



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Terms of Reference

International Consultant for the Interim Evaluation of the UNDP Supported GCF financed project ‘Strengthening the resilience of smallholder farmers in the Dry Zone to climate variability and extreme events through an integrated approach to water management’ also known as ‘Climate Resilient Integrated Water Management Project - CRIWMP’ in Sri Lanka

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: International Consultant

Duty Station: Home based

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 27th December 2020

Duration of Contract: 30 working days (27th of December 2020 to 26th April 2021)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed “Strengthening the resilience of smallholder farmers in the Dry Zone to climate variability and extreme events through an integrated approach to water management” project, (PIMS#5752) implemented through the *Ministry of Irrigation*, which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started in *June 2017* and is in its *4th* year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to support the Government of Sri Lanka to strengthen the resilience of smallholder farmers in Sri Lanka’s dry zone, who are facing increased risks of climate change. The project has adopted a river basin approach to deliver an integrated package of interventions for irrigation and drinking water in the Malwathu Oya, Mi Oya and Yan Oya watersheds in the dry zone. These watersheds cover the districts of Kurunegala, Puttalam, Anuradhapura, Mannar, Trincomalee, Vavuniya and Polonnaruwa.

The key objective of this project is to strengthen the resilience of smallholder farmers to climate variability and extreme weather events through an integrated approach to water management. The primary measurable benefits include resilient water and agricultural management for 770,500 direct beneficiaries and 1,179,800 indirect beneficiaries who will gain from improved water management, resilient agriculture practices, and the provision of climate and weather information. The project envisions initiating a paradigm shift in how water resources are managed, especially in the dry and intermediate climate zones of Sri Lanka. This shift is catalyzed through an integrated approach incorporating climate change concerns; understanding linkages across river basins/sub-river basins; and covering multiple uses of water including irrigation, agriculture, livelihoods, drinking water and disaster management. The Project’s bottom-up approach to integrated water management involves the preparation of integrated cascade water resource development and management plans. These plans cover a host of water management aspects including drinking water management, groundwater management, climate-smart agriculture development, catchment management plans, disaster preparedness plan, and, etc. These aspects correspond to the three outputs of the project while also recognizing the interconnectedness of the said outputs.

The three outputs of the project include,

Output 1: Upgrading and enhancing the resilience of village irrigation systems and scaling up climate-resilient farming practices in three river basins of the dry zone. This output mainly focuses on improved climate-risk informed water management for agricultural production in the selected river basins by

upgrading the inter-connected cascade systems and associated agricultural practices. These interventions will also lead to restoration and improvements in surface and groundwater availability as well as quality.

Output 2: Enhancing climate-resilient, decentralized water supply and management solutions to provide access to safe drinking water to vulnerable communities. This output intends to deliver drinking water solutions to poor farmer households through a multi-pronged partnership approach involving source replenishment, enhanced storage capacity, improved supply of clean and safe drinking water and addressing root causes of water quality issues.

Output 3: Strengthening weather/climate and hydrological observing, forecasting and water management systems to enhance the adaptive capacity of smallholder farmers to droughts and floods. This includes providing access to weather/climate-related knowledge, advisories and early warning for storms and flooding including the planning of water release from irrigation tanks.

Resources from the Green Climate Fund, in conjunction with government co-financing, will invest in improving the community irrigation water infrastructure and associated agricultural practices, scaling-up decentralized drinking water systems, and strengthening early warnings and forecasting for flood-response and water management. The grant from the Green Climate Fund is USD 38.08 million, with a government co-financing contribution of USD 14 million.

The project is implemented using UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM), with significant UNDP support to implementation. The implementing partner (IP) for the project is the Ministry of Irrigation (formerly, the IP was the Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment). However, with the Presidential/ Parliamentary elections of 2020, the portfolio of irrigation and water management was shifted to a new Ministry, requiring the project to change its Implementing Partner). The Project Board is responsible for providing overall direction, and consists of a wide group of project stakeholders including the Ministry of Irrigation, UNDP, the Department of External Resources, the Department of National Planning, and several Responsible Parties to the project, including the Department of Agrarian Development, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of National Community Water Supply, the National Water Supply and Drainage Board, and the Ministry of Disaster Management.

COVID-19 Context:

In March 2020, in response to growing numbers of COVID-19 cases in Sri Lanka, an island-wide curfew was imposed. A Presidential Task Force was established to combat the health crisis and its ripple effects on different sectors of the economy, to ensure that essential services continued unhindered. The agriculture sector was one of the worst affected sectors by the pandemic and subsequent lockdowns, resulting in breakdowns of supply and value chains during peak harvesting periods and the price collapses of agricultural produce.

Sustaining agricultural productivity was considered critical to ensuring food security and against this backdrop, the project, together with the Ministry of Agriculture, rolled out climate-smart agricultural support to poor urban and suburban households in select districts. The project promoted urban agriculture, particularly among women farmers, through the distribution of planting material and farming equipment, along with the required training for 2,600 people.

During the South-West Monsoon season this year, it became apparent that the districts that were likely to have the highest incidence of COVID-19 cases coincided with the districts that were also vulnerable to flooding during the monsoon. The project supported the operationalization of health and safety guidelines issued by the Ministry of Health, delivered 10,000 surgical masks and 30 infrared thermometers to the Disaster Management Center, to be distributed to disaster relief centres, search and rescue teams and to those affected by the monsoons. Also, together with the Sri Lanka Red Cross Society, the project team

organized additional resources for flood preparedness and response, including by mobilizing volunteers to conduct awareness programmes on camp management amid a pandemic and towards providing facilities for screening, disinfecting (handwashing) and personal safety in the camps.

The project supported the Disaster Management Centre (DMC) and the National Disaster Relief Services Centre in the development of an emergency preparedness plan and coordination arrangement for the monsoon season. The project also provided Zoom software facilities to the DMC to facilitate coordination and communications amongst stakeholders at a crucial time. In support of risk assessment and analysis, the project developed resource maps required for emergency planning and response in 40 high-risk areas, which were supplied to the relevant authorities.

Moreover, it facilitated preparedness and response activities in schools in the project locations, benefitting over 4,100 students, through the provision of handwashing facilities, basic hygiene items, first aid training, and COVID-19 awareness and hygiene promotion programmes, to reduce transmission risk. Similar assistance was provided to government officers within the project locations, to ensure that staff can practice safe hygiene.

Details of the Impact of COVID-19 on Project Implementation and other Challenges

One of the persistent challenges that the project team has faced, which has been exacerbated in recent months due to the pandemic, is in mobilizing the co-financing component of the project. A total of USD 14 million was due to be committed by the Government of Sri Lanka towards this project. The Sri Lankan economy continues to face the brunt of the COVID-19 crisis; the growth dynamics were dampened even before the onset of the crisis, the closing of international borders badly affected key sectors such as tourism and the apparel export sector, the country's highest foreign exchange-earners and the remittance earnings have also sharply declined. Given Sri Lanka's weakened fiscal position, it is less likely that the government will be able to meet its obligations for co-financing under this project.

The first wave of the COVID-19 outbreak coincided with the onset of the Yala cultivation season earlier this year. A nation-wide lockdown and travel restrictions that lasted several months severely impeded project interventions that had been planned with local communities in preparation for the cultivation season. The latest localized outbreak is taking place at the start of the Maha cultivation season. This, together with the fact that lower than usual levels of rainfall are expected this season will once again disrupt project activities. COVID-19-related import restrictions and the increasing price of inputs for project activities have prevented the project from delivering the interventions as planned and poses challenges to reaching the expected number of beneficiaries.

The water management advisories and disaster preparedness component of the project (which was to be facilitated through the installation of sensors and gauges) is dependent on downstream cascade development activities that were planned for 2020. These downstream initiatives were scheduled to commence after the completion of upstream irrigation development activities, which were delayed on account of the pandemic. The delays in one component of the project are having knock-on effects on other components, such as the forecasting and the issuance of water management advisories. Additionally, the downstream activities are also purely dependent on co-financing from the government, which UNDP has so far been challenging.

One of the key project outputs aims to enhance climate-resilient, decentralized water supply to provide year-round access to clean water for vulnerable communities in water-scarce regions of the country. It was decided to construct small-scale community water supply schemes. However, due to delays in commencing the project, water sources that were originally assigned to the project were allocated to other projects, which compelled this project to identify new water sources. The search was initiated in remote areas of the dry zone while considering communities with the highest need for water and water source investigations were carried out in the selected locations. Unfortunately, the test results showed inadequate water quality and inadequate yields. The project screened over 160 locations but only a fraction of them was deemed suitable

for the water supply schemes and therefore this intervention could not proceed as originally planned. With this background, UNDP has initiated discussions with GCF on challenges in achieving project objectives.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The Interim Evaluation will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), Funding Proposal (FP) and Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The Interim Evaluation team will assess implementation of the project and its alignment with the FAA¹ 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 with the goal of **identifying the necessary changes** to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will also assess the following:

- Implementation and adaptive management
- Risks to sustainability
- Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programmes;
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities;
- Gender equity;
- Country ownership of projects and programmes;
- Innovativeness in results areas (extent to which interventions may lead to 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); and
- Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

4. INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The interim evaluation of CRIWMP will be carried out by a team of two consultants; international and national, by providing evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The team 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, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The two consultants in the team are expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, National Designated Authority (NDA) focal point, relevant government counterparts (responsible parties), the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in, and

¹ FAA: https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/LKA/Executed_FAA_UNDP_SriLanka_07062017.pdf

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

other relevant stakeholders including beneficiaries etc., and ensure their perspectives are essentially captured in the final Independent Evaluation (IE).

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Interim Evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, 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 Board, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the Interim Evaluation team is expected to conduct field missions to project sites (if safe to do so), which is to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

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. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the Interim Evaluation team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the Interim Evaluation report.

As of 11 March 2020, The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since late March 2020, with regional restrictions to travel in-country due to localized outbreaks. Therefore, the international consultant with the support of the national consultant may require the use of remote interview methods, extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. These approaches and methodologies should be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

The international consultant will be engaged to work remotely with national consultant's support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. An equally qualified and independent national consultant hired, will conduct interviews and surveys using appropriate tools and innovative methodologies under the supervision of the International Consultant, considering the state of prevailing COVID19 pandemic context in the country.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

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 to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (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 conditions and covenants of the FAA with special reference to clause 9.02 into the project design process
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex H 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 governance, 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.
- Evaluate the Theory of Change (ToC) proposed by the project during the inception and design phases in comparison to the approach, relevance, actions, interventions, practicality, and current context. Foresee the way forward and propose necessary adjustments.

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?

- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project applies adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

- Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and 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 ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Fund Level Impact:	Indicator:							
Outcome 1:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
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 and outputs analysis:

- Identify 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 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? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? 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 UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

³ Populate with data from the Log-frame and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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 as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- 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 in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?
- Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

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 complimented 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 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 achievement of project objectives?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
 - The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks⁸ (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project’s social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project’s design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP’s safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project’s approval.

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.
- Assess the efficiency, timeliness, and adequacy of reporting requirements

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, APRs 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.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

⁸ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF’s “types of risks and potential impacts”: Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

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 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 on a continual basis 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 jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

vi. Country Ownership

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

vii. Gender equity

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

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

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

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

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

x. Replication and Scalability

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The Interim Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary.

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

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

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the Project Strengthening the resilience of smallholder farmers in the Dry Zone to climate variability and extreme events through an integrated approach to water management

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be maximum 30 working days over a time period of approximately 22 weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing Interim Evaluation Inception Report (Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission)	2-4 days	06 th January 2020
Interim Evaluation mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits.	7--10 days	05 th February 2021
Presentation of initial findings - last day of the Interim Evaluation mission	1 day	10 th February 2021
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the Interim Evaluation mission)	5-10 days	26 th February 2021
Finalization of Interim Evaluation report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	3-5 days	19 th March 2021

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Interim Evaluation Inception Report	Interim Evaluation team clarifies objectives and methods of the evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission	Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	Interim Evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Interim Evaluation Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
4	Final Interim Evaluation Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final Interim Evaluation 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.

8. INTERIM EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this Interim Evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's Interim Evaluation is UNDP Sri Lanka.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of travel arrangements within the country for the Interim Evaluation team. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the Interim Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the Interim Evaluation – one International Consultant/ Team Leader (with experience and exposure to GCF/ GEF projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National Expert based in Sri Lanka. The International Consultant will operate remotely but will lead the evaluation overall in collaboration with the national consultant.

The International Consultant will be responsible for deciding on the evaluation methodology, based on discussions with the project team and any restrictions as a result of the COVID-19 situation in-country. The International Consultant will present this methodology (as part of the inception report) with a subsequent discussion with the country office to agree on way forward. The development of the data collection methodologies and tools (including questionnaires) will be led by the International Consultant, with support from the National Expert. Following the literature review, stakeholder consultations and field data collection, the International Consultant will lead the process of presenting the preliminary findings to the project stakeholders, which will be followed by the development of the draft interim evaluation report. The International Consultant will be responsible for finalizing the report based on comments received.

The International Consultant will receive in-country support from the National Expert, who will be responsible for organizing and conducting field missions, interviews and field data collection. The National

Consultant will be responsible for arranging key informant interviews and focus group discussions with a wide range of stakeholders, which should be arranged virtually if possible, to facilitate the participation of the International Consultant. The National Expert will provide technical and administrative support to the International Consultant at the various stages of the Interim Evaluation, including data collection, desk reviews, presentations and drafting of the report.

The consultants 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.

Offers from interested applicants will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score, that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions, will be awarded the contract.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Evaluation and Assessment Criteria:	Weight
Technical Competencies	70
Master's degree in natural resource management, environmental sciences, development studies, Project Management or other closely related field AND at least ten (10) years of experience in relevant technical area (25%)	17.5
Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (10%)	7
Project evaluation/review experiences with the United Nations system including GEF/GCF will be considered an asset (10%)	7
Competence in adaptive management, as applied to integrated water management, agriculture and climate change adaptation (25%)	17.5
Work experience in a developing country context (10%);	7
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (15%);	10.5
Excellent knowledge of English. Knowledge of local languages by the National Consultant would be an asset (5%)	3.5
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30
Total Score Technical score + Financial Score	70+30

The required qualifications of the International and National Consultant are as follows:

Education

- A Master's degree in, natural resource management Environmental Sciences, Development Studies, Project Management or other closely related field.

Experience

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to integrated water management, agriculture and climate change adaptation;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in developing countries;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

This Interim Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The Interim Evaluation team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The Interim Evaluation team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the Interim Evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the Interim Evaluation process must also be solely used for the Interim Evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Payments will be based on milestones certified by the UNDP Country Office. Payment schedule will be as follows and milestones are required to be delivered in close coordination with the National Consultant hired for the same purpose;

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 50% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft Interim Evaluation report
- 30% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final Interim Evaluation report and approval by the Commissioning Unit, Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) and Principal Technical Advisor (PTA) – via signatures on the Interim Evaluation Report Clearance form) and completed Audit Trail

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

The International Consultant/ Team Leader for this Interim Evaluation will be selected from the GPN/ExpRes roster of vetted consultants. The selection process will follow standard UNDP procurement processes.

Sumudu Silva

21-Dec-2020

Prepared by: _____
Sumudu Silva, Project Coordinator

Sureka Perera

21-Dec-2020

Approved by: _____
Sureka Perera, Programme Quality and Design Analyst

⁹ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team

1. Funding Proposal
2. Funding Activity Agreement (FAA)
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
7. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
12. GCF Evaluation Policy¹⁰

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Important communications between GCF and Ministry illustrating ongoing challenges

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report¹¹

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
 - Interim Evaluation time frame and date of report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Interim Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, Interim Evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations
 - Structure of the Interim Evaluation report

¹⁰ At the time this TOR was drafted, the GCF Evaluation Policy had not yet been posted: <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluations/policy>

¹¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

3. Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Log frame
 - 4.2 Relevance
 - 4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency
 - 4.4 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.6 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
 - 4.7 Country Ownership
 - 4.8 Innovativeness in results areas
 - 4.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative
 - 4.10 Replication and Scalability
 - 4.11 Gender Equity
5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Interim Evaluation's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- Mission itinerary
- List of key stakeholders, responsible parties, other government stakeholders
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed Interim Evaluation Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim Evaluation report

ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the Inception Report and as an Annex to the Interim Evaluation report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
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?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Risks: To what extent the associated risks, especially COVID-19 made impacts to the achievements of the desired deliverables of the project?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Interim Evaluation Consultants¹²

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 an 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 if and how issues should be reported.
5. 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 clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. 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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

Interim 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): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for 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 (HU)	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 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)	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

ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit, RTA and PTA included in the final report)

Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Principal Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be listed as an annex in the final report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (date) from the Interim Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS #)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Interim Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft report	Interim Evaluation team response and actions taken

ToR ANNEX H: Checklist for Gender Sensitive Midterm Review Analysis

The degree of relevance of gender in projects supported by UNDP with GEF financing varies depending on the area of work and type of engagement¹³. This annex includes general points to consider for assessing how gender considerations have been mainstreaming into a project's design, monitoring framework, and implementation, as well as points to address the potential impact of project interventions on gender equality and women's empowerment. It is not required to discuss all of these aspects in the evaluation report, but these are areas for potential consideration in the report's gender mainstreaming analysis.

Points to consider relating to Project Design and Preparation:

1. Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
2. Were gender issues triggered during the mandatory UNDP Environmental and Social project screening? If so, were mitigation measures built into the project document? What other steps were taken to address these issues?
3. Does the project budget include funding for gender-relevant outcomes, outputs and activities?
4. Were gender specialists and representatives of women at different levels consulted throughout the project design and preparation process?

Points to consider relating to Project Monitoring:

1. Review the outcomes of all Project Appraisal Committee (PAC)¹⁴ meetings (including any pre-Project Appraisal Committee and local PAC meetings), inception workshop and the inception report, and any related stakeholder workshops that took place during the project's initiation stage.
 - a. Did these include a discussion of the potential gender equality impact of the project?
 - b. Did gender specialists and representatives of women at all levels participate? If yes, how did they participate?
2. How does the project capture gender results and are these results built into project monitoring?
 - a. Are the project's results framework indicators disaggregated by sex and wherever possible by age and by socio-economic group (or any other socially significant category in society)?

¹³ For further reference see the UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (2014-2017) which outlines the organization's commitment to promoting gender equality and women's empowerment. The strategy was prepared in conjunction with the UNDP Strategic Plan and is operationalized in parallel with it: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/womens-empowerment/genderequality-strategy-2014-2017.html> and the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, which provides guidance on how the GEF addresses gender mainstreaming in its policies, programmes, and operations: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/gender>.

¹⁴ The PAC is a standard UNDP procedure for all projects. According to the POPP, it is a required step before a project can be approved by UNDP. For more information, see: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/ft/ppmp/Pages/Project-Management.aspx>

- b. Are the project's results framework targets set up to guarantee a sufficient level of gender balance in activities (e.g. quotas for male and female participation)?
- c. Are gender sensitive indicators included in the project's results framework? Gender sensitive data can provide a more contextual understanding of the needs, access conditions and potential for empowerment of women and girls and men and boys.

Points to consider relating to Project Implementation:

1. Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or GEF Partner Agency and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
2. What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
3. What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Points to consider relating to Project Impact:

1. Who are the target beneficiaries?
 - a. Disaggregate the beneficiaries by sex.
 - b. Talk to women as well as men during interviews and site visits.
2. How does the project impact gender equality in the local context?
 - a. How does the project engage with women and girls?
 - b. Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys?
 - c. Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project.
 - d. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?
3. Why are the issues addressed by the project particularly relevant to or important for women and girls?
4. How are women and girls benefiting from project activities (even if these are unplanned/unintended results)? [N.B. Unplanned/unintended gender results, which may be reported in the PIR Gender section or identified by the MTR, should be incorporated into the project's results framework's outcomes, indicators and targets.]
5. Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality and women's empowerment? What can the project do to mitigate this?

For further information on integrating gender equality into evaluation, please see the UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation- Towards UNEG

Guidance: <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/IOS/temp/HRGE%20Handbook.pdf>

Certificate Of Completion

Envelope Id: 587DE4E69E1246058BD051F60302E984

Status: Completed

Subject: Intrenational Consultant - TOR-GCF

Source Envelope:

Document Pages: 23

Signatures: 2

Envelope Originator:

Certificate Pages: 2

Initials: 0

Sumudu Silva

AutoNav: Enabled

One United Nations Plaza

Envelopeld Stamping: Enabled

New York, NY 10017

Time Zone: (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

sumudu.silva@undp.org

IP Address: 175.157.23.88

Record Tracking

Status: Original

Holder: Sumudu Silva

Location: DocuSign

12/21/2020 2:25:09 AM

sumudu.silva@undp.org

Signer Events

Signature

Timestamp

Sumudu Silva

Sent: 12/21/2020 2:29:11 AM

sumudu.silva@undp.org

Viewed: 12/21/2020 2:29:27 AM

UNDP Headquarters

Signed: 12/21/2020 2:29:35 AM

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style

Using IP Address: 175.157.23.88

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:

Not Offered via DocuSign

Sureka Perera

Sent: 12/21/2020 2:29:37 AM

sureka.perera@undp.org

Viewed: 12/21/2020 2:30:40 AM

Programme Quality and Design Analyst

Signed: 12/21/2020 2:31:02 AM

UNDP Headquarters

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style

Using IP Address: 112.135.251.157

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:

Not Offered via DocuSign

In Person Signer Events

Signature

Timestamp

Editor Delivery Events

Status

Timestamp

Agent Delivery Events

Status

Timestamp

Intermediary Delivery Events

Status

Timestamp

Certified Delivery Events

Status

Timestamp

Carbon Copy Events

Status

Timestamp

Sujeewa Ratnayake

COPIED

Sent: 12/21/2020 2:31:04 AM

sujeewa.ratnayake@undp.org

UNDP Headquarters

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:

Not Offered via DocuSign

Witness Events

Signature

Timestamp

Notary Events	Signature	Timestamp
----------------------	------------------	------------------

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
--------------------------------	---------------	-------------------

Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	12/21/2020 2:29:11 AM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	12/21/2020 2:30:40 AM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	12/21/2020 2:31:02 AM
Completed	Security Checked	12/21/2020 2:31:04 AM

Payment Events	Status	Timestamps
-----------------------	---------------	-------------------