project's benefits. The team found out that there are required project management mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place. As explained in the above sections, there seems to be no institutional or governance risk at all levels. The coordination among several institutions is a key factor that would ensure the sustainability of results and eliminate any governance risks. Furthermore, the use of the already existed mechanism to serve as the Project board and technical committee provides additional support to the project institutional framework and ensure that governance risks to sustainability are minimized.

3.6.4 Environmental risks to sustainability

The IE team did not find any significant environmental risks that may jeopardize the continuity of the project outcomes. Indeed, under the Project, the resilience of the local communities will be increased and their capacities to adapt to climate change will be enhanced.

3.7 Innovativeness in results areas

The project promoted innovative use of mobile phone and ICT technologies for the development of and 'last mile' dissemination of climate information. In particular, the project enhanced the use of ICT and mobile platforms for agricultural advisories. The dissemination of information through the extension workers to the lead farmers and then to the farmers proved to be innovative and effective. The project will engage with Airtel and other telecom networks to facilitate cost-effective rates to enable outreach to even the remotest areas. These innovations engender scale-up of the use of climate information for early warnings as well as planning for enhanced livelihoods.

3.8 Environmental and social safeguards and progress concerning the gender action plan.

The identified environmental and social impacts were derived from the field investigations, consultation with community members, district and national government agents, focus group discussions, a participatory rapid assessment within the project area and professional judgment, concerning the expected activities and the list of impacts is by no means exhaustive. These identified impacts include the creation of employment and business opportunities, fauna and flora management, the safety of installed AWS, HIV/AIDs prevention etc.

The M-CLIMES project has created employment opportunities of Malawian experts who are respectful of local institutions. For example, Malawians certified bricklayers and other labours have been employed in the Emergency Operation Centre (EOC) construction in Zomba. The construction of EOC has also created business opportunities for Malawians including local communities who sell food items at the construction site. These employment and business opportunities have been exposed to both men and women. The M-CLIMES has created a market for local businesspersons; local markets provide soft drinks, snacks, and other small items that are procured at the district level during M-CLIMES activities such as training.

For example, it was reported that DCCMS procure some items locally and present invoices to M-CLIMES for payment of rendered goods and services. The IE has discovered adequate locals' capacity for use of EWS and climate information in disaster risks management and preparedness and agriculture activities. There are continuous development and dissemination of tailored climate information products targeting smallholder farmers, and communities are being trained to interpret and make use of climate information. However, communities are not capacitated to manage the facilities on their own as the DCCMS is in control of all the installed AWS. To some extent, extension workers have been trained to fix small problems that don't need more advanced technical expertise. For example, local people and extension workers can keep the AWS surrounding clean and remove dust particles from rain gauges that potentially affect weather data quality.

Sensitization of communities has proved significantly important as there have been few cases of vandalism of AWS reported. Contrary to the safety of Lake Buoys and water sensors installed, only Ngabu has registered a single incidence of vandalism that has forced the authorities to reallocate AWS within office premises.

To mitigate anticipated injuries, workers were provided with appropriate and recommended Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). However, IE did not establish clear measures that have been put to justify how negative impacts are being addressed in various project phases. For example, where EOC is being constructed, it is not clear how fauna and flora were managed, how child labour was considered and how other negative impacts such as dust from the construction site, HIV/AIDs prevention and noise from construction site were adhered to.

Gender consideration has been more observed at the local level (in various committees such as VCPCs, ACPCs, PICSA groups and VBCs) because the inclusion of all gender categories is deliberately influenced by project arrangement unlike in technical positions where the sex of an officer does not determine who should be trained but rather position that specialist holds. For example, if subject matter specialists are an all-male institution, it simply applies that

training opportunity was offered to men only. Such scenarios were observed at DCCMS, MACOF, and most Agriculture Districts Offices and EPAs where top technical positions are occupied by men. Despite that the action plan recommended equal opportunity for training men and women, this did not apply as described above.

Division of labour to some extent defines who should be involved in various activities. For example, fishing as an activity is done by men, but fishing gears are owned by both men and women. Fish processing and trading are mostly done by more women than men. This brings a balance when it comes to BVCs membership, hence gender seem to be considered in BVCs structures.

The PICSA farmers that interacted with evaluators were more of the womenfolk than the menfolk. The refresher training in Salima had more women than men as per lists of participants that the local evaluator interacted with. Besides, in Zomba, the evaluator encountered one male in a PICSA farmer group. On finding out the reason why it was learnt that men who participate in agriculture and other development committees are considered as people who like to be with women. This means that the project has to deal with cultural stereotypes to break gender barriers in meaningful public participation of both men and women. In Malawi, it has generally been reported that women participate more in agriculture and development activities than men (Gundula et al 2020). The project must document the number of men and women participating in project activities to track the numbers and percentages as per the gender action plan stipulation. At the time of data collection, no report indicated progress towards the gender action plan. The information on farmers trained, committees formed disaggregated by gender in all districts was demanded during data collection by evaluators, but this was not provided. This may be concluded that such data has not been compiled and hence the need for documentation to track the indicators in the gender action plan.

3.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

The project official reports and the meetings with the stakeholders did not reveal any unexpected results, neither positive nor negative.

3.10 Replication and Scalability.

The installed weather data integration and processing system have enabled the forecasters to integrate numerical weather products with satellite-based information and created a user-friendly platform to process and disseminate weather information. The investments brought about a positive change and interviewed stakeholders believe that the hydro-met departments are now confident in their capability to generate timely and reliable weather information for vulnerable communities. The work that has been done by the project in specific districts can be replicated in other districts. The potential for replication and scale of the expansion of the infrastructure and enhancing of concerned staff in different departments is very high.

Furthermore, the approach of working with farmers through the lead farmers to enhance access to information has led to enhanced relationships between lead farmers and farmers and lead farmers and extension workers. This approach can be replicated for other purpose and in other districts.

Also, the institutional coordination between different responsible partner agencies has increased and enhanced. The mechanism could be used in all district all over Malawi and used for other purposes.

The Project design ensured that the project's results are sustained beyond the project duration and can be replicated in other areas in Malawi, through its exit strategy, which has the following elements:

- *Leveraging domestic financing*: the project is considered successful in leveraging the committed co-financing (cash and in-kind) from UNDP CO and the Government of Malawi as fully described in sub-section 3.4.3: Financing and Co-financing. Also, it was noticed that the partnerships built between DODMA and the responsible parties have already enhanced local coordination to deliver results, not only related to this project, but also other initiatives and investments.
- *Ex-post plan for O&M of observing equipment*: the proposed exit strategy highlights the need to develop an O&M plan including the needed human and financial resources.

The Plan reflects the Government's commitment to the long-term sustainability of the project's results and outcomes. The O&M plan is to be drafted during the first two years of project implementation, however, at the IE time, the O&M plan is not yet drafted.

- *Capacity Building:* the project is considered successful in building the country's capacity to generate and use of EWS and CI. This is crucial to ensure that there is a knowledge and skills transfer and that the country can use the knowledge generated in other districts. An intensive capacity development programme has been implemented during the last three years of implementation. By strengthening last-mile access, the project facilitates effective adoption and use of the new systems, which will ensure sustained participation, as well as replication of best practices after the project.
- *Strengthening the demand-based model for CI/Products:* the project is in the process to develop products that are tailored to fisheries and agriculture. These products are essential to creating a sustainable ecosystem of CI and services catalyzing private sector engagement. This will enable livelihood planning and lead to economic and social benefits. The information can also be used for other activities, and sectors like water resources management, energy, and water supply.
- *Learning and knowledge management:* to the IE, the project needs to put some more emphases on knowledge generation. The generation and transfer of knowledge and collective learning are needed to ensure long term sustainability of the resilience-building activities and impacts.
- *Policy and legal frameworks.* The M-CLIMES Project is contributing to the operationalization of key national policies like NDRM and NCCIP policies. It is also supporting the GoM in mainstreaming of weather and CI into the national plans, policies, and local development plans. Furthermore, the project ensures that the capacities and infrastructure that are being built by the project, will continue to be very relevant. Yet, the GoM needs to put an exit strategy and sustainability plan to ensure that the project's interventions and impacts are sustained and scaled up after the Project.

To the IE team, the exit strategy proposed in the project document is very relevant and comprehensive. If it is implemented correctly, it will ensure that the project implementation is very effective and efficient. However, the IE recommend that the project team develop a detailed exit strategy and a sustainability plan with a clear set of actions on who is involved in the implementation, timeframe for implementation, milestones to be achieved, resources needed and a mechanism for follow up.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The M-CLIMES Project has achieved several of its intended mid-term targets for many reasons ranging from good project design, appropriate adaptive management measures such as the involvement of 6 national organizations as responsible partners, and finally the strong government, and Project team commitment to achieve the project results on time.

The Project design placed significant emphasis on building the capacity of local beneficiaries (farmers and fishers) as well as responsible government agencies and stakeholders to adapt to the changing climate. This was highly beneficial as all concerned groups were trained and capacity has been enhanced.

In its partnership arrangements, the Project properly engaged appropriate stakeholders at all levels, national and district.

The project provided timely assistance to the Government of Malawi to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts on lives and livelihoods, particularly of women, from extreme weather events and climate change. It is helping the Government in increasing resilience and enhancing livelihoods of the most vulnerable people.

Despite national events that have effectually set-back project implementation during the first six months of implementation, the Project managed to deliver considerable results by the mid-term point of its implementation.

The Project implementing and executing agencies, and responsible partners have provided satisfactory to highly satisfactory support to project implementation. The Project facilitated the implementation of a very successful and comprehensive capacity building programs reached local beneficiaries in vulnerable communities.

The installation of the equipment establishes an important step towards the development of a nation-wide architecture for generating science-based climate information to improve its early warning system (EWS). Furthermore, the coordination among all partners facilitated the establishment of this architecture.

The Project has strongly invested in addressing technical, financial, capacity, and access barriers related to weather and climate information by enhancing national and sub-national hydro-meteorological capacities for early warning and forecasting, by developing and disseminating tailored climate information products targeting smallholder farmers as well as fisherfolk, and by strengthening the capacity of communities to respond to climate-related disasters.

The project objective is to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts on the lives and livelihoods of women and men, boys, and girls, from extreme weather events and climate change in Malawi by Intensifying coverage of the hydrological and meteorological (hydro-met) observational systems and capacities to generate timely, reliable, and geographically relevant early warning and weather forecasting information to inform responses and manage climate impacts, enhancing capacities to package, diffuse, and apply climate and weather information to improve disaster response and adaptive planning and to implement risk transfer mechanisms among public and private sector actors as well as communities, and Mainstreaming and implementing climate risk management across national, sub-national, and local levels to ensure preparedness and urgent response to climate-related disasters. It follows from the detailed analysis of outputs that by June 2023 the project objective is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. Therefore, the overall rating for progress to the achievement of the project objective at IE is **Satisfactory (S)**.

The Project is very much acknowledged by the GOM, and very relevant to UNDP, GCF, and the Government's plans (at national and district levels). With the confirmed interest and support provided by the UNDP and the GoM prospects for sustainability are certain, and overall sustainability is considered **likely**.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project.

Corrective action 1: make the best use of the IW to ensure that the Project design is still responding to the national context and needs by reviewing and updating the project's outputs, indicators, targets, and management arrangement.

Corrective action 2: Adaptive management measures need to constitute part of the Project implementation review. This is crucial to effectively avoid any risks during the implementation.

4.2.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce the initial benefits of the Project

Recommendation 1: UNDP CO to put more attention on project monitoring and evaluation. Specifically, the management of risks, mitigation measures, and update at UNDP ATLAS system on quarterly bases.

Recommendation 2: Due to COVID-19 and its implication on the Project, the PCU – with the support of the IP and EA, revise and update the outdated project timeline, and develops clear adaptive management mechanisms for project implementation. A set of concrete actions need to be defined and agreed upon by all partners to be achieved on yearly bases to ensure the achievements of the end-of-the project targets. The LF to provide more details on how to measure the targets.

Recommendation 3: The implementing partner and the responsible parties facilitate the involvement of all stakeholders in the project implementation. The IE recommends establishing effective partnerships with identified NGOs, the private sector companies, *agro-dealers*, and academia.

The IE observed that seed companies and *agro-dealers* are not producing and supplying seed varieties that meet farmers' demands as far as climate information is concerned. Despite making an informed decision on crop variety to grow based on weather forecasts at hand, farmers are finding it difficult to access certified seed at the markets. Seed companies are not producing seed that suit predicted rainfall information.

Additionally, the project should utilize the availability of other NGOs that are working in related areas to expand their beneficiary targets. For example, in Chikwawa there is *WFP* and *Goal Malawi* which are also working with farmers on PICSA but in other isolated areas.

Extension department should financially support in climate data observation and dissemination as it has direct use of the climate information. Extension department should put climate information production and dissemination of climate products as a routine activity within the department that needs to be given yearly allocation.

Recommendation 4: To ensure the sustainability of the Project's outcomes (as it relates to the GCF Objective) it is necessary to document the project success stories. This can be supported by the production of seasonal calendars that portray seasonal CI with warning messages and advice to CI users. Also, PICSA should be mainstreamed in the agriculture sector so that it can be financially supported through yearly government financial allocation.

Recommendation 5: IE recommends expansion and intensification of safety on sea training to fisherfolk, who have not been trained yet. For example, the IE found that out of 23 BVCs at Namaso stream in Mangochi, only 11 BVCs have been trained on "Safety on Sea". The IE also found out that some VCPCs were revamped and the new members were yet to receive training on reducing disaster risks. The project should consider training all subject matter specialists on the use of CI about agriculture and disaster risks reduction intensification and the training should be accompanied by frequent refreshers and review meetings.

Recommendation 6: Although the project's interventions are addressing the problems that were identified to be addressed, M-CLIMES project should also consider taking a step further by providing operational resources for the monitoring and supervision of implemented activities until that level where knowledge absorption on use of EWS and CI in their agriculture activities, disaster risk management and other livelihood activities is adequately rich. Although the project is addressing the challenges that were identified, Field Officers should be provided with resources for monitoring and supervision of

implemented activities until the time when for example, PICSA farmers can independently make decisions based on CI. For example, PICSA training has 12 steps; before the season, on the season, during the season, and after season. After implementing activities under each stage, M-CLIMES project should provide resources to supervise and monitor farmers' adoption of PICSA interventions

Recommendation 7: Project activities' plan and procurement of locally available resources can easily be done at the district level with the adequate engagement of district representatives and officers at field level. For example, project stationery for training farmers, VCPCs, ACPCs, and BVCs should be procured at the district level. This is viewed as a tool to enhance the sustainability of the project in addition to promoting project national ownership and reducing some crucial delays in procurement processes.

Recommendation 8: DCCMS should widen the use of mobile operators to disseminate climate information through mobile phone messages. The project should increase the number of CI users such as farmers and flood-prone area residents who receive CI through mobile text messages. To some extent, climate information should be disseminated earlier (in September) and should be area specific.

Recommendation 9: Project should consider the use of decentralization structures such as DCPCs, ACPCs, VCPCs, ADCs in disseminating climate information as these platforms are viewed as strong and much respected in the communities.

4.2.3 Proposals for future directions underlining the main objectives.

Expand the scope of the project to cover the whole Country. The knowledge generated and capacity enhanced by the Project, are crucial to ensure that Malawi has enhanced adaptive capacity to climate change and has sustained human lives.

4.2.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success.

The project proved several good practices that resulted in the implementation of the project that may be adopted for the formulation of other projects as emerging lessons. Some of these are:

- **Lessons learned 1:** The IE recognizes the dedicated commitment and efforts of all actors, mainly, executing and implementing partners, as well as responsible parties' teams in achieving many of the project's mid-term target despite the delay encountered at the outset of the Project.
- **Lessons learned 2:** The IE recognizes the interest of the Government of Malawi which has supported the successes of the project and has the potential to ensure the outcomes are sustainable. Government ownership is key for projects' successful implementation.
- **Lessons learned 3:** Comprehensive and effective capacity development programmes at the institutional, organizational, and individual levels are crucial to ensure effective implementation of the projects' interventions, achieve outcomes, and ensure the sustainability of results.
- **Lessons learned 4:** The need for projects that are focusing on climate change adaptation to mainstream and interact closely with other initiatives with a focus on disaster risk management. Such projects are complex and need to use different processes to follow an adaptive management approach that tracks the risks and assumptions as well as the indicators and to apply several monitoring approaches and implementation strategies. These elements should be developed at the project development phase, discussed, and updated – if necessary- at the project inception phase, and systematically and thoroughly examined during the project implementation phase.

5. Annexes

5.1 Interim Evaluation ToR

Interim Evaluation (IE) of the UNDP supported GCF financed M-CLIMES project

Location:	Home-based with a mission to Lilongwe and project districts
Application Deadline:	
Time left:	
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	International Consultant
Languages Required:	English
Duration of Initial Contract:	30 days

A. Project Title: Saving Lives and Protecting Agriculture-based Livelihoods in Malawi: Scaling Up the Use of Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning systems (M-CLIMES)

B. Project Description:

The Government of Malawi, with the support from UNDP, has secured funding from the Green Climate Fund to scale up the use of modernized early warning systems (EWS) and climate information in the country. The project will work with communities in disaster-prone and food-insecure districts to co-develop tailored weather- and climate-based agricultural advisories to be disseminated through ICT/mobile, print and radio channels. The project will also scale up best practices in community readiness to respond to disasters and mitigate key risks. Community-based EWS will be scaled up in flood-prone areas and capacities to use and respond to warnings will be strengthened at the national, district and community levels.

The project is being implemented in 21 districts by the Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DODMA), in collaboration with the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS), Department of Water Resources (DWR), Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES), Department of Fisheries (DoF), and the National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi (NASFAM).

The project has three expected outputs;

- i. Expansion of observation networks that generate climate-related data to save lives and safeguard livelihoods from extreme climate events
- ii. Development and dissemination of products and platforms for climate-related information/services for vulnerable communities and livelihoods
- iii. Strengthening communities' capacities for use of EWS/CI in preparedness for response to climate-related disaster

The M-CLIMES project was approved by the GCF Board in November 2015. The Accreditation Master Agreement (AMA) was signed between GCF and UNDP on 5th August 2016, and the Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) for the project was signed on 10th May 2017. The FAA entered effectiveness on 28th June 2017, which is considered as the project start date. UNDP and the Department of Disaster Management (DoDMA), as Implementing Partner for this project, have worked together to finalize a subsidiary agreement (in the form of the UNDP Project Document), which was signed on 4th August 2017. An interim project evaluation is scheduled in the third year of the project implementation, while the final project evaluation will be carried out in 2023. In the above context, UNDP is seeking an international consultant to carry out the interim evaluation (IE) of the project.

C. Objectives

The consultant will assess the implementation of the project and its alignment with FAA obligations and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as

specified in the Project Document. The evaluation will assess early signs of project success or failure to identify **the necessary changes** to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. IE will also assess the following.

- Project Strategy
- Implementation and adaptive management
- Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programmes;
- Overall performance of the project concerning project goals, outcomes, outputs, targets, and indicators.
- Performance of the project concerning GCF investment criteria, paradigm shift potential, contribution to the creation of an enabling environment, the potential for knowledge and learning, sustainable development potential and meeting needs of the recipients and country ownership.
- Compliance of the project concerning environmental and social safeguards and gender equity.
- Relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the project.
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities.
- Risks to sustainability; and
- Country Ownership
- Innovativeness in results areas (the extent to which interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways);
- Replication and scalability – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporated in independent evaluations);
- Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

D. IE approach and methodology

The consultant must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The consultant will review 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 reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & 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). The consultant will review the baseline Funding Proposal submitted to the GCF. The consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach⁴⁸ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Interim Evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the IE team is expected to conduct field missions to project sites including a sample of the following districts; Chikwawa, Phalombe, Chiradzulu, Zomba, Ntcheu, Dedza, Salima, Lilongwe, Dowa, Ntchisi, Nkhatabay, Rumphi, Mzimba and Karonga; and the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services in Blantyre.

⁴⁸ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

E. Scope of the IE

The consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context of 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 (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- 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.

Results Framework/Log frame:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame 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?
- Are the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Do 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 promptly? 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 baseline indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project applies adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcome and outputs Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁴⁹	Baseline Level ⁵⁰	Level in 1 st APR (self-reported)	Level in 2 nd APR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵¹	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵²	Achievement Rating ⁵³	Justification for Rating
Outcomes:	Indicator (if applicable):								
Outputs 1:	Indicator 1:								
	Indicator 2:								
Outputs 2:	Indicator 3:								
	Indicator 4:								
	Etc.								
Etc.									

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved

Yellow= On target to be achieved

Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

⁴⁹ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁵⁰ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵¹ If available

⁵² Colour code this column only

⁵³ Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Identify the remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review the overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Are agencies sufficiently staffed? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken promptly? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GCF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations because of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Review project cost norms to assess their appropriateness to the current situation in different localities.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complemented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate-resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they 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? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Reporting:

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

Communications:

- 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 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?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

v. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Performance Reports and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- Besides, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

vi. Performance of the project concerning GCF criteria.

- To what extent the project meeting the GCF investment criteria?
- The progress of the project towards paradigm shift potential.
- How is the project contributing to the creation of an enabling environment including potential for knowledge and learning?
- The progress of the project in meeting sustainable development potential including economic, social and environmental benefits.

vii. Needs of the recipient and country Ownership

- To what extent the project is aligned to the needs of beneficiary groups as well as the financial, economic, social and institutional needs?
- 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?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build-essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure the sustainability of the result achieved?

viii. Environment and social safeguards and gender equity

- To what extent the project is compliant to environmental and social safeguards as outlined in the project document?
- 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?

ix. 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.

x. 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 because of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

i. 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 to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability, or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The consultant will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation's evidence-based conclusions, considering the findings.⁵⁴

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. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations in total.

Ratings

The consultant will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *IE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the evaluation report. See Annex E for rating scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

Measure	IE Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

F. Timeframe

⁵⁴ Alternatively, IE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

The total duration of the consultancy will be approximately 30 working days. The tentative evaluation of timeframe is as follows:

No.	Activity	Number of working days	Expected completion date
1	Document review and preparing IE Inception Report (IE Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the IE mission)	3 days	10 th June 2020
2	IE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	15 days	26 th June 2020
3	Meeting with PMU, internal presentation on preliminary findings, preparation presentation	1 day	2nd July 2020
4	Workshop presentation – debriefing/handout key findings presented to stakeholders	1 day	3 rd July 2020
5	Preparing a draft report	6 days	11 th July 2020
6	Finalization of IE report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) (<i>note: 2 weeks' time delay accommodated for circulation and review of the draft report</i>)	4 days	17 th July 2020

G. IE deliverables

Deliverable	Description	Responsibilities
Inception report	Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
Presentation	Initial findings	Consultant presents to project management. Project stakeholders and the Commissioning Unit
Draft report	Draft final report	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
Final report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final IE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

H. IE arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's IE is the UNDP Malawi Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

I. Qualifications

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

Education:

- At least a master's degree in economics, environment, climate change, environmental science, sustainable development or related fields.

Experience:

- Minimum 8 years at the national or international level, related to environmental and/or energy planning, climate change, transport and waste management, low carbon development, and carbon footprint development.
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management.
- Some experience working with UNDP or UNDP-evaluations is an advantage.
- Strong report writing and communication skills in English.
- Familiarity with climate change issues in Africa an advantage.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, gender-sensitive evaluations, youth, and interlinkages with the Sustainable Development Goals.
- Good in data analytic and visualization techniques

Competencies:

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards.
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Technical Competencies:

- Analytic capacity and demonstrated the ability to process, analyze and synthesize complex technical information.
- Proven ability to support the development of high-quality knowledge and training materials, and to train technical teams.
- Proven experience in the developing country context and working in different cultural settings.

Communication:

- Communicate effectively in writing to a varied and broad audience simply and concisely.

Professionalism:

- Capable of working in a high-pressure environment with sharp and frequent deadlines, managing many tasks simultaneously.
- Excellent analytical and organizational skills.

Language Requirements:

- Fluency in written and spoken English is essential. Ability to write reports, make presentations

J. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

A *Lump Sum Amount* payable modality is envisaged upon submission of deliverables and acceptance/approval by UNDP CO for each identified task reflected in the agreed and signed specific TOR. The lump-sum amount is inclusive of all the costs related to the assignment. Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. All planned costs related to this consultancy must be specified in the proposal by the contractor for this assignment. The contract will be paid in US\$.

% of Payment	Deliverable
20%	Upon submission and approval by Commissioning Unit of final TE Inception Report
50%	Upon submission and approval by Commissioning Unit of draft TE report
30%	Upon submission and approval of final TE report (TE Report Clearance form must be signed by Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GCF RTA) and TE Audit Trail

K. Recommended Presentation of Offer

Interested and qualified consultant are invited to apply. The consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁵⁵ provided by UNDP;
2. **CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form)**⁵⁶;
3. **Brief description of the approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel-related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (fill address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for MCLIMES Project Interim Evaluation" or by email at the following address ONLY: (fill email) by **(time and date)**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The award of the contract shall be made to the consultant who has received the highest score out of pre-determined technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical criteria weight – 70 %

Financial criteria weight – 30 %

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical (based on Technical proposal)	70%	70
Minimum educational background and work experience	20%	20

⁵⁵

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.doc>

⁵⁶

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Understanding of the assignment from the ToRs	20%	20
Methodology and experience with similar assignments	30 %	30
Financial (based on the financial proposal)	30%	30

M. Approval

This TOR is approved by Sothini Nyirenda, Program Analyst, Resilience and Sustainable Growth

Signature _____
Name and Designation _____
Date of Signing _____

5.2 List of documents reviewed

S. No.	Document Title
1.	Executed FAA UNDP Malawi
2.	Final UNDP ProDoc for M-CLIMES
3.	FP 002 Schedule 2A FAA UNDP CO-finance Budget
4.	Funding Proposal – Malawi
5.	GCF Budget – Procurement Tool v3.1
6.	Gender Action Plan
7.	Gender Assessment
8.	NOE-FAA-UNDP Malawi
9.	Schedule A-FAA Budget Malawi
10.	Schedule 2B-Disburments Plan
11.	Schedule 5_Implementation Plan
12.	Signed Prodoc Malawi
13.	2018 Signed Annual Work Plan
14.	2019 Signed Annual Work Plan
15.	2020 Signed Annual Work Plan
16.	2017_ GCF_APR_PIMS5710-GCFIDFP002
17.	2018_ GCF_APR_PIMS5710-GCFIDFP002
18.	2019_ GCF_APR_PIMS5710-GCFIDFP002
19.	Q 1 M-CLIMES- Progress Report 2018
20.	Q 2 M-CLIMES- Progress Report 2018
21.	Q 3 M-CLIMES- Progress Report 2018
22.	Q 2 M-CLIMES- Progress Report 2019
23.	Q 3 M-CLIMES- Progress Report 2019
24.	Q 1_2 M-CLIMES- Progress Report 2020
25.	BTOR – Profiling
26.	Malawi M-CLIMES Survey
27.	Report PICSA TOT workshop Dedza 2018
28.	Report PICSA TOT workshop Ntcheu 2018
29.	UNDP PICSA workshop in Rumphi
30.	Capacity Development Plan
31.	Report on Operational Training of Synergies
32.	Report on Factory Training on lake-based buoys
33.	Report on System administration training for synergies.
34.	Malawi National Guidelines for CBEWS
35.	MCLIMES_ Monitoring and Evaluation Report
36.	Hydrological Assessment Report

37.	DOF Profiling _Mangochi
38.	DOF Profiling _Nkhata Bay
39.	DOF Profiling _Nkhotakota
40.	DOF Profiling _Salima
41.	The full report of NASFAM and DAES learning visit to Nairobi
42.	UNDP NASFAM PICS workshop Karonga
43.	ELMC_ Fisheries
44.	UNDP PICSA workshop in Mponela
45.	BTOR Monitoring Report on PICSA
46.	BTOR on development of agriculture advisories
47.	BTOR Blantyre
48.	BTOR Coordination Meeting_Salima
49.	MCLIMES Baseline- Final Report
50.	Updated LORTA Impact Evaluation Design Report
51.	MCLIEMS M and E Plan
52.	Results-Based Matrix
53.	PR Activity Progress- Tracker
54.	ESS First
55.	ESS Second
56.	ESS for hydro stations
57.	MCLIMES Comprehensive ESMP Report
58.	Report of the EWS Scoping Mission
59.	UNDP Co finance Letter
60.	Final Audit Report DODMA
61.	Final Audit Report DODMA 2018
62.	DWR Financing Letter
63.	DOF Financing Letter
64.	DODMA Financing Letter
65.	DCCMS Financing Letter
66.	DAES Financing Letter
67.	Co-financing master plan
68.	5710 APR 2019 Section 12
69.	5710 APR 2018 Section Final
70.	CDR by Project 2020
71.	CDR 2019 By Project
72.	CDR 2019 by activity
73.	CDR 2018 by activity
74.	CDR 2017 by activity

75.	2020 Signed AWP
76.	2019 Signed AWP
77.	2018 Signed AWP
78.	2018 CDR by Project
79.	2017 ATLAS budget
80.	BTOR GCF Malawi March 2019 RO
81.	BTOR Sep 2018 Babatunde
82.	Photos for Joint M&E visit
83.	Photos for MCLIEMS PICSA training
84.	2018 Q1 work plan
85.	2019 Q1 work plan
86.	Consolidated Q4 WP
87.	Work plan 2020 Q1 consolidated
88.	2019 Mapping Agriculture- Appendices
89.	2019 Mapping Agriculture- Main Report
90.	2019 Training
91.	BTOR-Directors visit
92.	DCCMS Report on the local operation and management training
93.	Draft minutes of the NDPRC in progress
94.	Indicative disbursement schedule
95.	Joint TC minutes
96.	List of consultants
97.	M&E requirements and budget 2020
98.	Malawi expenditure
99.	Malawi Finance
100.	Malawi M-CLIMES Survey
101.	Malawi UNDAF 2019-2023
102.	M-CLIMES Framer info Assessment
103.	Minutes of the national disaster preparedness and relief committee
104.	Minutes of the NDPRCT 2018
105.	Minutes of the second joint technical committee
106.	Names of focal points
107.	NDPRTC minutes
108.	Note to file – GCF Discussion 2017
109.	PCU Staff
110.	PICSA field manual- Chichewa
111.	Report on operational training of synergieWeb
112.	Report on DCCMS PICSA preparation workshop

113.	Report on in Factory Training Kaufbauren
114.	Report on Salima training
115.	Report on System Administration Training for Synergie-Web
116.	Report on the 2019-2020 Rainfall Seasonal Forecast Downscaling
117.	Schedule 2A-FAA Budget Notes
118.	Signed LPAC Minutes
119.	Travel Plan for field visits
120.	Updated LORTA Impact Evaluation Design Report 2019-2020

5.3 Example Questionnaire used for data collection

Many of the below questions were used in the virtual interviews. These questions were used to make sure that all aspects are covered, and the needed information is requested to complete the review exercise and a guide to preparing the semi-structured interviews.

I. Relevance - How does the Project relate to the main objectives of the UNDP/GCF/GOM and the environment and development priorities?

1. Is the Project relevant to the GCF objectives?
2. Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?
3. Is the Project relevant to the Country development objectives?
4. Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries?
5. Is the Project internally coherent in its design?
6. How is the Project relevant considering other donors?
7. What lessons have been learned and what changes could have been made to the Project to strengthen the alignment between the Project and the Partners' priorities and areas of focus?
8. How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?

II. Effectiveness – To what extent are the expected outcomes of the Project being achieved?

1. How is the Project effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
2. How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?

III. Efficiency - How efficiently is the Project implemented?

1. Was the adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
2. Did the Project logical framework and work plan and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?
3. Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
4. Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
5. Was Project implementation as cost-effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently?
6. Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?
7. Were there institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanism to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations about Project design and implementation effectiveness were shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP CO and UNDP Regional Hub Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement? Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?
8. To what extent were partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations encouraged and supported?
9. Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable?
10. What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? (between local actors, UNDP, and relevant government entities)
11. Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?
12. Did the Project consider local capacity in the design and implementation of the Project?

IV. IMPACTS - What are the potential and realized the impacts of activities carried out in the context of the Project?

1. Will the project achieve its objective that is to improve fiscal measures for collecting, managing, and allocating revenues for global environmental management?
2. How is the Project impacting the local environment such as impacts or likely impacts on the local environment; on poverty; and, on other socio-economic issues?

V. Sustainability - Are the initiatives and results of the Project allowing for continued benefits?

1. Are sustainability issues adequately integrated into Project design?
2. Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?
3. Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?
4. Our laws, policies, and frameworks being addressed through the Project, to address the sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?
5. Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure the sustainability of the results achieved to date?
6. Did the Project contribute to key building blocks for social and political sustainability?
7. Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?
8. What are the main challenges that may hinder the sustainability of efforts?

5.4 Interim Evaluation Agenda

International Evaluator and Team Leader: Dr Amal Aldababseh

National Evaluator: Dr Judith Kamoto

Date	IP/RP	Name of Focal Persons	Position/ (Role in MCLIMES)
Tuesday, 7th July 2020	UNDP Regional Office	Benjamin Larroquette	Regional Technical Advisor UNDP Global Environmental Finance
Tuesday, 7th July 2020	PCU	Rabi Narayan	Project Coordinator
		Ted Nyekanyeka	M&E and Knowledge management Specialist
		Blessing Thole	Head of the finance for this unit (PCU)
		Ephraim Chiunjiza	Part of the finance team
Tuesday, 7th July 2020	Project Advisor	Mark Tadross	Technical Advisor on Climate Information and Early warning system.
Wednesday, 8th July 2020	UNDP CO	Sothini Nyirenda	Project Assurance
Thursday, 9th July 16- 17Hrs	Department of Fishers (RP- Outcome 2)	Dr. Friday Njaya	Director of Fisheries (MCLIMES Main Focal Point)
		Caroline Munthali	Fisheries Officer (Alternate Focal Point)
9th July 2020 afternoon. 14 - 15 Hrs	Department of Agricultural Extension Services (RP- Outcome 2)	Geoffrey Chilombo	Agricultural Communications Officer (Main Focal Point)
		Anderson Chikomola	Deputy Director – DAES (former Main focal point)
		Bonface Kautale	(Alternate Focal Point)
Friday, 10th July 8 am – 9 am	Dept of Disaster Management Affairs (Project Implementing Partner & RP- Outcome 3)	James Chiusiwa	Director- Disaster Risk Reduction (Project Manager for MCLIMES)
		Mulder Mkutumula	Mitigation Officer (M-CLIMES Focal Point)
		Samuel P. Gama	Principal Mitigation Officer ((M-CLIMES Focal Point)
Friday 10th July 2020 11 am - 12noon	NASFAM (RP- Outcome 2)	Wycliff Kumwenda	Farm Services Coordinator (MCLIMES Main Focal Point)
		Frank Masankha	Farm Services Officer (MCLIMES Alternate Focal Point)
Friday 10 July 16- 17 Hrs	Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (RP- Outcome 1)	Jolamu Nkhokwe	Director of DCCMS
		Rodrick Walusa	Deputy Director DCCMS (MCLIMES Alternate Focal Point)
		Amos Ntonya	Chief Meteorologist (MCLIMES Main Focal Point)
30 July 2020	Department of Water Resources (RP- Outcome 1 &2)	Chikondi Mbemba	Principal hydrologist (Alternate Focal Point)
		Chilungamo Banda	Water resources development officer
		Rodrick	Senior water resources development officer
Monday 12th October 2020	Department of Fisheries (RP- Outcome 2), &	Dr. Friday Njaya	Director of Fisheries (MCLIMES Main Focal Point)

	Department of Agriculture Extension Services (RP- Outcome 2)	Geoffrey Chilombo	Agricultural Communications Officer (Main Focal Point)
Tuesday 13th and Wednesday 14th October 2020	Department of Agriculture Extension Services (RP- Outcome 2)	Geoffrey Chilombo	Agricultural Communications Officer (Main Focal Point)
Friday 16th October 2020	Department of Fisheries (RP- Outcome 2), & Department of Climate Change and Meteorology Services (RP- Outcome 1)	Dr.Friday Njaya Amos Ntonya	Director of Fisheries (MCLIMES Main Focal Point) Chief Meteorologist (MCLIMES Main Focal Point)
Monday 19th October 2020 08-12 hrs. 13-17hrs.	Department of Climate Change and Meteorology Services (RP- Outcome 1) NASFAM (RP- Outcome 2)	Amos Ntonya Frank Masankha	Chief Meteorologist (MCLIMES Main Focal Point) Farm Services Coordinator
Tuesday 20th October 2020	NASFAM (RP- Outcome 2)	Frank Masankha	Farm Services Coordinator
Wednesday 21st October 2020, and Thursday 22nd October 2020	Department of Climate Change and Meteorology Services (RP- Outcome 1) Department of Disaster Management Affairs (Project Implementing Partner & RP- Outcome 3)	Amos Ntonya 0999 Mulder Nkutumula	Chief Meteorologist (MCLIMES Main Focal Point) Mitigation Officer (M-CLIMES Focal Point)

5.5 List of persons interviewed

	Name	Title	Organization
1.	Benjamin Larroquette	Regional Technical Advisor	UNDP RO Global Environmental Finance
2.	Rabi Narayan	Project Coordinator	PCU
3.	Ted Nyekanyeka	M&E and Knowledge management Specialist	PCU
4.	Blessing Thole	Head of the finance for this unit (PCU)	PCU
5.	Ephraim Chiunjiza	Part of the finance team	PCU
6.	Mark Tadross	Technical Advisor on Climate Information and Early warning system.	Independent consultant
7.	Sothini Nyirenda	Project Assurance	UNDP CO
8.	Dr. Friday Njaya	MCLIMES Main Focal Point	Director of Fisheries
9.	Caroline Munthali	(Alternate Focal Point)	Director of Fisheries Fisheries Officer
10.	Geoffrey Chilombo	Agricultural Communications Officer (Main Focal Point)	Agricultural Communications
11.	Anderson Chikomola	Deputy Director – DAES (former Main focal point)	DAES
12.	Bonface Kautale	(Alternate Focal Point)	DAES
13.	James Chiusiwa	Director- Disaster Risk Reduction (Project Manager for MCLIMES)	Department of Disaster Management Affairs
14.	Mulder Mkutumula	Mitigation Officer (M-CLIMES Focal Point)	Department of Disaster Management Affairs
15.	Samuel Gama	Principal Mitigation Officer (M-CLIMES Focal Point)	Department of Disaster Management Affairs
15.	Wycliff Kumwenda	Farm Services Coordinator (MCLIMES Main Focal Point)	NASFAM
17.	Frank Masankha	Farm Services Officer (MCLIMES Alternate Focal Point)	NASFAM
18.	Jolamu Nkhokwe	Director of DCCMS	Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services
19.	Rodrick Walusa	Deputy Director DCCMS (MCLIMES Alternate Focal Point)	Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services

21.	Amos Mtonya	Chief Meteorologist (MCLIMES Main Focal Point)	Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services
22.	Chikondi Mbemba	Principal hydrologist (Alternate Focal Point)	Department of Water Resources
23.	Chilungamo Banda	Water resources development officer	Department of Water Resources
24.	Rodrick	Senior water resources development officer	Department of Water Resources
25	Amos Mtonya	Chief Meteorologist	Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services
26	Rodrick Walusa	Deputy Director-engineering and communications	Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services
27	Vincent Chisale	Association Business Manager	NASFAM
28	McKenlay Dupu	Crops Officer	Zomba District Agriculture Office
29	Sidney Kim	Agriculture Enumerator	Malosa EPA
30	Peter Malata	Field Officer	NASFAM
31	Nelson Banda	AEDC	Tembwe EPA
32	Christina Masontenganji	AEDO	Tembwe EPA
33	Mercy Kapesi	AEDO	Tembwe EPA
34	Lucin Kanamwali	AEDO	Tembwe EPA
35	Alfred Chikweza		Salima District Agriculture Office
36	Matiya Phiri	Crops Officer	Salima District Agriculture Office
37	Pauleen Kadammanja	Land Resources Conservation Officer	Salima District Agriculture Office
38	Francisco Kachoma		Salima District Agriculture Office
38	Witness Tanganyika	Fisheries Extension Worker	Salima District Fisheries Office
39	Madalitso Kauwa	Fisheries Extension Worker	Salima District Fisheries Office
40	Blesco Ndowa	Fisheries Extension Worker	Salima District Fisheries Office
41	Micheal Steven	Fisheries Extension Worker	Salima District Fisheries Office
42	Hardwell Cosmas		Salima District Fisheries Office
43	Enefi Tsekula		Salima District Fisheries Office
44	Ernesto Phiri	AEDC	Linthipe EPA
45	Thokozani Mvula	Research Technician	Dedza District Agriculture Office
46	Mercy Chigwenembe	District Agriculture Communication Officer	Dedza District Agriculture Office
47	Margaret Burirani	Agribusiness Officer	Dedza District Agriculture Office

48	Chrissie Somanje	Food and Nutrition Officer	Dedza District Agriculture Office
49	Harlod Nkhoma	Meteorology Officer	Dedza District Agriculture Office
50	Mcdonald Kachiwala	Reporter	Bembeke community radio
51	Maxon Ngochera (PhD)	Fisheries Research Officer	Fisheries Research
52	Mathews Chirwa	Senior Aquaculture and Fisheries Officer – community outreach unit	Malawi College of Fisheries
53	Medicine Dazilone	Aquaculture and Fisheries Officer – community outreach unit	Malawi College of Fisheries
54	Patrick Linos	Meteorology Officer	Chkwawa District Agriculture Office
55	Alick Thyolamwendo	AEDC	Kalambo EPA
56	Paul Kananji	AEDO	Kalambo EPA
57	Jika Chaona	AEDO	Kalambo EPA
58	Dalitso Mhango	Senior Crops Officer	Chikwawa District Agriculture Office
59	Blessings Munthali	Crops Officer	Chikwawa District Agriculture Office
60	John Mthepheya	Crops Officer	Chikwawa District Agriculture Office
61	Rodger Kanyimbiri	Crops Officer	Chikwawa District Agriculture Office
62	Mr. Magalasi	Mitigation Officer	DoDMA

5.6 Interim Evaluation Rating Scales

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

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all 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”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
4	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.
3	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.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

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

5.7 Interim Evaluation matrix

Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Overall project assessment, lessons learned and recommendations				
What do you perceive as the project's most significant achievements thus far?		Project achievements	Interviews Project documentation	Interviews Review of project documentation
Please comment on any lessons learned thus far through this project		Lessons learned	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
What issues, if any, are impeding project progress and how might these be addressed?		Obstacles to progress	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
Do you have any recommendations to strengthen project execution and delivery?		Recommendations	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
Do you have any recommendations to maximize project impact and sustainability?		Recommendations	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Design				
Are there any aspects of the project design that should be modified at this point to maximize project impact or to better reflect the project reality?		Design changes required	Interviews Project documentation	Interviews Review of project documentation
Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?		Content of logframe	Logframe Interviews	Review of logframe interviews
Were the main project assumptions and risks identified?		Project assumptions and risks	Logframe Interviews	Review of logframe interviews
Were the capacities and resources of the executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?		Capacity and resources of EA and counterparts at project entry	Interviews ProDoc	Interviews Review of ProDoc
Were the management arrangements and roles and responsibilities properly identified before project approval?		Detail and clarity of management arrangements	ProDoc	Review of ProDoc
Were partnership arrangements negotiated before project approval?		Agreements with partners on project implementation at project entry	Interviews ProDoc	Interviews Review of ProDoc

To what extent did stakeholders participate in the project formulation process?	Level of stakeholder participation in project design	Interviews ProDoc	Interviews Review of ProDoc
Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?	Project design reflecting previous lessons learned	Interviews	Interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Effectiveness: to what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved			
To what extent were each of the project outcomes and project objectives achieved thus far?	Each of the project outcomes and project objective achieved thus far? Logframe indicators at the objective and outcome levels	APRs, progress reports, consultancy reports Interviews	Interviews Review of project documentation
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	Risks are identified and a clear set of mitigation measures were identified and taken	Risks log	Review of project documentation
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	Lessons learned generated and shared	Lessons learned the report. Progress Reports	Review of project documentation Interviews
Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Gender equality and women's empowerment			
How is the project contributing to gender equality and women's empowerment?	Level of the progress of gender action plan and gender indicators in the results framework	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Desk review, interviews, field visits
In what ways is the project's gender results advancing or contributing to the project's climate change outcomes?	Existence of logical linkages between gender results and project outcomes and impacts	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Desk review, interviews, field visits

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Finance			
Is there enough clarity in the reported co-financing and leveraged resources to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources?	Table specifying co-financing and leveraged resources secured and sources thereof	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews

Have the reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing been made clear and are the reasons compelling?	Explanation of the difference between expected and actual co-financing	Project reports with co-financing figures	Review of project documentation Interviews
Are externally funded project components well integrated into the GCF supported components?	Components funded by co-financing	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
Is the extent of materialization of co-financing influencing project outcomes and/or sustainability?	Total co-financing secured. Level of achievement of project outcomes Perceived project sustainability.	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews

Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
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?				
Have the project and individual activities been implemented in line with the defined timeframe and budget, and accordance with the Annual Work Plans and Budgets?		Annual Work Plans and Budgets (AWBs) are based on the results framework and total budget and work plan; Activities are implemented within the timeframe and budgets indicated in the AWP	Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners, RTA	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders
Were the project monitoring and evaluation and reporting plans implemented satisfactorily and did they support the project's implementation?		Quarterly and Annual Reports submitted timely and provide adequate information on progress, bottlenecks, and proposed mitigation measures; M&E Plan implemented and used to improve the project's implementation	Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners, RTA	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders
Were risks, challenges and bottlenecks adequately and timely identified and mitigated?		Mitigation measures of identified bottlenecks and negative impact on implementation were implemented timely and effectively	Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders

Were any needs for adaptive management changes identified and implemented?	Adaptive management changes made and positively impacted project implementation	Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders
Was the project communication strategy designed and implemented satisfactorily and did it support achieving the project's objective and outcomes?	Project communication strategy elaborated, adopted and implemented; identified stakeholders and target groups were adequately informed	Project documentation; Communication materials; interviews with relevant stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders
Were the project's management arrangement and support of the partner organizations adequate for enabling efficient implementation?	Project implemented smoothly. Support provided by UNDP facilitated implementation	Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders
Was the project's financial management adequate?	Adequate, complete, and detailed financial reports; audit	Project documentation, specifically - financial reports; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders

Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Implementation				
Has Implementing Agency & Executing Agency supervision and support been adequate so far?	EA and IA level of supervision and support	EA and IA monitoring results	Interviews Project reports (PIRs, progress reports)	Interviews Review of project documentation
Has there been an appropriate focus on results by the IA and EA?	EA and IA monitoring results	Response to implementation problems and risks	Interviews Project reports (APRs, progress reports)	Interviews Review of project documentation
Are managing parties responsive to significant implementation problems (if any) and project risks?	Response to implementation problems and risks	M&E Plan	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
Does the M&E plan include all necessary elements to permit the monitoring of results and identify M&E roles and responsibilities?	M&E Plan	Amount of funding designated and utilized for M&E	Pro.Doc.	Review of Pro.Doc.
Was the M&E Plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?	Amount of funding designated and utilized for M&E		Pro.Doc. Interviews Project reports detailing expenses	Review of Pro.Doc. Interviews Review of project expenses

Is the project log-frame effectively being used as a management tool to measure progress and performance?	Use of log-frame	Project reports including PIRs Interviews	Review of project reports Interviews
Are progress and financial reporting requirements/schedules complied with, including the timely delivery of well-developed monitoring reports (APRs)?	Content and submission dates of project reports	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
Are follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, taken in response to M&E activities (e.g., in response to APRs, and steering committee meetings)?	Responses to M&E activities	Project reports Interviews	Interviews Review of project documentation
If changes in planned project outputs, activities or implementation methodology were made, were these adequately justified and approved by the project steering committee?	Explanations provided for changes during project implementation	Steering committee minutes Project reports	Review of steering committee minutes and project documentation

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Stakeholders			
Is the project involving the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their active participation in project implementation, and M&E?	Level of participation of stakeholders in project implementation	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews

Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Progress Towards outcomes/outputs: To what extent have the expected outcomes/outputs and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?				
Fund level impact: To what extent the project increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions?		Percentage of beneficiaries' relative total population of Malawi	Project reports; interviews with relevant national and local stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders
Project Outcome: To what extent the project targeted vulnerable communities including women in selected areas have access and use climate-related risk information to enhance livelihoods and increase resilience?		Strengthen adaptive capacity and reduce exposure to climate risk	Project reports; interviews with relevant stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders; ToC exercise

Is the project realistically expected to achieve its objective by project end, within the defined timeline?	Review against the mid-term targets.	Project documentation; interviews with Project team, UNDP CO and implementing partners	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders; ToC exercise
Output 1: Has the capacity of hydro-met networks and staff enhanced to generate climate-related data and forecast extreme weather and climate change?	Percentage of national coverage of climate monitoring network (fully operational AWS– 32% national coverage Hydrological stations– 49% national coverage Number of lightning detection sensors (7) - 100% Number of lake-based buoys (2) - 40% 105 Number of trained personnel that are proficient with the generation of EWs/CI and related activities	Project reports; interviews with relevant national and local stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders. inspection of selected hydro-met stations in the target districts.
Output 2: Has tailored climate information/products and decision-support platforms developed and disseminated for agriculture, fisheries, and flood risk management	Percentage of population with access to tailored climate information and early warnings for agriculture, fisheries and flood risk management in the 21 target districts (disaggregated by sex) Percentage of population in targeted districts that are satisfied by level and quality of services provided by DCICs and other district-level information sources Assessments of private sector engagement and market feasibility for tailored products developed	Project reports; interviews with stakeholders and communities in the target districts	Documents review; consultation with relevant national and local stakeholders; questionnaires to selected communities in the target districts
Output 3: Has the community capacities strengthened for use of EWS/CI in preparedness for and response to climate-related disasters in targeted districts?	Number of males and females reached by community-based automated early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established Number of district and community level actors in targeted communities that show increased knowledge and use of EWS/DRM	Project reports; interviews with stakeholders and communities in the target districts	Documents review; consultation with relevant national and local stakeholders; questionnaires to selected communities in the target districts

Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation 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?				
Does the project strategy support achieve national needs and priorities?		Project objective and outcomes in line with priorities indicated in national policies, strategies, and programmes	PRODOC; published relevant national policies, strategies and programmes	Documents review; consultation with UNDP CO and main government partners
Does the project strategy support achieve the needs and priorities of local stakeholders?		Project objective and outcomes in line with priorities indicated by local stakeholders	Project documentation; interviews with local stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with District and local level stakeholders
To what extent is the project complementary to government's and partners' initiatives (regional, national and local projects and programmes) addressing the same priorities?		Project design complements existing and planned initiatives	PRODOC; documentation of complementing initiatives	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders and partners
Are the Project outputs and activities relevant and feasible for achieving the Project objective and outcomes?		Project outputs and activities logically lead to achieving Project objective and outcomes	Project documentation; interviews with local stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders
Were risks well-identified and mitigation measures well designed to adequately address the risks?		Verification relevance of risks and effectiveness of mitigation measures indicated in the PRODOC, through later Project reporting	Project documentation; interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders
Do the Project's outputs and management arrangements promote national ownership?		Project outputs support national and local capacity building; Project management arrangements are based on national ownership	Project documentation; interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders	Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders

Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Mainstreaming				
Is it possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations?		Employment generated because of the project Impact of the project on income levels, food security, etc.	APRs, Interviews	Review of APRs Interviews
Do the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme documents, UNDAF, etc?		The consistency of Project with CPD, CPAP, and UNDAF	Pro.Doc., CPD, CPAP	Review of Pro.Doc., and UNDAF.
Have gender issues been considered in project implementation? If so, how and to what extent?		Level and nature of participation of women in project implementation	PIRs, interviews	Review of PIRs, interviews

Evaluation Questions	Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?				
To what extent have the results been delivered with the least costly resources possible?		Total amount spent compared to budget Amount spent per output and outcome compared to budget The total amount of co-financing secured	APRs (particularly summaries of project expenses) Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?		The number of partnerships established.	Progress reports.	Review of project documentation Interviews
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?		The number of local experts and staff engaged in the project's implementation.	Project HR documents	Review of project documentation Interview
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?			Project financial reports and progress reports	Review of project documentation Interviews

5.8 Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well-founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance the evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about it and how issues should be reported.
5. They should be sensitive to beliefs, manners, and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. They are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings, and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Terminal Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant:

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT




I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (Jordan) on (November 2020)

Signature: 

5.9 Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by UNDP Country Office	
Name: Andrew Spezowka, Portfolio Manager, Resilience and Sustainable Growth	
Signature: 	Date: December 3, 2020
Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: Benjamin Larroquette	
Signature: 	Date: _04/12/2020
Principal Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: __Srilata Kammila_____	
Signature: 	Date: _7 Dec 2020_____

5.10 Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft IE report.