

Mid-Term Evaluation

Final Report

UNDP Project “Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia”

*Amal Ahmad, International Evaluator
UNDP, Georgia*

Acknowledgements

The Mid-term Evaluation consultant would like to acknowledge the support of the UNDP Georgia, and the Project Management Unit during this evaluation. Special thanks are due to the UNDP team (the DRR, the Team Leader for Environment and Energy, and the support staff) for their insights, invaluable comments, and inputs.

The MTE consultant also wishes to share her sincerest gratitude to all governmental agencies representatives, stakeholders and beneficiaries for the efforts made by them to ensure a smooth and successful evaluation and to find the time to meet with the evaluation team and share their experiences and insights on this project with us. Without their valuable input, the MTE work could not have been accomplished.

Thanks also go to the representatives of the donor, SDC, for allocating the needed time to meet with the evaluation team and share their in-depth views, comments and thought.

Finally, the international evaluator would like to thank the national consultant – Ms Rusudan Kardava - who provided great support in setting up all interviews and following up on meetings to ensure that all concerned stakeholders are virtually interviewed.

Disclaimer

This MTE report is prepared by an international consultant commissioned by UNDP. However, the findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the UNDP.

Project and Evaluation Information Details

Project Information		
Project/outcome title	<i>Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia</i>	
Atlas ID	00094354	
Corporate outcome and output	<p>UNPSD 2016-2020: Outcome 8: By 2020 communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction.</p> <p>UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021: Outcome 2. Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development/ Output 2.3.1 Data and risk-informed development policies, plans, systems and financing incorporate integrated and gender-responsive solutions to reduce disaster risks, enable climate change adaptation and mitigation, and prevent the risk of conflict</p>	
Country	Georgia	
Region		
Date project document signed	December 2018	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	December 2018	November 2023
Project budget	5,020,270.22 USD	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	2,254,751.72 USD	
Funding source	SDC	
Implementing party	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	

Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)	Project	
Final/midterm review/ other	Mid-term Evaluation	
Period under evaluation	Start	End
	December 2018	October 2021
Evaluators	Amal Ahmad, Rusudan Kardava	
Evaluator email address	adababseh@hotmail.com	
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion
	September 2021	December 2021

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	4
1. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	6
1. Executive Summary	7
1.1 Project Description.....	7
1.2 Evaluation Ratings Summary	8
1.3 Key Findings and conclusions.....	10
1.4 Recommendations	13
2. Introduction	15
3. Description of the Intervention	17
4. Evaluation Scope and Objectives.....	23
4.1 Evaluation Scope	23
4.2 Evaluation Objectives.....	23
4.3 Evaluation Criteria.....	23
4.4 Evaluation Questions	24
5. Evaluation approach and methods	28
6. Data Analysis.....	31
7. Findings.....	32
7.1 Project Design/Formulation.....	32
7.1.1 Analysis of Results Framework: project logic, strategy, and indicators	32
7.1.2 Assumptions and Risks.....	36
7.2 Planned stakeholder participation.....	36
7.3 Project Implementation.....	37
7.3.1 Management Arrangements.....	37
7.3.2 Adaptive management.....	41
7.4 Project Finance and Co-finance	42
7.5 Monitoring & Evaluation:.....	45
7.6 Project Results	46
7.6.1 Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*).....	47
7.7 Relevance (*).....	57
7.8 Effectiveness and Efficiency (*).....	58
7.9 Sustainability.....	61

○ Financial Risks to Sustainability	61
○ Socio-economic Risks to Sustainability	62
○ Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability	62
○ Environmental Risks to Sustainability	63
7.10 Impact	63
8. Conclusions.....	65
9. Recommendations	69
10. Lessons learned.....	72
11. Annexes.....	74
11.1 MTE ToR	75
11.2 Mid-Term Evaluation Matrix.....	83
11.3 List of Documents Reviewed.....	92
11.4 The final list of interviewees.....	97
11.5 MTE Rating Scales	98
11.6 Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form	99
11.7 Signed MTE Final Report Clearance Form	100
11.8 Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTE report.	101

1. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronyms	Full Name
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EWS	Early Warning System
EMS	Emergency Management Service
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoG	Government of Georgia
LEPL	Legal Entity of Public Law
LF	Logical Framework
MHEWS	Multi-hazard early warning system
MoEPA	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NEA	National Environmental Agency
NIM	National Implementation Modality
OECD / DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
PB	Project Board
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SC	Steering Committee
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
TWGs	Technical Working Groups
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP CO	United Nations Development Programme - Country Office

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Project Description

Georgia is suffering from several hydro-meteorological hazards that are intensifying due to climate change. The country needs to move towards a more proactive integrated risk-informed approach to adapt to climate change and mitigate its impact. The country lacks a multi-hazard early warning system and effective hazard emergency response which rely on effective forecasting and warning, that also includes knowledge of where and when the hazards will occur (high-risk areas identified by hazard mapping). Georgia has also a gap in climate risk information that would enable the Government of Georgia to implement several nationwide trans-formative policies for reducing exposure and vulnerability of the population and economic sectors to climate-induced hazards. Thus, the Government of Georgia decided to design a project to enhance the country capacity to adapt to the changing climate. This project was funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

The overall objective of the project is the development of a well-established system for multi-hazard risk knowledge to ensure effective climate risk management of all hydro-meteorological and geological hazards in Georgia geographical coverage of the project interventions is nationwide, particularly 11 major river basins in Georgia: Enguri, Rioni, Chorokhi-Adjaristskali, Supsa, Natanebi, Khobi, Kintrishi, Khrami-Ktsia, Alazani, and Iori, Mtkvari (same as Kura) focusing on the following hazards: floods, landslides, mudflows, avalanches, strong wind, hailstorms and droughts.

The project was designed to be complementary to the overall initiative funded by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) /Government of Georgia/ Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and SIDA. It aimed to reduce the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nationwide multi-hazard early warning system and risk-informed local action which will serve 1.7 Million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards.

The GCF-funded project *"Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate Information in Georgia"* (USD 27,054,000), aims to reduce exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide multi-hazard early warning system (EWS) and risk-informed local action. The project will provide critical climate risk information that would enable the Government of Georgia to implement several nationwide transformative policies and actions for reducing the exposure and vulnerability of the population to climate-induced hazards.

The SIDA-funded *"Improved Resilience of Communities to Climate Risks"* project (USD 3,621,132) aims to reduce exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods, and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards.

The SDC-funded project (refer to herein and after as "Project") *"Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia"* (**USD 5,020,270.22**), is contributing to an overall goal of reducing the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and risk-informed local action serving 1.7 million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards. The given goal is expected to be achieved through 1) Equipping the Georgian authorities with the financial, technical and human capacities to establish a nationwide multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting (with focus on floods, landslides, mudflows, avalanches, hailstorms and droughts); and 2) Increasing vulnerable communities' and regions' resilience when facing risks from natural and climate change threats to their livelihoods.

The project is the subject of the given Mid-term evaluation. The project has been launched in December 2018 and will accomplish all its activities in November 2023. It has been designed to contribute to overcoming the main barriers identified within the project inception phase and

GCF-funded project, which include: lack of appropriate climate induced hazard maps that would enable informed decision-making, limited technical capacity and experience to produce hazard and risk maps, limited knowledge, and implementation of modern hazard modelling tools, lack of systematic data collection capacities and key data sets for the development of flood hazard models, lack of clarity in distribution of responsibilities and mandates and lack of cooperation among risk information related government agencies and scientific sector, unclear definition of the institutional responsibilities in legal documents of the country, hence lack of institutional arrangements supporting efficient and effective cooperation on hazard management, and absence of multi-hazard planning platforms at municipal, sector and river basin levels.

The project is implemented under the UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture (MoEPA) bears the role of the National Implementing Partner and project implementation is supported by the Program Management Unit (PMU), staffed by personnel provided by UNDP. The major partner for the project is the Legal Entity of Public Law (LEPL) - National Environmental Agency (NEA) under the MoEPA, Besides, Emergency Management Service (EMS) under the Ministry of Internal Affairs, is another major partner of the project for the activities related to multi-hazard risk assessment, mapping, and development of risk-informed municipal preparedness and response plans.

In addition, the project stakeholders are different line ministries (including the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Ministry of Internal Affairs, etc.), local self-governments of target regions, and international donors implementing different interventions related to CCA and DRR in Georgia.

The project outcomes to be evaluated in the frame of the mid-term evaluation are as follows:

Outcome 1 - The Georgian authorities have the financial, technical, and human capacities to establish a nation-wide multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting, and **Outcome 2** - Vulnerable people, communities and regions in Georgia have increased resilience and face fewer risks from natural and climate change threats to their livelihoods

1.2 Evaluation Rating Summary

SDC-financed UNDP-supported projects of this type require the MTE to assess the progress against the implementation plan to set parameters and ratings. The result of this MTE is presented below.

The implementation adheres to the project strategy and it has around two more years of implementation. The review of the project's documents, meetings with stakeholders and analysis of the project's technical and progress reports indicated that the Project has made some good progress, but it is still slow and lagging in comparison to the approved work plans. The measures taken by the UNDP has accelerated the project implementation including the changing of the contracting modality of the specialized company and replacing it with a group of technical experts.

Taking into consideration the delay the project encountered due to procurement and recruitment issues, the complexity of the project and its interlinkage with the GCF/SIDA Projects, and the overall impact of COVID19 and the global lockdown, the overall rating for the Progress to the achievement of the project results is **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** as the Project is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets but with moderate shortcomings.

The evaluator considers that the management arrangements used for the project support effective and efficient implementation of the project, and the delays caused mainly by some elements of the project management arrangement could be mitigated in the second phase of the project but would require immediate attention. Thus, the overall Project implementation and adaptive management rating is **Satisfactory (S)** as shown in **Table 1**.

The Project is very much recognized and respected by the Government of Georgia. It is considered very relevant to the national context and the UNDP programmatic direction. Many

good steps have been already accomplished at the national and local levels. There are many strong and positive indications for potential sustainability. Based on the ongoing discussion between UNDP and the GoG, the project's minutes of meetings, and project's review meetings prospects for sustainability are almost certain, and overall sustainability is considered **likely**.

Table 1: MTE Ratings and Achievement Summary Table for the Project

Measure	Mid-Term Evaluation Rating ¹	Achievement Description
Progress Towards Results	Outcome 1: Rating: 4 Moderately Satisfactory	At the time of submitting this report, the project did not achieve any of the mid-term targets, yet. However, the project is in progress to achieve all of them. The outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets with <i>significant</i> shortcomings.
	Outcome 2: Rating: 3.34 Moderately unsatisfactory	The project did not achieve any of the mid-term targets. The Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets with <i>major</i> shortcomings.
	Output 1.1 Rating: 3 Moderately unsatisfactory	The project did not achieve any of the mid-term targets and the work has just been initiated. The Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets with <i>major</i> shortcomings.
	Output 1.2 Rating: 3.5	The project did not achieve any of the mid-term targets at the mid-point of implementation, but the work has been initiated. The Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets with <i>major</i> shortcomings.
	Output 1.3 Rating: 4.33	The output did not achieve any of the mid-term targets however, the project is in progress to achieve some targets. The Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets with <i>significant</i> shortcomings.
	Output 2.1 Rating: 2	The output did not achieve any targets yet, but the work is going on. Based on the current status, the output is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets without any remedial actions.
	Output 2.2 Rating: 3.34	The project did not achieve any of the mid-term targets and the work has just been initiated. The Project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets with <i>major</i> shortcomings.
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	Rating: 5	Implementation of most of the components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only a few that are subject to remedial actions.

¹ 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).

Sustainability	Rating: 4 (L)²	Negligible risks to sustainability, with some outputs on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future.
-----------------------	----------------------------------	--

1.3 Key Findings and conclusions

The evaluation team has ranked the evaluation criteria using the UNDP Scoring Scale, with an overall score of **4: Moderately Satisfactory**, with moderate shortcomings. Below is a comprehensive summary of the key findings and conclusions.

OVERALL SCORE:

Overall Score	4: Moderately satisfactory (MS), with moderate shortcomings
----------------------	--

RELEVANCE:

Overall Rating	5: Satisfactory, with minor shortcomings
-----------------------	---

Observations	<p>The project is highly relevant to the situational context, tackling key problems at the central and local levels through the two main components/outcomes. The project is well aligned with UNDP and national strategies as well as target group priorities.</p> <p>Yet, the level these strategies are referred to in the project document is relatively general. The Project is of high relevance in terms of local needs, in line with national and local level strategies and UNDP, SDC and GCF/SIDA priorities. The design of the project has been adequately adapted to the chosen goal and to complement the GCF/SIDA programmes.</p> <p>The evaluation of the theory of change shows that the hypotheses are plausible, the strategic reference framework is well anchored in the concept and the expected results (outcomes, outputs) are clearly defined. However, there is a need to elaborate the assumptions and risks in line with this theory of change and to set mid-term targets and indicators to allow for proper monitoring of the work progress.</p>
---------------------	---

EFFECTIVENESS:

Overall Rating	5: Satisfactory, with minor shortcomings
-----------------------	---

Observations	<p>The evaluation of the effectiveness criterion concludes with an overall rating of satisfactory with minor shortcomings (score: 5). The evaluation of the effectiveness criterion showed that the project is not well on track to achieve its expected results (outcomes, outputs) but has initiated all needed steps to achieve the outcomes and outputs with minor shortcomings. The project implementation resulted in a track record of achievements such as the development of comprehensive multi-hazards assessment methodologies. Moreover, the use of the developed methodologies, and building the capacities at the national and local levels show some delay.</p>
---------------------	---

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

Furthermore, the competent, demand-driven, and participatory approach of the project team make the team a trusted partner of key stakeholders providing access to sensitive issues. While the project implementation progresses tackles challenges such as lack of national capacities, resistance to change, and the project's complex technical nature, the COVID19 lockdown adds another obstacle that the project team must take care of. Most of the identified challenges are adequately addressed by the project as measures have been developed to tackle the challenges/problems, which hindered the effective implementation. Key challenges such as lack of national capacities and understanding of the role of each national entity to effectively manage climate change-related disasters are very difficult to effectively address, while tangible results in CCA/DRR will depend on national ownership and capacities of key stakeholders. Commitments to promote ownership, alignment and harmonization, management for development results and mutual accountability are all anchored and reflected in mechanisms to ensure effective project implementation.

The effectiveness of the project strategy is evidenced by the high level of satisfaction with the Project progress expressed by many stakeholders during the MTE. Stakeholders reported that the level of effectiveness of this Project is high taking into consideration the challenges the project has faced -up until the time of the MTE- in comparison to other projects they have been involved with.

EFFICIENCY:

Overall Rating **5: Satisfactory, with minor shortcomings**

Observations Overall, it appears the project has been **efficient** for the following reasons:

- The proposed co-financing resources are mobilized and correctly tracked by the project team. According to UNDP ProDoc, the Government of Georgia and GCF will contribute US\$ 64,831,022 as an in-kind and cash contribution. Until the MTE time, around 42% of the total co-financing has been mobilized.
- Consistency and contribution to the UNDP/SDC focal areas objectives and national development strategies.
- Involvement of relevant stakeholders through the utilization of some of the existed coordination mechanisms with the GCF and SIDA initiatives (PSC and TWGs).
- Reasonableness of the costs relative to the scale of outputs generated. The cost-effectiveness of the project is considered **Satisfactory (S)**.
- The M&E of the project was undertaken according to UNDP procedures and it is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**, yet some aspects could have been streamlined like reporting.
- Risks and issues identification and management is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**. The Project was affected by many risks and issues more than one time during its implementation which was registered using the UNDP ATLAS system and reported in the annual reports.
- Project capacity to build needed partnerships during the project's implementation phase is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**. More effort should be put towards enhancing the specialized community-based organizations' participation.
- The Project ensured the representation and participation of women in all the project's activities. The involvement of men

and women equally into project activities as well as mainstreaming gender in the project's activities are rated as **Satisfactory (S)**.

- The quick shift from the agreed-upon activities into a new set of activities due to COVID-19 facilitated the implementation of the remaining activities and ensured that the fund was utilized as per the need of the stakeholders and in line with the overall project's goal.

However, some aspects were inefficient in project implementation and need the PMU's attention to tackle:

- Substantial delay of the project with recruitment and procurement processes mainly for critical positions like the CTA and the hiring of highly technical companies to undertake hazard methodology and hazard mapping.
- The long delay in recruiting consultants/experts, mainly the CTA, due to the need to comply with the UNDP rules and regulations and the need to have the CTA based in Georgia for effective involvement in project implementation.

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

IMPACT (potential):

Overall Rating

3 = Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): Significant shortcomings

Observations

The project impact perspective remains unchanged, and the impact potential of project interventions remains very relevant and urgently needed. However, at the time of the MTE, the project technical work is still at its earlier stages and thus the MTE consultant is not in a position to define the potential impact at the MTE time.

SUSTAINABILITY:

Overall Rating

5: Satisfactory with minor shortcomings

Observations

The evaluation of the sustainability criterion is satisfactory with minor shortcomings. The findings show that there is still room for improvement to ensure that the benefits of the project will continue after it has ended.

On the positive side, the project's systematic approach to standardize and harmonize national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology enables the development of unified risk information on a national level, supported by adequate Institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is put in place and implemented to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information provide a solid basis to ensure the sustainability of the CCA/DRR work in Georgia. These will be also complemented with enhanced long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment to provide adequate risk information, which will help in developing multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia, which provides valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning. Finally, the support provided to the local level (municipal) to improve their preparedness to multi-hazard risks through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and the existence of the risk-informed preparedness plans will all contribute to the sustainability of the impacts after the project ends.

Yet, the project currently lacks a coherent approach to ensure the sustainability of results once it has been ended. This is particularly required considering the policy and legislation implementation gap, nonetheless, and the risk of not effectively using the multi-hazard maps and risks profiles and the donor dependence. Furthermore, a lack of a concrete and realistic exit strategy and sufficient mitigation measures on sustainability risks will hinder ensuring sustainability to the full extent possible.

1.4 Recommendations

The evaluation suggests that the project on oncoming future phases needs to undertake the following measures:

Overall Recommendations:

1. To grant a 12 to 18 months no-cost extension in the project timeframe. This will greatly help in fully achieving the stipulated objectives and outputs of the project. If this no-cost extension cannot be granted, the project team with the support of the TWGs and the Programme Steering Committee should revisit the overall scope: a focused and less ambitious Results Framework for the entire duration of the second phase should be developed. Nevertheless, the MTE would like to highlight that this second option is tricky and should be examined very carefully as the outputs of the SDC Project are the inputs for the GCF Project and thus any changes on the deliverables might be greatly affecting the overall aim of the whole programme **(GoG, UNDP CO, SDC, PMU)**.

Strengthening effectiveness

2. To convene, at the earliest, a special meeting of the Technical Working Groups to discuss and guide on the interventions that are lagging. UNDP should also further streamline and accelerate the work to engage a Regional Technical Advisor to further support the implementation of project interventions and develop revised plans. The revised plans developed by the Project should be duly approved by UNDP and the SDC and be implemented at the earliest **(PMU with GoG support)**.
3. The assessment methodologies prepared are very complicated for government practitioners to understand and to use/implement in the future. Hence, it is recommended that once these methodologies are implemented with the support of the project, these should be modified, simplified, and translated. Intensive training programmes should be delivered to ensure that concerned stakeholders can use them **(PMU with external technical support)**.
4. With the limited time left available, develop a well-designed scientific approach³ promoting the adoption of the standardized and harmonized national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology. To ensure that national institutions can utilize the national multi-hazards mapping and risk assessment methodology, concrete steps need to be put in place **(PMU)**.
5. Due to the limited time left, develop a coherent approach fostering the adoption and utilization of the developed institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment implemented to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information. If successful, this approach of fostering the adoption of legal and institutional

³ Observe and develop empathy, questioning the assumptions, creating many ideas in brainstorming session, adopting a hands-on approach in piloting and testing, and undertake ongoing experimentation: sketching, piloting, testing, and trying out concepts and ideas.

frameworks should also be applied to other policies and laws **(PMU with the GoG support)**.

6. Considering that the project focused the first half of the implementation on developing key methodologies, assessments and background studies, the focus on the second half needs to be on ensuring that key stakeholders possess the necessary capacities and mechanisms to effectively implement the established methodology and the updated policy and regulatory framework. The work on the capacity building component should be accelerated and made very condensed **(PMU with UNDP CO and SDC support)**.
7. Institutionalize the approach to national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment based on stakeholder interests, capacities and potential to effectively apply the methodologies in the long run. Clear institutional accountability lines should be established to avoid “blame-shifting” in case the methodologies are not implemented coherently **(PMU with UNDP CO and SDC support)**.
8. Ensure that key stakeholders are supported by increasing their capacity to implement their mandates in line with the new legal and institutional framework. This will require training of staff and eventually establishing a ToT approach to increase the sustainability of the Project’s impact but will also require identifying the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder **(PMU)**.

Improving efficiency

9. It is recommended to employ a dedicated Specialist at the PMU level for the SDC project to coordinate the implementation of Outputs 1.1 and 2.1 and to support the Project Manager in reviewing and approving the technical reports. Furthermore, there is also a need to compile data on objective level indicators to duly assess the achievement status of project objectives **(UNDP CO to initiate, SDC to support)**.
10. To further regularize and streamline weekly coordination meetings at the PMU level and prepare mechanisms to address coordination issues between the SDC and GCF funded projects especially with the local and national governments **(PMU, UNDP CO)**.

Increasing potential for impact:

11. To increase the potential for the impact it is recommended to consider the latest research findings on multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology as well as in multi-hazard mapping and risk profiling tools and approaches. Accordingly, the project should continue and potentially expand approaches to enhance national and local levels capacities to utilize the tools developed by the project and to ensure the continuity of the work after the project closure. These approaches demonstrated a high potential for impact **(PMU)**.

Increasing sustainability

12. Given that the project experienced a major delay during the first half of its implementation, the upcoming implementation period should be focused on sustainability. The project team is encouraged to develop a timely and pragmatic exit strategy along with a financial sustainability plan in a participatory manner with key stakeholders involved in the project as well as close coordination with the donors to the project. It should be outlining issues, ways and means to smoothly phase out and hand over interventions to partners, to ensure sustainability and continuity **(PMU, GoG)**.
13. Consider establishing a monitoring mechanism on the implementation of recommendations of the capacity assessments and knowledge management carried within the framework of this project. It is assumed that this would result in an increased implementation rate and improved sustainability of the results **(PMU, GoG)**.

2. Introduction

This evaluation exercise was commissioned by UNDP. It was designed to examine the extent of the project's realistic achievement in comparison to planned activities and value for money. The results framework is essential to understanding whether the project is in the process to achieve its desired outcome. The evaluator sought to ascertain the extent to which the project is contributing to reducing exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards reduced through a well-functioning national-wide multi-hazards early warning system and risk-informed local action as well as in key areas of UNDP's work on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. The evaluator also sought to establish the existence of a well-defined results framework that is SMART⁴.

The MTE followed the UNDP Evaluation Guidance. It used the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, etc. as defined, and explained in the UNDP Guidance for conducting Mid-Term Evaluations of UNDP-supported Projects.

According to the Guidelines, the MTE should provide evidence-based credible, useful, and reliable information. It set up a collaborative as well as a participatory approach to ensure close cooperation with the project team, government counterparts with a focus on the UNDP Country Offices in Georgia, UNDP Regional team in Istanbul, the local and national levels partners and other key stakeholders.

This MTE was conducted following the project proposals and the agreements with the project donors and in line with UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2019), among other resources, which set out several guiding principles, norms and standards for evaluation within UNDP. In compliance with the overall UNDP Evaluation Policy, the evaluation exercise must be independent, impartial, credible, and designed with utility in mind. The evaluation should generate relevant and useful information to support evidence-based decision making.

The Midterm Evaluation is taking place at the mid-time of the project's implementation, to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency), assess the project's strategy and its risk to sustainability, assess progress towards the achievements of the project objectives and outcomes intending to identify the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTE has two primary objectives:

- to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
- to provide a clear way forward based on the current progress after viewing 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

More specifically, the MTE will look at the achievements of the SDC Project, i.e. the extent of attainment of the expected results, as initially planned and as adjusted upon the extension of the support, and review the Project's theory of change (TOC) as part of broader Programme TOC vis-à-vis the Project's accomplishments. The exercise is also expected to highlight key good practices, weaknesses/gaps and other lessons learnt during the implementation of the project framework to provide forward-looking insights and practical and actionable recommendations to increase the likelihood of success relating to impact and sustainability, taking into account the continuity of the Project and the two other associated projects for the second half and to inform future programming in the field of Climate Change Adaptation CCA/Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR).

⁴ Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Relevant and Time-based

Pertinent issues such as management arrangements, procurement and financial procedures, timeliness of interventions, selection of beneficiaries, incorporation of innovative solutions and prospects for sustainability were also included in the analysis.

The evaluation findings will be utilized, and the recommendations are applied by the project team to improve the implementation of the second half of the project in both technical and operational terms.

This evaluation document is divided into eight main Chapters including: -

- **Executive summary:** the first section is a stand-alone section that briefly describes the intervention that was evaluated, explains the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses, describe the key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods, summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations and include the evaluator's quality standards and assurance ratings.
- **Chapter 2: Introduction:** it explains evaluation purposes, why the project is being evaluated, the intervention of the evaluation and the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.
- **Chapter 3: Description of the intervention:** it provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. It provides sufficient detail on the project, who seeks to benefit, the problem it seeks to address, expected results, implementation strategies and links with national and UN priorities.
- **Chapter 4: Evaluation scope and objectives.** It provides a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions including the evaluation scope, objectives, criteria, and questions in addition to the evaluation approach and methods.
- **Chapter 5: Evaluation approach and methods.** It provides details on the set of data sources (especially for triangulation) where appropriate, set of quantitative and qualitative surveys, and analysis approaches where the appropriate, clear presentation of data analysis and citation within the report, and documents meetings and surveys with stakeholders and beneficiary groups, where appropriate.
- **Chapter 6: Data analysis.** The report describes the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It details the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.)
- **Chapter 7: Findings.** This chapter presents statements of facts that are based on an analysis of the data.
- **Chapter 8: Conclusions.** Provides a comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, and outcomes of the intervention.
- **Chapter 9: Recommendations.** It provides practical, actionable, and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make.
- **Chapter 10: Lessons learned.** This chapter includes a discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that apply to a similar context.

In addition to the chapters and the executive summary, the report contains several **annexes**. These annexes provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report.

3. Description of the Intervention

According to the Fourth National Communications of Georgia, the climate change process is considerably activated in Georgia. In 1986-2015, compared to 1956-1985, the mean annual ground air temperature in the country increased averagely by 0.47C. During the same period, the annual precipitation in western Georgia has mainly increased, while it decreased in some of the eastern regions. In addition to the climate change processes, the frequency, intensity and geographical spread of hydro-meteorological hazards have been significantly increased in the country. Over the last 21-year period total damages from hydrometeorological hazards were GEL 2.8 billion (USD 1.2 Billion) for 152 lives (22 of which occurred in the Tbilisi flash flood in 2015). Floods, landslides, and mudflows make up 60% of these damages/losses and 67% of loss of life. It is forecasted that the negative effects will be even stronger in the future and this may have significant negative impacts on agriculture, infrastructure (transportation networks, buildings, roads, water supply, etc.), natural resources and eco-systems, glaciers and forests. Thus, it becomes more and more vital to improve preparedness and adaptation capacity by developing climate-resilient practices that will reduce the vulnerability of the most sensitive communities to climate change.

In 2014 UNDP supported the implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction Capacity Assessment, which paved the way for the elaboration of the National Plan of Action for Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2019) by the Government of Georgia. In 2017 Georgia was admitted as a full member of the European Energy Community, which puts an important focus on undertaking respective measures in the field of climate change in terms of establishment of the legislative and institutional framework for the promotion and development of energy efficiency and renewable energy sources and elaboration of action plans. Besides, 6 cities and 17 municipalities have joined the list of signatories of the EU initiative Covenant of Mayors⁵. Covenant signatories commit to adopting an integrated approach to climate change mitigation and adaptation. They are required to develop, within the first two years of adhesion, a Sustainable Energy and Climate Action Plan with the aims of cutting CO₂ emissions by at least 40% by 2030 and increasing resilience to climate change.

In 2020 Georgia has been ranked the 106th (classified as medium risk) out of 181 countries on World Risk Index (WRI). In comparison with 2016, it seems there has been some improvement in terms of WRI and other indices as indicated in the table below, however more details of the processes laying behind these scores can be found out during the mid-term evaluation (especially related to the lack of coping and adaptive capacities).

	WRI	Exposure	Vulnerability	Susceptibility	Lack of coping capacities	Lack of adaptive capacities
2016 ⁶	6.27 (88th)	14.69	42.67	24.60	63.13	40.28
2020 ⁷	5.72 (106th)	14.58	39.23	22.56	31.36	63.77 ⁸

*Note on classification:

very low	low	medium	high	very high
----------	-----	--------	------	-----------

⁵ <https://www.covenantofmayors.eu/about/covenant-community/signatories.html>

⁶ http://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:5763/WeltRisikoBericht2016_small2meta.pdf

⁷ <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/WorldRiskReport-2020.pdf>

⁸ Author's remark: WRI classification method suggests that the Lack of adaptive capacities with scores between 52.73-69.72 should be classified as very high (dark pink), however the color in the report is given for the low (light green) classification. The same type of issue applies to Lack of coping capacities in 2016 and 2020, which has the same color despite the significant change in figure. This can be the subject of further clarification during the mid-term evaluation process.

Despite the slight improvement in World Risk Index, as for a transition country with around 4.9-5.2% annual GDP growth rate in 2018-2019 and -6% in 2020⁹, negative export-import balance¹⁰, 18% unemployment (as of 2020)¹¹, etc., it is challenging to deal with the hydro-meteorological hazards and disaster risks that are intensifying due to climate change. There is an increasing need to develop effective forecasting and early warning systems and generate climate risk information (including mapping of high-risk hazards) to enable the government in terms of planning and implementation of relevant policies.

Thus, complementary funding provided by three donors - Green Climate Fund (GCF), Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) - through separately run projects is aimed to contribute to reducing the risk of climate-driven disasters and improvement of multi-hazard early warning system in Georgia. The program also benefits from the co-funding from the Georgian Government for USD 38,239,024.

The GCF-funded project Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate Information in Georgia (USD 27,054,000), aims to reduce exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide multi-hazard early warning system (EWS) and risk-informed local action. The project will provide critical climate risk information that would enable the Government of Georgia to implement several nationwide transformative policies and actions for reducing the exposure and vulnerability of the population to climate-induced hazards.

The SIDA-funded "Improved Resilience of Communities to Climate Risks" project (USD 3,621,132) aims to reduce exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods, and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards by achieving the following outputs: 1) improved resilience of communities on the Tbilisi Administered Territory through implementing community-based EWS and priority risk reduction actions, as complementary measures to the GCF/SDC project; 2) improved resilience of communities in Abkhazia to climate-induced multi-hazard natural disasters through building a knowledge base on multi-hazard natural disasters, implementing community-based EWS and priority climate risk reduction measures.

As for the SDC-funded project "Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia" (**USD 5,020,270.22**), it is contributing to an overall goal of reducing the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and risk-informed local action serving 1.7 million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards. The given goal is expected to be achieved through 1) Equipping the Georgian authorities with the financial, technical and human capacities to establish a nation-wide multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting (with focus on floods, landslides, mudflows, avalanches, hailstorms and droughts); and 2) Increasing vulnerable communities' and regions' resilience when facing risks from natural and climate change threats to their livelihoods. The impact hypothesis of the project is the following:

- Standardized and harmonized national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology enable the development of unified risk information on the national level.
- Adequate institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is in place and implemented to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information.
- Enhanced long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment provide adequate risk information.

⁹ <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.KD.ZG?locations=GE>

¹⁰ <https://www.geostat.ge/en/modules/categories/35/external-trade>

¹¹ <https://www.geostat.ge/en/modules/categories/683/Employment-Unemployment>

- Multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia (Enguri, Rioni, Chorokhi-Adjaristskali, Supsa, Natanebi, Khobi, Kintrishi, Khrami-Ktsia, Alazani, Iori, Mtkvari), which provides valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning.
- Local (municipal) preparedness to multi-hazard risks is improved through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and the existence of risk-informed preparedness plans.

The SDC-funded project is the subject of the given Mid-term evaluation. The project has been launched in December 2018 and will accomplish all its activities in November 2023. It has been designed to contribute to overcoming the main barriers identified within the project inception phase and GCF-funded project, which include:

- Lack of appropriate climate induced hazard maps that would enable informed decision-making.
- Limited technical capacity and experience to produce hazard and risk maps, limited knowledge, and implementation of modern hazard modelling tools.
- Lack of systematic data collection capacities and key data sets for the development of flood hazard models.
- Lack of clarity in distribution of responsibilities and mandates and lack of cooperation among risk information related government agencies and scientific sector.
- Unclear definition of the institutional responsibilities in legal documents of the country, hence lack of institutional arrangements supporting efficient and effective cooperation on hazard management.
- Absence of multi-hazard planning platforms at municipal, sector and river basin levels.

The project is implemented under the UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM), according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) signed in 1994 between UNDP and the Government of Georgia and the policies and procedures outlined in the UNDP's Program Operational Procedures and Practices (POPP).

The Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture (MoEPA) bears the role of the National Implementing Partner and project implementation is supported by the Program Management Unit (PMU), staffed by personnel provided by UNDP. The major partner for the project is the Legal Entity of Public Law (LEPL) - National Environmental Agency (NEA) under the MoEPA, which is responsible for hydro-meteorological and geological monitoring and hazard mapping. Besides, the Emergency Management Service (EMS) under the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia, is another major partner of the project for the activities related to multi-hazard risk assessment, mapping, and development of risk-informed municipal preparedness and response plans.

In addition, the project stakeholders are different line ministries (including the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Ministry of Internal Affairs, etc.), local self-governments of target regions, and international donors implementing different interventions related to CCA and DRR in Georgia.

The project outcome/outputs to be evaluated in the frame of the mid-term evaluation are as follows:

Outcome 1 - The Georgian authorities have the financial, technical, and human capacities to establish a nation-wide multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting

- **Output 1.1** Multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology are developed and institutionalized on the national level.
- **Output 1.2** Institutional and legal frameworks are in place to roll out the standardized hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology.
- **Output 1.3** Knowledge on multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment are available and enhanced.

Outcome 2 - Vulnerable people, communities and regions in Georgia have increased resilience and face fewer risks from natural and climate change threats to their livelihoods

- **Output 2.1** Nation-wide, multi-hazard maps and risk profiles based on risk assessment are developed.
- **Output 2.2** Municipal level multi-hazard response and preparedness capacities are enhanced.

The Project is in line with the key national programmes and plans and is building upon the following:

- The National Plan of Action for Capacity Development in DRR (2015-2019),
- The National DRR Strategy and Action Plan (2016-2020).
- The National Plan of Action for Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction is based on the Disaster Risk Reduction Capacity Assessment supported by UNDP in 2014.
- Support the compliance with relevant EU directives under the EU Georgia Association Agreement. Particularly, EU-Georgia Association Agreement (Article 302) requires Georgia to develop accessible, unified special environmental information management systems.
- Furthermore, Annex XXVI to the EUAA obliges Georgia to transpose Article 4, 5, 6 and 7 of EU Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks into national legislation and systems and, implement them including preliminary flood assessment, flood hazard and risk mapping and preparation of flood hazard maps.

The Project also helps Georgia in complying with *international obligations* mainly:

- Priority 1. Understanding disaster risk under **Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030)**. Particularly priority 1. entails that policies and practices for disaster risk management should be based on an understanding of disaster risk in all its dimensions of vulnerability, capacity, exposure of persons and assets, hazard characteristics and the environment. Such knowledge can be leveraged for pre-disaster risk assessment, for prevention and mitigation and the development and implementation of appropriate preparedness and effective response to disasters.
- The project contributes to the achievement of **SDG 13. Climate action**, particularly the following goals: Strengthen the resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries; Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning; and Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in the least developed countries and small island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities.

The project is fully relevant to UNDP's commitment to supporting CCA/DRR as defined in its UNPSD 2016-2020, **Outcome B**: By 2020 communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. It is also in line with the UNDP CPD 2016-2020, **Outcome 4 (4.2 and 4.2)**: communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. More especially to **output 4.2**: By 2020, environmental knowledge and formation systems enhanced, including capacities for regular reporting to international treaties. Ultimately, the Project is also part of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021, **Outcome 1**: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor, and **Outcome 2**: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development, **Outcome 5**: Countries can reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change and **Outcome 8**: Communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative

systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. Data and risk-informed development policies, plans, systems, and financing incorporate integrated and gender-responsive solutions to reduce disaster risks, enable climate change adaptation and mitigation, and prevent the risk of conflict.

The Project has been launched in December 2018 and will accomplish all its activities in November 2023. It is almost at the mid-point of implementation.

A detailed review of the phases in the implementation of the project, the changes to the project's initial design, plans, logical framework that have occurred over time, and the implications of these changes as well as a comprehensive assessment of the project's design and the implementation constraints are discussed in the Finding section.

The following section provides a brief assessment of the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues of gender equality, capacity building and human rights in the project design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation:

a) Gender

Women and children are the ones who are most vulnerable to disasters related to climate change. The project design has recognized risks associated with climate change and the vulnerability of women to such risks. Poor women with limited access to resources, restricted rights, limited mobility and voice in the community and household decision-making can make them more vulnerable than men to climate change-related hazards. The knowledge provided by this project will help to empower women and advance resilience to climate change.

At the project development phase, specific efforts were made to consult women and collect information regarding the impacts of climate change on women. A full Gender Action Plan was completed for the project which details the gender mainstreaming actions per activity per output with a clear identification of the baseline, indicators and targets, timeline and who is responsible. The project implementation is so far participatory and made provision of at least representation of women. It had made arrangements to provide direct benefits to women by building the capacity of women at central and municipal levels as well as to those vulnerable women with disrupted livelihoods.

The project specifically addresses the women CCA and DRR capacity at the national level. The project completed the general institutional capacity assessment report under the baseline institutional and technical capacity assessment exercise. The capacity development interventions will be implemented gradually throughout the project lifespan. Yet, the project ensured that the number of female participants is equal to the number of male participants mainly when it comes to hydraulic modelling while the number of females in the Linux and Python training should be around 3 folds the number of males trained because the majority of Linux and Python models at NEA are males and its essential that the project support females in getting the needed knowledge and skills for these essential programming languages.

As mentioned in the previous section, the project result framework objective and output level indicators were thoroughly reviewed and only one is a gender-specific indicator to capture gender mainstreaming at the output level. Two targets are gender-specific, and the Project's annual reports provided a good analysis of the status of work concerning these two targets. According to the project's team and UNDP management, the project is mainstreaming gender considerations and reflecting them as a mandatory requirement in all tasks description of the relevant technical experts working on the project's technical deliverables, such as the preparation of the policy/legal documents and the methodologies. For example, the gender aspects were integrated into methodology on the development of emergency management

planning for municipalities.¹² Overall, the inclusion of gender indicators in the results framework is considered a big step forward in mainstreaming gender in the project design.

The project is organized a one-day training course in Gender in DRR in July 2021. It will be based on a workshop manual on Gender and DRR in Europe and Central Asia, which was developed by UNDP and UN Women. The training is planned to be provided by the Programme's gender expert¹³.

b) Capacity Building

As mentioned in the previous sections, the project design has laid specific emphasis on the capacity building of stakeholders, especially at the central and local/municipal levels. In this regard, project Output 2.2 specifically focuses on building the stakeholders' capacities to support and strengthen municipal level multi-hazard response and preparedness capacities. Similarly, capacity building was also mainstreamed in other outputs of the project. The project organized several sessions to raise awareness on CCA and multi-hazard risk management for the public as well as for communities affected by CC induced hazards. However, the review suggests that the overall capacity building work of the project is considerably lagging.

c) Human rights

The project is guided by the human rights-based approach. All project activities are based on and apply Human rights principles such as Equality and non-discrimination, participation and inclusion, accountability, and rule of law. The development of multi-hazard risk information and capacity development with relevant risk-informed preparedness and response planning are considered as means for safeguarding the basic rights of rights-holders (women, men, youth and other vulnerable groups) and enabling proper satisfaction of their fundamental rights, needs and interests as well as reducing their vulnerability to climate risks. Whilst, at the same time, it provides the duty-bearers at central, regional, and local levels stronger capacities and opportunities to effectively fulfil their obligations and increase accountability.

The overall project design aimed at bringing a positive change in the lives of vulnerable populations/communities through addressing the climate change-related hazards, through the reduction of the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide multi-hazard early warning system and risk-informed local action which should serve 1.7 Million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards. Overall, the project has implemented a few capacity building interventions and will implement more during the second part of the project, where local communities also participated. However, it could not be ascertained if and how many of the participants belonged to marginalized, disadvantaged, and vulnerable groups.

¹² The Project's Mid-year report, 2021.

¹³ The Project's Mid-year report, 2021

4. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

4.1 Evaluation Scope

The mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the project “Strengthening Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia” is aimed to evaluate the project outcomes/outputs (listed below) in line with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (Relevance, Impact, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability). The key questions to measure these aspects of the project are provided below. Since the project is in the midpoint of its implementation, the intervention is not anticipated to have an impact at this stage, however, MTE might apply several questions rather focus on expected impact and possible challenges /obstacles to achieving the project outcomes. The MTE will provide relevant recommendations and lessons learnt per each evaluation criteria.

Besides, special focus will be placed on assessing the design and coherence of the project, including design of the project Theory of Change/Results Framework, the level of indicators being Specific, Measurable, Attainable and action-oriented, Relevant, and Time-bound (SMART), the progress in the achievement of the indicator targets, and clarity and appropriateness of data collection methods for each indicator. Thus, the MTE will provide recommendations for applicable adjustments to the results framework in case of need.

In addition, the MTE will analyze the strengths and weaknesses in terms of planning, management, implementation and monitoring of the project and the extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender mainstreaming) are applied, and provide recommendations for improvements. The extent of gender mainstreaming will be assessed for the project planning phase as well as for the project implementation and monitoring phases.

4.2 Evaluation Objectives

Following a review of the evaluation terms of reference and project proposals and the agreements with the project donors, the MTE assessed the SDC-supported Project (a component of a larger programme financed by GCF, SDC and GoG) performance against expectations set out in the project results framework.

The MTE assessed results according to evaluation criteria and in line with the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2019), among other resources, which set out several guiding principles, norms and standards for evaluation within UNDP.¹⁴

The MTE seeks to assess project performance against expectations set out in the project results framework. This included interviews and consultations with relevant stakeholders, including local beneficiaries in areas of a specific intervention.

The evaluation considered the pertinent outcomes and outputs as stated in the SDC-supported project document focused on enhancing resilience to climate change hazards by building national institutional and individual capacities in CCA/DRR.

4.3 Evaluation Criteria

According to the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2019), the MTE should provide evidence-based credible, useful, and reliable information. It will set up a collaborative as well as a participatory approach to ensure close cooperation with the project team, government counterparts in participating countries with a focus on the UNDP Country Offices, UNDP Regional team, members of the steering committee, local communities, and other key stakeholders.

The MTE followed the UNDP MTE Guidance. It used the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined, and explained in the UNDP

¹⁴ UNDP Evaluation Guidelines: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook>

Guidance for conducting a Mid-Term Evaluation of UNDP Projects. It was undertaken following UN evaluation norms and policies, including UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards for Evaluations and UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2019)

Key informant interviews were used, to the extent possible, to collect data from project participants. These participants included project partners, project stakeholders and targeted beneficiaries. Sets of questions were used to facilitate data and document collection and knowledge sharing. The questions were arranged around the evaluation criteria. 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 guide in preparing the semi-structured interviews.

4.4 Evaluation Questions

Below are some of the guiding questions within the framework of the evaluation criteria.

Relevance - How does the Project relate to the main objectives of the UNDP and the environment and development priorities?

- Was there a clear and logical consistency between, inputs, activities, outputs, and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity, and timeframe)?
- How has the project contributed to the priorities of the overall environmental protection and development programmes?
- Were the project's objectives, including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries, clear and realistic?
- Was the project relevant to the needs of target beneficiaries?
- How well did the project react to changing work environment and how well has the design been able to adjust to emerging circumstances?

Effectiveness - To what extent are the expected outcomes of the Project being achieved?

- To what extent is the project successful in achieving the expected results?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the component build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the results, and how effective have the project's partnerships been in contributing to achieving the planned results?
- To what extent have the targeted stakeholders and beneficiaries benefitted from the project? Are there any other beneficiaries, besides the targeted, who have benefitted from the project?
- To what extent are the current results benefitting women and men equally?
- To what extent are the project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing to the achievement of the project and broader Climate Change Adaptation objectives?

Efficiency - How efficiently is the Project implemented?

- To what extent are funding, staff, and other resources used to achieve the expected results of the project? Was there economic use of resources?

- Were the strategies utilized adequately? How have they contributed to the maximum intervention efficiency?
- To what extent was project implementation (e.g. procurement, recruitment) guided by effectiveness principles such as accountability, fairness, and value for money?
- To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- Were there any unanticipated events (e.g. COVID 19), opportunities or constraints that contributed to or hindered the delivery of the interventions promptly?
- To what extent were partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations encouraged and supported?
- Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable?
- What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? (between different actors, UNDP, and relevant government entities)
- Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?

Sustainability

- What strategies and mechanisms have been incorporated into the implementation of the project to guarantee the sustainability of expected outputs in the broader environmental management and CCA frameworks?
- To what extent did the capacity-building activities under the project produce lasting results?
- To what extent have partners and other stakeholders committed to providing continuing support?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team continually and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent can the results of the component be replicated/ upscaled in other areas?

Potential Impact

- Did the component have the intended impact and/or is the component likely to have an impact on the overall project and beyond?
- What specific contribution did the component make within the broader project framework? What specific part of this difference can be attributed to the component?

Gender equality

- To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender?
- Have gender issues been considered in project implementation? If so, how and to what extent? how data was collected during project implementation, i.e. sex-disaggregated. The number of females/males who participated in different events. Females/males satisfaction and feedback on attending and participating in different events.

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and POPs and chemical management, experience in gender-sensitive evaluation and analysis.

Human Rights:

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and tribal peoples, women, and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from the project's interventions? details of the impact of the project on livelihoods, job creation, etc.
- The MTE framework is presented in **Annex 2** (a matrix that details review questions, indicators, and sources of verification).

A list of questions was prepared and was further tailored based on initial interviews and depending on the different categories of participants engaged in the discussion:

General Questions:

- Why did you take part in this activity?
- What did you get from this activity?
- Did it change something in your way of working, living? If so, what?
- Were there components of this activity useless to your work? Which ones?
- Were there specific difficulties in the implementation of this activity? What could be improved?
- Do you also face difficulties in the implementation of what you have learnt/discussed during this activity? Why? How could this be overcome?
- Do you see other effects of this activity, on your organization and its performance/results?
- Do you see categories of stakeholders excluded from the potential benefits of the project? Which ones and why?
- Would you have other recommendations to strengthen the work at the county level?

More specific questions were used based on the interviewed stakeholders:

Interview Guide:	
1.	How was the project formulated? To what extent was it participatory and inclusive?
2.	To what extent have social, economic, and political dynamics been taken into consideration?
3.	Are there gaps to be addressed?
4.	To what extent are the project's monitoring mechanisms in place effective for measuring and informing management
5.	How was the prioritization undertaken, including the selection of countries? To what extent have the most relevant activities and outputs been selected to achieve the objectives?
6.	What needs could not be covered? Have some activities been rejected at the inception stage?
7.	How and to what extent was the gender dimension included in the project?
8.	How was gender factored in the component and the results? How have cultural constraints related to gender been addressed? To what extent do the results differ between males and females?
9.	To what extent did the M&E process identify the results and limitations of the process across the various implementing partners and participants? How would you suggest improvements in the M&E to enable documenting results at outcome and impact level in the future?
10.	How have lessons learned been identified and included in the projects?
11.	Which activities could not be implemented as planned and why? What were the difficulties? To what extent can they be anticipated and planned?
12.	To what extent were coordination and the partnership strategy relevant and effective? How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs

13. To what extent were civil society and the private sector involved? Are there further opportunities in that respect?
14. What were the potential limitations to put into practice the learnings of the activities
15. To what extent did you try to overcome potential limitations and difficulties during the projects' implementation?
16. Which changes can be identified in the beneficiary (partners), organizations and to what extent can they be attributed to the project work?
17. To what extent did those changes lead to potential impacts?
18. Can any unexpected positive or negative effects be identified?
19. What would be your recommendations for the potential future "networks of networks" project operations, particularly at the global -national level?
20. Has the project-built synergies with other similar projects being implemented at the country level with the United Nations and the Governments?

5. Evaluation approach and methods

This evaluation assessed the achievement of project results by analyzing the progress made towards the achievement of general and specific objectives. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results of the SDC Project's intervention. Documentation of the project's experiences and achievements, as well as challenges, will be excellent tools for the government and development partners, who will be able to draw inspiration for the implementation of other programs and projects related to CCA and DRR. The evaluation consultant virtually met with key stakeholders for observation, data collection and other forms of project evaluation related discussion meetings. Remote interviews were conducted through skype, zoom etc.

Considering a pre-determined time frame of (30) working days for the consultant, the evaluation was conducted in three (3) Phases as follows:

- The First Phase covered (5) days for the preparation of the Inception report and evaluation matrix. This time was devoted to preliminary documentary reviews, inception meetings, and consultations with the UNDP management team as necessary, etc., that culminated into the drafting of the inception report.
- The Second Phase covered 20 days (13 for developing preliminary findings and 7 days to prepare the draft report). It involved engagement of consultation/meetings with partners, Data collection, analysis, and preparations for the preliminary findings/MTE Report. Documents reviewed included but were not limited to UNDP Programme Documents, Project proposal, GCF Project Document, CDRs, annual work plans, co-financing letters, list of key stakeholders and partners, project technical deliverables and progress reports and other relevant project and program documents. One-on-one consultations were carried out with the UNDP team, government officials, stakeholders, direct beneficiaries of the project leading to the presentation of the draft document. During this period, the consultant utilized (13) days to develop preliminary findings.
- The Third Phase covered (5) days and was devoted to the preparation, finalization, and submission of the Final Report after the submission of the draft MTE Report and obtaining feedback from relevant stakeholders from comments solicited in a consultative process. The comments should be incorporated, and the report refined. The Final MTE Report is to be finalized and submitted for approval. An Audit trail report containing all comments on the final MTE report and if the comments were/were not addressed would be developed and submitted along with the final version of the final MTE report.

The approach for this evaluation included various activities specified below. It entailed project stakeholder consultation meetings, and data collection (both qualitative and quantitative). It enabled the MTE consultant to examine the extent of the project's realistic achievement in comparison to the planned activities and value for money. Below is a detailed explanation of the methods used:

Desk study: A comprehensive desk review of relevant project-related documents has been conducted during the inception phase. The focus of this desk review has been on understanding the project, its theory of change, relevant beneficiaries, and stakeholders to develop the evaluation methodology, evaluation matrix and a detailed work plan. The desk review also analyzed existing secondary data which was used to assess the evaluation questions.

Interview data collection: In the period of 28 October – 10 November 2021 a series of virtual meetings took place to collect primary data through semi-structured interviews, and small group discussions with key stakeholders and beneficiaries. This data collection phase aimed to gather diverse views on the project.

Sampling: To increase the reliability of findings, the MTE consultant used targeted sampling methods for each data collection process. Based on the stakeholder mapping a targeted non-random sampling technique was used to ensure balanced views and opinions from different stakeholder groups. Accordingly, the primary qualitative data collection process was designed to reach the full range of stakeholders, including beneficiaries, partners in Georgian institutions, other international development partners, and key experts and non-governmental actors. To this end, a targeted selection procedure was applied for identifying relevant primary stakeholders who were closely involved in the implementation of the project and therefore possess sound knowledge of the project. Additionally, secondary stakeholders such as relevant civil society actors involved in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction work have been identified. The final sampling procedure was completed in collaboration with the UNDP project team and a national consultant who assisted in developing the interview schedule and arranging the interviews.

Data collection instruments and protocols: Interview questions for the interviews were developed and applied consistently in line with the evaluation matrix. This ensured the systematic collection of data encompassing the questions and sub-questions of the evaluation matrix.

Data analysis and management: all data was collated, triangulated (see below on triangulation) and verified before conclusions were drawn. To analyze the data, protocols on interviews and group discussions were developed during the interviews (virtual mission).

Triangulation of data, sources and methods was used to minimize the possibility of errors and discrepancies. On data triangulation, data from different sources were collected using different data collection techniques, e.g. semi-structured interviews with different stakeholders and document analysis. Additional data collection methods such as meetings, discussion groups, and comprehensive analysis of different project documents and relevant policy documents were used to enhance the reliability. Researcher triangulation, i.e. an independent international evaluator supported by a national expert collecting and analyzing the data, was used throughout the evaluation process. Impartiality and independence were strictly observed during the selection of respondents for interviews. Reliability and quality of information/data were ensured through a critical review and analysis, cross-checks, discussions among the team and probation of respondents while collecting project information. The methodology used for this evaluation is an approach of analysis of primary and secondary data and finding out their interlinkages and developing an evaluative report. This approach is an established evaluation methodology aiming at capturing all stakeholders' comprehensive views.

The following limitations inherent to the methods used were identified:

- **Selection bias** - As some informants may decline to participate, there is a possibility of selection bias, i.e. those respondents who choose to participate might differ from those who do not in terms of their attitudes and perceptions, their affiliation with central institutional / non-government structures, and experience. This may apply to in-person interviews, and group discussions.
- **Recall bias** - Since several questions deal with issues that took place in the past or with changes that have taken place since the projects began, recall bias cannot be excluded. Some respondents may find it difficult to accurately compare organizational arrangements/capacity one or more years ago to the current situation.
- **Mission to Georgia** - since the COVID19 outbreak is still affecting people mobility at the global level. The interviews were conducted virtually to ensure that there is no delay in conducting the interviews due to the complex travel approvals procedures. So, the MTE team utilized a range of available tools to ensure stakeholders engagement. When one tool is not possible to be used other tools were used like skype, zoom and MS Teams. If conducting a virtual meeting was not an option for some stakeholders, emails exchange facilitated the process.

Finally, the evaluation team used different triangulation methods to identify any inconsistencies and reduce the “response bias”, in which respondents tend to tell the evaluator what they want to hear. The use of layered triangulation across different methods, sources of information and evaluator and the mixed methods approach reduced uncertainty in this regard. In sum, since data, researcher and method triangulation were possible and was used for most evaluation questions the evidence generated is reliable.

6. Data Analysis

The selection of the right analytical approach depends on the list of questions being asked and the review matrix that is developed to support the team. This process entails having a clear understanding of the project, its objective, aim, outcomes, outputs, the theory of change, and the resulting impacts and approach for sustainability.

The analytical approaches and methods that will be used include:

- **Descriptive:** this approach was used to define the status of the Project component implementation, it describes the project's objective, outputs, and impact.
- **Diagnostics:** this approach was used to understand what happened? What did the project component achieve? How? why is this happening? Partnerships developed, use of financial resources, project co-financing, analyses of project component risks and issues, and mitigation measures. It was used to define what is the project component's impact, are these sustainable, and what will happen after the closure of the project component.
- **Prescriptive:** this approach was used to define the main findings of the evaluation and to define a set of recommendations for the project component and future interventions.

7. Findings

This section provides a summary of the main facts based on data collected during the evaluation exercise. The MTE paid attention to cross-verification of the evaluative evidence using multiple sources of information and, to the extent possible, avoided over-reliance on opinions obtained during the interviews.

7.1 Project Design/Formulation

The MTE analyzed the design of the project as outlined in the UNDP proposals to identify whether the project strategy proved to be effective in reaching the desired results. In doing so, the evaluator assessed the extent to which the project addressed stakeholders' priorities and need. Furthermore, the MTE consultant evaluated the extent to which the project objectives were consistent with the priorities and objectives of the UNDP, SDC, NEA and MoEPA.

7.1.1 Analysis of Results Framework: project logic, strategy, and indicators

A UNDP programme was designed with the Government of Georgia in December 2018 that aimed at reducing exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards reduced through a well-functioning national-wide multi-hazards early warning system and risk-informed local action.

The Programme has three main projects that are interrelated and interlined. The two projects are funded by the Green Climate Fund (GCF)/ the Swedish Government (SIDA) and the Swiss Development and Cooperation (SDC). The GCF-funded project targets the expansion of hydro-meteorological network and modelling capacities and improving community resilience through the implementation of EWS and risk reduction measures.

The SDC-funded project "*Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia*", is contributing to an overall goal of reducing the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide Multi-Hazard Early Warning System (MHEWS) and risk-informed local action serving 1.7 Million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards. The project aims at developing financial, technical and human capacities to establish a nation-wide multi-hazard risk, monitoring, modelling and forecasting and reducing exposure and vulnerability risk of communities in Georgia, through the development of multi-hazard risk information and relevant capacities.

The SDC-funded Project is supposed to support the GoG in:

1. standardizing and harmonizing national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology to enable the development of unified risk information on the national level,
2. the Project is working on developing an adequate Institutional and legal framework for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment that should be implemented to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information.
3. enhancing long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment to provide adequate risk information.
4. developing multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia, to provide valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning and
5. improving local (municipal) preparedness to multi-hazard risks through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and the existence of the risk-informed preparedness plans.

The SDC-project was designed to build on and contribute to the GCF Project. Its components were designed to support the GoG in reducing the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning

nation-wide multi-hazard early warning system and risk-informed local action which should serve 1.7 Million Georgians at risk from climate-induced hazards.

The SDC-project benefited from the overall programme design and implementation. An inception phase (February to April) of the project provided valuable information to identify intervention strategies to climate change adaptation focusing on hazard mapping and defined related capacity development. Also, the analytical papers developed provided Georgia with additional baseline information required for the creation of the enabling environment for enhancing DRM capacities through improved hazard mapping capabilities.

The SDC-project was designed based on the output findings under the IR project. The ProDoc included a detailed analysis of the work conducted during the IP and the main findings under different technical areas. The analysis also identified what need to be done, why and how.

The SDC-component provided, under the baseline analysis and scenario, means to provide support to main target groups. These include:

- i) **Large proportions of the Georgian population.** Round 1.7 Million currently lack the coping capacities and adaptation strategies at communities and individual levels to adapt to CC and to manage and minimize their exposure and resilience to hydro-meteorological hazards.
- ii) **Governmental officials and Practitioners:** these work on the ground, directly or with intermediaries, to define, manage and minimize climate hazards.
- iii) **Scientists and knowledge holders.**

Within this context, the project is fully relevant to UNDP's commitment to supporting CCA/DRR as defined in its UNPSD 2016-2020, **Outcome B:** By 2020 communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. It is also in line with the UNDP CPD 2016-2020, **Outcome 4 (4.2 and 4.2):** communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. More especially to **output 4.2:** By 2020, environmental knowledge and formation systems enhanced, including capacities for regular reporting to international treaties. Ultimately, the Project is also part of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021, **Outcome 1:** Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor, and **Outcome 2:** Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development, **Outcome 5:** Countries can reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change and **Outcome 8:** Communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. Data and risk-informed development policies, plans, systems, and financing incorporate integrated and gender-responsive solutions to reduce disaster risks, enable climate change adaptation and mitigation, and prevent the risk of conflict.

The Project is also linked with SDC's strategy for DRR work in Georgia. The Project is aligned with the following SDC's initiatives in Georgia:

- **SDC Caucasus Network for Sustainable Development in Mountain Regions (Sustainable Caucasus),** the overarching goal of the project is to reduce the population's vulnerabilities towards climate-induced hazards and foster regional cooperation on adaptation challenges in the Caucasus.
- **SDC Prevention and Preparedness project** aims at developing the initial multi-hazard mapping methodology including cost-benefit analysis tools for the prioritization of the preventive actions, and
- **SDC-ADA-UN Women – Women's economic empowerment in the south Caucasus.** It aims at supporting women's economic empowerment in Georgia and across the South Caucasus. The project will coordinate its activities with other ongoing SDC/ADA-funded projects on Women's Economic Empowerment to ensure

consideration of gender aspects into multi-hazard risk profiling and risk-informed preparedness and response planning with the inclusion of social and gender aspects.

The Project is considered an integral part of the GCF project. GCF project also supports achieving transformative change in climate risk reduction and management in Georgia by the development of a fully integrated impact based MHEWS system. It aims at introducing a standardized hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment and mapping methods and technologies and providing critical climate risk information to enable the implementation of nation-wide risk reduction policies. It is supposed to develop long-term institutional and community capacities in climate risk reduction, climate change adaption and MHEWS.

Results Framework formulated during the design phase of this project presents a coherent set of expected results and indicators but also complement the work of the GCF project. This has its pros and cons as the two projects are very much interlinked and interdependent. So, any delay in any of the activities in one project will lead to a delay in the implementation of the other project's activities. This cannot be avoided as the outputs of one project are the inputs for the second project and vis-a-vis.

The project document is well structured and follows the UNDP (ProDoc) formats. When considering the implementation timeframe of 5 years and financing of about US\$ 5million from SDC, the project is progressing but not on track so far.

The project strategy was confirmed during the inception phase of the project. The Project benefited from the Inception Phase and the technical notes developed which were integrated into the overall project document. The review of the LF components indicates a good and logical "chain of results": Actions ➡ Activities ➡ Outputs ➡ Outcomes ➡ Impacts ➡ Objectives. Yet, after the signing of the ProDoc, there was an extended inception workshop for the whole programme (GCF and SDC) and the LF was briefly discussed. Yet, the focus of the IW was mainly on the GCF project. No discussion took place on the SDC-project targets and thus no changes were made to the SDC-project LF which indicates logical presentations of the chains of results. This framework also includes - for each outcome and output- a set of indicators and targets to be achieved at the end of the project that is used to monitor the performance of the project. However, it misses the mid-term targets which made it difficult for the project team to measure progress and monitor the performance of the project at the mid-point of implementation. This flaw was not addressed in the Inception Phase/ Workshop (IP/IW) as no mid-term targets were added to the LF.

The review of the Project LFs confirms that this project is well aligned with national, regional, and global priorities and their logic is appropriate to address clear national, regional, and global needs/priorities. The Project strategy includes two outcomes and 5 outputs as presented in the project LF and theory of change. Furthermore, the Project document highlighted the project contribution to supporting Georgia in achieving the SDGs. Both, the GCF and the SDC projects are contributing to enhancing Georgia capacity to achieve **SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts**¹⁵. Mainly by reducing exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods, and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards. The SDC project is also contributing to mainstreaming gender in the CCA/DRR work by focusing on gender-sensitive indicators.

Fundamentally, the LF followed the UNDP format. However, the following observations were made:

¹⁵ In particular, the SDC project is supporting Georgia in achieving targets 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 (calling for strengthening resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries, integrating climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning, and improving, education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning).

- No mid-term targets were provided per output. This makes it difficult for the project team to measure progress against the intended results.
- Indicators and Targets were not SMART in general. The review of the Project LF indicated that targets and indicators together provide the needed information concerning the target to be achieved and the indicator used to measure progress. However, targets were used as the deadlines to achieve the indicators! This makes it difficult and does not allow for proper adaptive management and monitoring of progress.

Essentially the LF followed the UNDP formats. Yet, it failed -in some cases- to provide SMART indicators that allow for proper adaptive management and monitoring of progress. This resulted in some weaknesses in the LF mainly in defining targets and indicators at the mid-term level. Given the fact that the project has a high budget, includes many interlinkages with the other two projects that need to be achieved in relatively a short period, and taking into consideration the delay the project encountered up until year 3 of its commencement, the project designers (development stage) and the project team (implementation stage) should have identified priorities in implementation of some outputs. It is evident that some outputs with completion targets earlier than the end of the Project should have been given the priority to be implemented so that other project outputs/activities could benefit from the produced deliverables. Yet, there is no action taken by the project team to prioritize the remaining activities and start with the outputs/activities that were supposed to be implemented on the fast track.

In conclusion, the review of the project strategy and the national context for this project indicates that this strategy is a direct response to national needs and priorities to strengthen adaptive capacity and reduce exposure to climate risks. Table 2 provides an overview of the MTE assessment of the project's LF and how "SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound" achievements are compared to the defined end-of-project targets.

Table 2 Overview of the MTE of the Project's Logframe.

Criteria	MTE Comments
S pecific	Indicators are mostly specific and target-oriented. Indicators used clear language and described a specific future condition. However, some indicators are not very specific like indicator 1.2: <i># of gender considerations reflected in newly developed policy documents and technical guidance</i> .
M easurable	The indicators are linked to measurable targets. Indicators have measurable aspects making it possible to assess whether they are achieved or not
A chievable	Most of the targets and associated indicators seem realistic to be achievable. They are ambitious, yet with the financial support from SDC, the interlinkages with the other two initiatives; GCF and SIDA, and technical support by UNDP and a group of national and international experts, the indicators are achievable yet very ambitious and challenging
R elevant	All indicators are relevant since they address national development priorities and are linked to the project's outcome and outputs.
T ime-bound	Indicators are linked to targets that are linked to specific timeframes (end of the project). No mid-term targets under the mid-term column, however, a few targets were listed under 2020 and 2021. The missing mid-term targets should have been identified during the inception phase.

In conclusion, the review of the Project strategy indicates that the strategy is a direct response to national, regional and global needs and priorities to advance many of the developing Georgia capacities in adapting to the changing climate and enhancing disaster risk management at local and national levels.

7.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

The Project document discussed assumptions and risks in detail under the Risks and Assumptions section. It listed the anticipated risk, following the UNDP Risk log template under annexe 3 of the ProDoc and has identified **5 risks** during the formulation stage¹⁶ and included risks description, category, the overall level of risk, probability of incidence and impact and the planned measures/mitigation or reduction. The risk types included contextual (3), and programmatic (2). However, the project document mentioned that other risk factors are associated with the project including policy, financial, technical and operation but those were not clarified, discussed, or even defined/listed in annexe 3. No discussions took place for assumptions at all.

Risks are thoroughly examined and analyzed mainly during the project implementation. The Project's team has been using very comprehensive and well-developed and maintained risk monitoring and risk registered sheets. However, upon examining these logs by the MTE expert, it was noticed that there is a mix up between the Project's risks and issues. In total, the project identified 74 risks since its inception. While many of these are critical risks, some are issues and challenges rather than risks.

According to the Project's team, these Project's risks and issues logs had been maintained largely off-line. This is given the fact that the project is set as an output of the broader GCF project within UNDP Atlas, which is divided into the GCF component and the SDC component. It looks like the Project' team decided to avoid crowding the Atlas with the component and sub-component specific risk logs, so only those risks which are generally applicable for the overall project were listed on Atlas including the risk logs on COVID-19¹⁷. The MTE believes that the management of the project's risks is **satisfactory** as risks were initially identified and were regularly and carefully analyzed and monitored with concrete mitigation measures and were updated on project reports with a follow-up plan on mitigation measures.

7.2 Planned stakeholder participation

According to the UNDP ProDoc, the Project benefited from the established working model with various national, sub-national and international stakeholders, which was developed as part of the inception phase and the preparation for the GCF Project. The development of the Project's activities has been generated through consultation with stakeholders and beneficiaries. These consultations included meeting with officials at the municipal/local and national levels. Women, men, the elderly, and youth, academia and non-governmental sector across the project's targeted municipalities have been consulted in the formulation of the Project. The UNDP ProDoc also included a list of key stakeholders to be involved in the implementation of the project which also articulated their respective expected roles and responsibilities¹⁸.

Finally, the Project Board is composed of all key Implementing Partners from MEPA, NEA, EIEC, EMS, MRDI, UNDP, SDC, representatives of the local governments and civil society organizations. They have met twice a year so far, yet more PB meetings will certainly contribute to good coordination and collaboration among project partners.

Furthermore, the funding proposal identified the need to develop a Technical Advisory Working Groups (TAWG) to be established under GCF funded interventions. This TAWG should support the CTA and PC for the GCF. They are supposed to provide inputs to and endorsement of the design and quality of the GCF project outputs. However, considering the inter-linkages of the interventions from SDC and GCF funded initiatives, the GCF TAWGs members should be able

¹⁶ UNDP Project Document, Table 5: Project Risks and Risk Mitigation Measures (2019-2020). Page 13.

¹⁷ Screenshots were provided by the project team.

¹⁸ UNDP ProDoc, Sub-Section: Stakeholder Engagement. Table 2. Stakeholder Analysis. Page 24.

to provide valuable support to the SCD Project. They were supposed to be from the government, private sector, academia, and civil society to provide guidance and technical advice on the project. At the time of the MTE, it was noticed that a few TAWG were formulated.

2 TAGWs were established in 2019 with around 10 members in each group. The GCF project team developed the ToRs and defined the functioning of TAWGs. Representation of all concerned stakeholders in the TAWG has been insured.

The first TAGW on MHEWS was held on December 13, 2019. The purpose of the meeting was to present and discuss the proposed outline of the Centralized Multi-Hazard Disaster Risk Information System, as well as to agree on the subsequent actions of the involved parties during the implementation of the project. The TAWG ToR was also presented and agreed with members from relevant state agencies.

A stakeholder analysis was undertaken to update the existed stakeholder analysis document. The exercise took place in early 2019. The analysis covered the key main aspects as follows: identified the stakeholders, role in the projects (GCF/SDC), and the actions of the project to strengthen capacities of a stakeholder.

7.3 Project Implementation.

The MTE discusses in this section the assessment of how the project has been implemented. It assessed how efficient the management of the project has been and how conducive it is to contribute to successful project implementation.

7.3.1 Management Arrangements

The MoEPA was designated as the Implementing Partner (IP) following a NIM implementation modality. It assumed the overall responsibility for the achievement of the Project results. UNDP is the Senior Supplier responsible for transparent practices, appropriate conduct and providing oversight through the Country Office (CO) in Georgia as well as quality assurance.

The management arrangements for this project are as follows:

- UNDP assume the role of Project quality assurance and providing oversight through its Headquarter, Regional and Country Office. This includes¹⁹ supporting the Project Board by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed and reported to the donor. The project assurance role includes the following services: Day-to-day oversight supervision, oversight of project completion, and oversight of M&E plan, including reporting.
- The Implementing Partner for this project is MoEPA. It is responsible for the overall implementation of the project and closely cooperates with UNDP to ensure the successful implementation of all project activities. MoEPA 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.
- Considering the programmatic approach of SDC and GCF funded interventions, the two projects share the Project Board (PB)/Project Steering Committee (PSC), and a National Project Director (NPD).
- According to UNDP ProDoc, an NPD should be appointed by MoEPA and should chair the PB. The NPD was appointed in early 2019. She is the Deputy Minister of MoEPA and provides the general coordination and support to the project on behalf of the MoEPA. The NPD is also responsible for project execution on a day-to-day basis on behalf of MoEPA within the parameters laid down by the Project Board. NPD is

¹⁹ UNDP ProDoc. Section X. Governance and Management Arrangements. Pages 38-39.

accountable to PB and will end her authority when the final project terminal evaluation report, and other documentation required by the GCF, SDC and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP.

- The project is guided by a Project Board (PB) as the executive decision-making body of the project. The PB is composed of representatives from MoEPA, NEA, EIEC, EMS, MRDI, UNDP, SDC and representatives of the local governments and civil society organizations. The Project Board is responsible for making, by consensus, management decisions. The PB/PSC is composed of representatives of the following entities:
 - Representative(s) of the MoEPA– **Executive**
 - Representative(s) of National Environmental Agency (NEA), MoEPA – **Senior User**
 - Representative of Environmental Information and Education Center, MoEPA – **Senior User**
 - Representative of National Food Agency, MoEPA – **Senior User**
 - Representative of Agriculture Scientific-Research Center, MoEPA – **Senior User**
 - Representative of Emergency Management Service (EMS), MIA – **Senior User**
 - Representative of Joint Operations Center/112, MIA – **Senior User**
 - Representative(s) of the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure (MRDI) – **Senior User**
 - Representatives of local municipalities²⁰ – **Senior Users**
 - Representative(s) of Tbilisi Municipality – **Senior User**
 - Representatives of the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)²¹– **Senior Users**
 - UNDP Country Office Management – Resident Representative, Deputy Resident Representative – **Senior Supplier**
 - Representative(s) of the Swiss Cooperation Office in the South Caucasus (SCO) - Deputy Regional Director
 - SCO's Head of Program in Georgia on Effective Democratic Institutions, Human Safety and Security, SCO's National Programme Officer – **Senior Supplier**
 - Representative(s) of Swedish International Development Agency in Georgia (**observer member**)
 - UNDP Country Office Environment and Energy Team Leader/ex-officio: Programme Associate – **Project Assurance**
- The PMU, serving as a Secretariat to the Program Steering Committee, is responsible to:
 - Present progress reports with detailed financial reports.
 - Develop and present semi-(annual) and annual work plans with the estimated/planned budgets
 - Raise any issue that needs discussion or guidance/approval from the Program Steering Committee.
 - Introduce the context-related information about the project; present challenges and risks in the program implementation and propose solutions and seek approval from the Program Steering Committee members.
- The PB provides strategic oversight and guidance based upon project progress assessments and related recommendations from the NPD who is a non-voting member. The PB ensures that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes of the required quality. According to the ProDoc, the PB should meet twice a year. However, due to the project's complexity, its technical nature, and the inter-linkages with the GCF project, several stakeholders voiced their concerns over the role of the PB and highlighted the need to organize more meetings for the PB (meet at least four times a year). Yet, on the ground, the PB convenes twice a year and had

²⁰ Local municipalities will be invited only when projects activities take place in each municipality

²¹ Representatives of CSO will be selected on rotation basis.

around 5 meetings since the project's inception as follows: Feb 2019, December 2019, July 2020, Feb 2021, and July 2021).

- A full-time Project Manager (PM)²² was hired by UNDP. The PM is responsible for managing the project on a day-to-day basis. The PM provides daily support to the NPD to ensure the project produces and results specified in the project document, meet the required standard of quality, timeliness, and cost criteria. The annual work plans are being prepared by the PM and reviewed and cleared by the UNDP Country Office as part of the quality assurance and reviewed and approved by PB. The PM is responsible for managing and monitoring the project risks initially identified and submitting new risks to the project board for consideration and decision on possible actions if required and updating the status of these risks by maintaining the project risks log according to the NIM Guidelines.
- In January 2019, a joint Project Management Unit for GCF and SDC projects have been established. During the second quarter of 2019, the PMU was fully formed and consisted of the SDC Project Manager, GCF project coordinator, Chief Technical Advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, and Administrative Assistant, Procurement Specialist, respective Team Leaders under GCF project (Team Leader in Hydrometeorology, Team Leader in MHEWS, Team Leader in community-based processes), and UNV volunteer. A team of individual international and national experts were also hired for specific project activities.
- On 19 February 2019, the programme has been officially launched jointly with the Government and the inception workshop (IW) was held with the opening speech of the Prime Minister of Georgia.
- The Steering committee was formed at its first meeting (SCM) held on February 19, 2019. The PSC terms of references, membership and annual work plans were discussed at the consequent PSC meeting on 23 April, and through online consultation with the PSC members. PSC members agreed to revise and integrate annual work plans for two projects. A round of discussions and reviews took place before the Integrated GCF/SDC Annual Work Plan for 2019 has been approved on August 8, 2019.
- A Project Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) was hired as part of the PMU during the second quarter of 2019. This CTA was assigned for the whole Programme (the GCF and SDC projects) due to the inter-linkage nature of the two interventions. According to the ProDoc, the CTA should provide regular technical guidance to the projects' management and technical teams in managerial and technical issues. However, the CTA resigned in September 2021. Up until the MTE time, the CTA position was vacant. UNDP has been facing difficulty in mobilizing a qualified international expert quickly to serve as the project's CTA and be based in Georgia. These difficulties were due to the unexpected departure of the CTA and for UNDP application of standard recruitment procure, which normally takes 3-4 months. The MTE believes that this issue should be solved as soon as possible to provide the PM with the needed technical guidance and management support.
- The Chief Technical Advisor of the program should be attending the PSC meetings (physically or online) as an observer to provide technical inputs.
- A Programme management team (formally known as the Programme Management Unit) was established in Tbilisi at the beginning of the Programme to manage the GCF and SDC projects; it is located outside UNDP and MoPEA premises. It is headed by the GCF Project Coordinator and provides project administration, management, and technical support as required by the needs of the day-to-day operations of the SDC project. The team includes 8 staff members as follows: a GCF project coordinator (GCF-PC), **SDC Project Manager (PM)**, SIDA Project Manager (SIDA-PM), an

²² This is equivalent to the project coordinator position identified in the ProDoc.

Admin/Finance Associate, a monitoring and evaluation officer (M&E Office)²³, procurement and contracting assistant (GCF) and admin/fin assistant (SIDA) and two team leaders for GCF components.

- The PMU is technically supported by the CTA, and a group of national and international experts are hired on a short-term basis as per the need of the project. The recruitment of the Project's team, and the national and international consultants, and the procurement of any equipment and materials for the project is done by UNDP, based on the PM request, and subject to the NPD approval, and following relevant recruitment and procurement rules and procedures of UNDP. Most of the interviewed stakeholders expressed their dissatisfaction over the UNDP lengthy recruitment process. Furthermore, currently, 8 technical experts are working on the SDC project, developing very technical deliverables, yet, as there is no CTA currently, there is a concern over the ability of the Project to verify the experts' deliverables and manage the work of the experts in the absence of a CTA. Also, it was noticed that the 8 experts are working independently with no team leader, which is also a gap in managing the deliverables. A technical team leader is very much needed to coordinate the work of the national and international experts and ensure the synergies and inter-linkages not only within the SDC project but also with the GCF and SIDA initiatives.
- Reviewing the current project's management structure indicates that the absence of a CTA²⁴ for the Programme and a technical team leader for the SDC component makes it very difficult to manage the project and provide the group of national and international consultants with the needed coordination support. The MTE has a reservation on the composition of the PMU. Technical positions like a climate change adaptation expert or a DRR specialist are vital to have technical input, otherwise, the project will be at the mercy of part-time consultants. The MTE team believes that the project should have created such technical positions.
- The interviewed project team indicated the difficulties they face in implementing project activities on the ground due to: restrictions imposed by COVID-19, the absence of a CTA and the absence of a technical team leader for the SDC project.
- The project is implemented under the "UNDP Support Services to National Implementation Modality (NIM)" in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) between the Government of Georgia and UNDP that was signed on 1 July 1994. In this modality, UNDP may be requested to provide support services to nationally implemented projects, which must be done following UNDP rules and regulations. To facilitate the mobilization of project resources and coordinate project supported activities, the project developed a Letter of Agreement (LOA) between UNDP and MEPA. In addition to regular clauses of an agreement, it included a description of services to be provided by UNDP, including their respective costs. The LOA was developed and signed in 2019.
- The review indicates that the management arrangements as planned at the outset of the project are detailed in terms of outlining partners' responsibilities, project personnel, and the overall governance structure, however, it is abstracted and not conducive for a smooth and effective day-to-day implementation of project activities. For example, the mitigation measures on technical and operational risks due to the inter-linkages nature of the GCF-SDC-SIDA projects are not identified anywhere and are completely missing.
- The interviews conducted with the project team informed that the mobilization of the technical experts is another area of concern that was not highlighted as a risk in the ProDoc. The management of a group of high-level experts and providing quality

²³ For the SDC project, only 3 people are serving the project: a full-time project manager, a part-time fin/admin assistant and a part-time M&E.

²⁴ The Programme's CTA resigned in September 2021.

assurance for the technical deliverable is another cumbersome process which is one of the main reasons to hire a specialist to provide the PM with the needed technical support.

- The ProDoc proposed a management team supported by short-term experts bringing together a broad range of skills and knowledge in climate change adaptation, hydrology and meteorology and disaster risk management. In addition to that, the ProDoc stated that the Project should partner with the NEA and EMS through LOA to ensure the development of long-term capacities related to multi-hazard mapping/risk assessment and risk-informed preparedness/response planning. An overview of the status of recruitment and procurement of technical short-term experts is delayed. To be effective during a time-constrained five-year project, experts should be mobilized as soon as possible. Additionally, the fact that the former CTA was home-based and worked remotely is another issue highlighted by all stakeholders including the project team. According to the interviewed stakeholders, the CTA should be in Georgia and more specifically within the PMU to be close to the Ministry's staff to provide the needed technical support when needed.

7.3.2 Adaptive management

The project witnessed a delay due to several issues highlighted earlier. In addition to that, the complex nature of the project activities, the inter-linkages with other projects' components (GCF and SIDA), the involvement of several experts with different work packages which are very technical, have added more complexity and made the effective resources planning a must to ensure timely submission and high quality of work.

To cope with the delay, the project took the following adaptive actions to expedite implementation and enhance project delivery:

- The PMU developed a Resource Planning document (in a form of a Gant Chart) for the activity related to institutional capacity assessment. The tool provided detailed information on the specific deliverables for the overall capacity assessment exercise, with an indication of inputs and the relevant experts within the program (recruited both by SDC and GCF) and timelines for submission.
- The PMU plans to add inputs from the relevant governmental institutions with specified tasks and schedules as well. The tool will be regularly updated to enable PMU to have an overall picture of the responsible actors for the development of the capacity assessment on one hand and ensure constant monitoring over the progress achieved as well, through detecting the shortcomings promptly.
- The PMU plans to implement a similar approach for other inter-linked activities as well: development of multi-hazard mapping methodology and development of legal and institutional frameworks for MHEWS and climate information throughout project implementation.
- Due to the complexity of the technical work, the PMU faced great challenges and identified several risks in the process of developing the TORs. Thus, the PMU developed very comprehensive and detailed risks management plans. The detailed matrix was reviewed by the MTE and is considered a very effective tool to keep close monitoring. The PMU developed detailed risk matrixes for each complex activity with identified types of risks, level of the risk, owners of the risk and respective mitigation measures. The PMU updates the tool regularly.
- The PMU developed a data repository to assemble all the information and data developed through the groups of experts and stakeholders. This internal server is managed by the programme. The idea is to ensure that all products are available to all concerned stakeholders and the project's team when needed. It was agreed that after completion of the projects, the information would be a useful source for further interventions in that field.

The activity will be funded through the GCF project; however, the server will serve the SDC project as well.

- the PMU ensured business continuity during the COVID19 lockdown through regular monitoring of possible consequences and timely adjustment of the modality of the works focusing mostly on remote work. Though the approach required additional time from PMU for quality assurance, the project managed to keep up with many of the activities planned per year.
- The Project had to revise the annual work plan for 2020 based on the identified risk mitigation measures, shifting the finalization of part of the activities either till the end of the year or early 2021. Consequently, the budget planned for 2020 initially had to be reduced. The revised AWP 2020 was communicated, discussed, and agreed with SDC during consultation meetings.
- The Project was able to accommodate the Government's request of including Tbilisi municipality to prepare the risk-informed municipality preparedness/response plans. Changes were made to the scope of the project activities after discussing the request with SDC. NEA agreed to add Tbilisi hazard maps as separate from the Kura river basin (16 small river basins, which are part of Kura river basin, will be assessed within Tbilisi boundaries) and historical data analysis and field data collection for the left bank of Tbilisi would start in 2020 to be continued with a collection of remaining field data and multi-hazard mapping of Tbilisi in 2021.

Against this analysis, and based on collected information and evidence, the rating for the management arrangement and adaptive management component is **Satisfactory (S)**.

7.4 Project Finance and Co-finance

As discussed earlier, the implementation modality of the project is the UNDP Support Services to NIM. In this modality, UNDP is requested to provide support services to the project, which must be done following UNDP rules and regulations.

At the time of this MTE, the review of financial records as recorded in the UNDP Atlas system indicates that the actual expenditures including commitments allocated against the SDC project grant for the years December 2018²⁵ to October 2021 (33 months) represent about 55% (**US\$ 2,254,751.72**) of the approved budget of **US\$5,020,270**. The breakdown of project expenditures by output and by year is presented in Table 3.

As of October 2021, the remaining budget from the SDC grant is **US\$ 2,765,518.50** (55.1%). When considering the timeline left for implementing the project, the entire budget should be expended by November 2023. Yet, the percentage of spending is not equally distributed to all outputs. The spending is very low for Outputs 1.3 and 3.2, around 23% and 19% of the total allocated budget, respectively. While Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 have slightly high spending and reached 68% and 62%, respectively. About 46% of the project management budget has been spent as of the end of October 2021.

Finally, the project was not subject to any financial audit during the last 3 years as per the confirmation of the Project Manager and the UNDP Environment and Energy Programme Associate. The project must be audited as part of the UNDP CO audit, which is done approximately every five years. The last Country Office audit took place in June 2017, and the next planned one is most probably in 2022. The SDC project will be part of it.

²⁵ The ProDoc was signed on 5.12.2018. The project document was revised late 2019 after adding the remaining funds from the inception phase. The revised version was signed on 20.12.2019.

Co-financing / Parallel Financing

Co-financing commitments at the outset of the project totalled the amount of **US\$65,292,622** as cash and in-kind co-financing (see Table 4), which represented about 92.9 % of the total financial resources required in the project document of **US\$70,292,622** (GCF grant + co-financing from the Government + SDC funds) for the implementation of the project. All pledged amounts listed in the table below were supported by co-financing letters and agreements and are part of the UNDP ProDoc.

At the time of the MTE, the project team succeeded in mobilizing around 46% of the total co-financing with most of the contribution being mobilized from the different governmental agencies. All co-financing contributions were reported by the Government. However, the GCF fund is being underutilized and not dispersed as per the AWP.

Table 3. Project Funds Disbursement Status (August 2020 in USD)

Project components	Budget Approved (USD)	2019	2020	2021	Total Spent	% budget spent	Difference between total budget and ...
Output 1.1	1,754,409.74	76,593.23	55,543.24	1,037,756.17	1,169,892.64	66.68 %	584,517.10
Output 1.2	210,000.00	0	93,352.88	35,720.35	129,073.23	61.46 %	80,926.77
Output 1.3	361,213.46	16,892.50	52,383.30	32,650.36	101,926.16	28.22 %	259,287.30
Output 2.1	1,489,360.00	165,301.81	209,912.51	171,193.34	546,407.66	36.69 %	942,952.34
Output 2.2	322,700.00	0	27,641.94	34,416.28	62,058.22	19.23 %	260,641.78
Project Management Cost	510,715.15	82,457.19	81,796.46	73,760.59	238,014.24	46.60 %	272,700.91
Unrealized loss/gain	371,871.87	6,736.02	1,994.44	-1,350.89	7,379.57	1.98 %	364,492.30
Total SDC	5,020,270.22	347,980.75	522,624.77	1,384,146.20	2,254,751.72	44.91 %	2,765,518.50

Table 4. Co-financing Status

Sources of co-financing	Cash contribution (USD)	In-Kind contribution (estimated in USD)	The actual amount contributed at the stage of MTE (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
GCF	27,053,598	0	3,966,000	14.66%
GoG (MoEPA, MIA, Tbilisi City hall, MRDI)	37,777,424	461,600	23,620,268.00	61.77%
	69,831,022	461,600	27,586,268.00	42%

7.5 Monitoring & Evaluation:

The standard UNDP M&E procedures were presented in a comprehensive M&E plan in the UNDP ProDoc. A total budget of US\$ 60,000 was allocated to the evaluation exercise (MTE including cost-benefit/effectiveness analysis and terminal evaluation), representing about 1.2% of the SDC grant. All monitoring activities were not costed and thus up until the MTE, conducting the M&E activities was costless.

Below is a summary of the M&E plan operating modalities (combined from UNDP ProDoc):

- **NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies:** Audits are conducted following UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on UNDP projects. No audit of this project has been conducted until the time of the MTE.
- **Inception phase, workshop, and report (IP, IW, IR):** an inception workshop was organized in February 2019 in Tbilisi. More than 80 representatives from the Government, academics, donors, UN communities, local governments and non-governmental sectors attended the workshop. The inception phase provided valuable information required to identify intervention strategy on climate change adaptation focusing on hazard mapping and related capacity development. Several analytical papers were developed during the IP that was crucial to providing the country with additional baseline information required for the creation of the enabling environment for enhancing disaster risk management capacities through improved hazard mapping capabilities. The IR was submitted in April 2019.
- **Interim Project Reports (IPRs):** these annual reporting requirements are submitted by the Project Manager to the PB/PSC, using template provided by SDC for project progress reporting. These IPRs include a summary of implementation progress per outcome, a summary of performance against the outputs and according to the yearly operational plan, achievements against the overall targets identified in the project budget/ financial summary; a summary of the implementation process, progress against the LF, and lessons learned. The Project has submitted 2 annual interim project reports (2019, 2020) and 2 mid-year progress reports (2020 and 2021).
- **Knowledge, good practices, and lessons** should be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project. To date, the work on this M&E tool was limited to documenting lessons learned in the project's IPRs.
- **Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) including cost-benefit/efficiency analysis (CB/EA and final evaluation/ impact assessment (FE/IA):** The MTE and CB/EA are underway; a final evaluation will take place three months before the final PB meeting and will follow UNDP evaluation guidelines. According to the UNDP ProDoc M&E plan, the MTE is due in the 3rd quarter of 2021. The process was initiated around the end of the third quarter and should be concluded during the 4th quarter of 2021. Taking into consideration the delay encountered at the beginning of the project the timing of the MTE is very reasonable.
- **Project Board Meetings (PB/PSC):** The PB/PSC holds project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the AWP for the following year. The PB/PSC met 5 times since the project launch. Minutes of the meetings were prepared and shared with members of the PB/PSC. Members of the stakeholders highlighted the need to further enhance the PB/PSC by convening it more often, like quarterly to ensure that members of the PB are informed about the status of the project implementation and to enable PB to correctly and timely steer the Project.
- **Supervision (UNDP) and oversight (UNDP Regional Office) missions:** UNDP CO follows up on the project as per the UNDP standard rules and responsibilities and provided the team with the needed technical, administrative, and financial support. The UNDP Regional Office in Istanbul is involved, through the UNDP CO, in finding suitable ways to support the project implementation. At the time of the MTE, the Regional Technical Advisor position was vacant with only a temporary replacement was available for 2 months, and thus with the absence of the project's CTA and the RTA, the project team is facing a great technical challenge.

- **Logic framework indicators (Performance indicators):** Progress data against the results indicators in the LF should be collected and analyzed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs. A set of 18 indicators with their respective baselines and targets at the end of the project were identified and documented in the Project Results Framework (LF). A comprehensive review of the LF is provided in the Finding section. The 18 indicators and their respective targets have been used on yearly basis to report progress made in the project reports.

Most of the indicators are SMART as discussed in the previous section. However, the review of these indicators and associated targets reveals that the monitoring framework is not adequate to assess the performance of the project at the mid-point of implementation.

The MTE team noticed that the Project has introduced a COVID19 impact monitoring tool for effective management of risks and issues associated with COVID19. To the MTE team, this tool is essential to enhance the team capacity in monitoring new risks associated with COVID19.

Overall, the MTE team noticed that the monitoring framework in place is workable and the project implementation team has been able to use this framework to annually report progress made by the project, yet, not adequate to assess the performance of the project at the mid-term point. Another set of reports, not specified in the ProDoc, was also introduced. These reports include mid-year and annual financial reports to SDC.

It is recommended to incorporate all reports in one to release the PM from the heavy reporting and to ensure the regular preparation of the annual report as an effective monitoring tool to support the project team in measuring project progress on annual basis. It is also recommended that the project management team works with MEPA and UNDP to review the LF and its baseline and establish meaningful yearly targets for the remaining time of the project. This should also include reviewing all remaining activities and introducing a very realistic plan to ensure the timely and proper implementation of the activities.

Based on the above, the evaluator believes that the project level monitoring requires some remedial actions particularly in the area of i) the mid-point targets for individual outputs and activities of the project to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation, ii) the planning for the second half of the project, and iii) the semi-annual and annual reporting to be mainstreamed to release the PM and the team from the heavy reporting requirements. Accordingly, the rating given for the project level monitoring component is **Satisfactory (S)**.

7.6 Project Results

In line with the UNDP evaluation policy, the Midterm Evaluation is supposed to take place at the mid-time of the project's implementation, to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency), assess the project's strategy and its risk to sustainability, assess progress towards the achievements of the project objectives and outcomes intending to identify the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. As stated earlier, the MTE has two primary objectives:

- to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
- to provide a clear way forward based on the current progress after viewing 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

The information presented in this section has been sourced from the End of Year Progress Reports, mid-year Progress Reports for 2019, 2020, and 2021 and Annual Work Plans (AWP) 2019, 2020, and 2021 and Annual and Semi-Annual Progress Reports for 2019, 2020 and 2021 for the whole Programme (GCF, SDC and SIDA) those were submitted to GCF. Also, the MTE review of the Project's technical reports was supplemented with information collected during the MTE, the findings and observations of the MTE virtual meetings organized with key stakeholders, and interviews with the project stakeholders. A detailed assessment at the output level is presented below (Table 5). As stated earlier, the project has very limited yearly targets but no specified mid-term targets which make it difficult for the project team to monitor the progress.

7.6.1 Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)

Table 5 below summarizes the progress towards the end-of-project targets for the project objective and outputs. According to the UNDP MTE manual, progress towards the results matrix should be carried out at the outcome level, however, the MTE Consultant provides progress towards the results matrix at the outputs level.

The below key is used for indicator assessment:

Green: Achieved at MET or on target to be achieved by terminal evaluation	Yellow = On target to be achieved by terminal evaluation	Red = Not on target to be achieved
--	---	---

Table 5. Progress towards the end-of-project targets for the project objectives and output

OUTPUT INDICATORS	BASELINE		TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)						Midterm level evaluation (Based on Mid-year progress report 2021)	Achievement Rating	Justification
	Value	Year	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	FINAL			
Project Outcome 1. The Georgian authorities have the financial, technical, and human capacities to establish a nation-wide multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting											
Indicator 1.1: # of norms, policies and political processes developed in multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting fields	0	2018	3					3	The work is still in progress. No mid-term targets were identified. Thus, it is difficult to measure the progress so far. Under this outcome, the following have been done: - An in-depth analysis of institutional and legal setup and corresponding gaps and needs for improvement were assessed. - A list of legislative changes has been identified, including amendments and new legislation requirements. - Draft of SoP for Operation and Maintenance for observation network developed and need for legal changes in that regard identified.	MS	Could be achieved by terminal evaluation
Indicator 1.2: # of gender considerations reflected in newly developed policy documents and technical guidance	0	2018					3	3	In progress. Gender aspects were integrated into methodology on the development of emergency management planning for municipalities.	MS	Could be achieved by terminal evaluation
Indicator 1.3: # of partner government agencies with staff whose institutional	0	2018					10	10	The project completed the general institutional capacity assessment report under the baseline	MS	Could be achieved by

capacities in risk knowledge development increased									<p>institutional and technical capacity assessment exercise.</p> <p>Detailed technical and institutional capacity assessments, covering enabling environment, institutional management, and individual/human resource management capacities are ongoing.</p> <p>The urgent on-job training needs that were identified, have been conducted in the following for NEA staff:</p> <p>Hydraulic modelling: number of participants: participants 6 (3 from NEA, 3 students) with equal gender representation (3 women, 3 men). The progress of the on-job training was measured through pre and post-training tests which reflected the improvement in understanding of the basics for hydraulic modelling. The overall evaluation from the participants of the on-job pieces of training was positive.</p> <p>Introductory pieces of training in Linux and Python to provide with basic skills for further training in windstorm/hailstorm and drought hazard modelling and mapping: 15 NEA staff members were trained (11 women, 4 men)</p>		terminal evaluation
Output 1.1: Multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology is developed and institutionalized on the national level											
1.1.1 # of unified methodologies for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment developed and institutionalized	0	2018	1					1	7 hazard mapping methodologies were finalized (flood, avalanches, drought, hailstorm, windstorm, landslide, and mudflow). The methodologies were presented for validation to TWG on Hazard mapping and risk assessment.	MU	In progress, but there will be delays in achieving the targets

									Yet, to meet the target, these methodologies need to be institutionalized. The project is still in the process to discuss these methodologies with NEA to take the needed steps to institutionalize. LIDAR data was captured, processed and submitted for 92% of the survey area.		
Output 1.2: Institutional and legal frameworks are in place to roll out the standardized multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology											
1.2.1 # of legal documents developed regulating multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology with consideration of gender/vulnerable groups	1	2018	1	2				3	The general structure of the Multi-hazard Early Warning System, to be specified per hazard was developed and submitted for review. A draft copy of the detailed review of all legal reports developed by the project was developed.	MU	In progress, but there will be delays in achieving the targets
1.2.2 # of gender-sensitive Standard Operating Procedures (SoPs) and guidance documents for multi-hazard risk assessment and Early Warning Systems (EWS)	0	2018	1	1				2	General Standard Operation Procedures for the Operation and Maintenance of hydrometric observation network, to be specified for hydrological, meteorological and agrometeorological observation networks with respective identified needs for legal amendments was drafted and submitted for review. However, it was not clear how gender-sensitive these SOPs are.	MS	Will be achieved by terminal evaluation
Output 1.3 Knowledge on multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is available and enhanced											
1.3.1 # of gender-sensitive, capacity development plans put in place to enhance the	0	2018	1					1	The project started baseline capacity assessment, covering both institutional capacity assessment of each stakeholder, implemented by international and	MS	Will be achieved by terminal evaluation

knowledge on nation-wide multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment among the target stakeholders									national experts in institutional capacity assessment and technical level capacity assessment to be supplemented by technical experts recruited within both projects. However, due to the complexity of MHEWS implementation of detailed assessment and strategy and action plan development required more human resources than the individual contractors. Thus, after the completion of the detailed scorecard for capacity assessment, another tender was announced for developing the capacity development plan. As reported by the Project, the project has developed the scorecard, questionnaires (based on the WMO MHEWS and IBF official checklists, detailed to enable quantification of each indicator and tailored to institutions by type). In addition, technical experts across the whole programme have developed the specific indicators for technical scorecards and are conducting the technical assessments with relevant institutions, which will feed into the final capacity assessment scorecard.		
1.3.2 # of NEA/EMS specialists and undergraduate students trained in hazard mapping risk profiling methodology	0	2018		10 (at least 3 women)	10 (at least 3 women)	15 (at least 4 women)	15 (at least 4 women)	50 At least 15 women (30%)	On-job training in <i>hydraulic modelling</i> : Total number of trained participants 6 (3 from NEA, 3 students) with equal gender representation (3 women, 3 men). Considering the limited human resources within NEA and as per MoU with Ilia State University the students were included in the team of modellers to be engaged in hydraulic modelling. The students	S	Achieved at the mid-term point

									<p>were selected through pre-training testing and interviews. As a result, out of the proposed 23 students, 3 students with the highest scores were selected (2 women, 1 man).</p> <p>An introductory <i>course in Linux and Python</i>: the need for the training course was identified upon completion of drought and wind/hailstorm methodologies that will require programming in Python based on Linux. Thus, the training requirements were identified by the international experts in drought and windstorm/ hailstorm hazard modelling and mapping and based on the ToR the project recruited trainers from Cyber Security Association to provide the training. <i>In total 15 NEA staff members were training during the course (11 women, 4 men).</i></p>		
1.3.3 # of public awareness interventions implemented on CCA and multi-hazard risk management issues	0	2019			1	1	1	3	The project organized a DRR/CCA workshop for representatives of legislative and executive bodies	S	Will be achieved by terminal evaluation
Project Outcome 2. Vulnerable people, communities and regions in Georgia have increased resilience and face fewer risks from natural and climate change threats to their livelihoods											
2.1 # of integrated risk management (IRM) actions implemented by local authorities for major river basins in Georgia	0	2018						10	<p>The project is in the process of finalizing a unified methodology for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment. The process so far has achieved the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk reviews detailing the comparative analysis between international best practice and Georgian practice for hazard modelling and mapping has 	MS	The final achievement will depend on the results of the inter-related GCF project and the willingness of the local

									<p>been completed for all 7 hazards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final national methodologies for each of the 7 hazards has been completed which has been presented to and approved by NEA and wider stakeholders <p>Implementation of the methodologies has started.</p> <p>Revisions of the methodology for municipal level preparedness response planning has been completed and all revisions accepted by EMS to be officially adopted by EMS. This will create an enabling environment for achieving the outcome indicator.</p>		<p>authorities to further utilize the results of the project for the development of IRM actions;</p>
2.2 # of municipalities with specific measures related to climate change adaptation (CCA)/IRM incorporated in their development plans and budgets benefiting # of persons	0	2018					10	10	<p>Methodology for municipal level preparedness response planning was finalized.</p> <p>The methodology was agreed with EMS however further proceedings are required to ensure revision of the existing bylaws by the Service.</p> <p>The project will continue supporting EMS to adopt the proposed amendments. These will create an enabling environment for achieving the outcome indicator.</p>	MU	<p>The final achievement will depend on the results of the inter-related GCF project and the willingness of the local authorities to further utilize the results of the project for the development of IRM actions;</p>
2.3: Participatory and inclusive processes put in place by 10	0	2018					10 municipalities with 30% women	10 municipality with	<p>The interventions under the Output have been initiated and methodology for the participatory and inclusive methodology for risk-</p>	MU	<p>In progress, but there will be delays in</p>

municipalities to involve local socially excluded groups and women in consultations							and other vulnerable groups	30% women and other vulnerable groups	informed preparedness and response planning for the municipalities was developed in partnership with EMS in 2020. Development of methodology was supplemented by gender experts who ensured identification, assessment, and inclusion of socially excluded and vulnerable groups in municipal risk assessment. Risk training informs preparedness and response planning for municipalities will be conducted throughout 2021 as per training material developed by the project. To ensure knowledge transfer to EMS a methodology and ToT in emergency management simulation design was developed and conducted for EMS staff. (Number of participants 12)		achieving the targets
Output 2.1: Nation-wide, multi-hazard maps and risk profiles based on risk assessments are developed											
2.1.1 # of river basin multi-hazard maps and risk profiles	0	2018		2	3	3	3	11	NEA has conducted the field surveys and completed data availability analysis per each hazard. Furthermore, the draft of hydraulic models for Kintrishi, Supsa and Natanebi was prepared by the NEA team to be completed by end of the year. Hazard maps for windstorm and hailstorm finalized for 11 river basins,	US	Not on target to be achieved
Output 2.2: Municipal level multi-hazard response and preparedness capacities are enhanced											
2.2.1 # of standardized methodologies and SoPs for multi-hazard risk-	0	2018		1				1	Methodologies for hazard modelling and mapping include SoPs as well and it will be covered while institutionalizing the methodologies into the laws	MU	In progress, but there will be

informed, preparedness and response plans developed considering gender and vulnerable groups												delays in achieving the targets
2.2.2 # of gender-sensitive municipal multi-hazard preparedness and response plans for major river basins in Georgia	0			1	3	3	3	10	Work on finalization of scope of works for LoA to be signed with EMS on development of municipal preparedness and response plans for the 10 target municipalities and Tbilisi is underway to provide training in preparedness and response planning based on the ToT prepared by UNDP international DRM expert on one hand and the plans will follow the revised methodology for the development of the municipal plans prepared by the expert as well. LoA with EMS was signed, and training have started.	MS	Not on target to be achieved	
2.2.3 # of municipal employees with enhanced capacities in multi-hazard response and preparedness				5	5	5	5	20 (at least 6 women)	The training of trainers for Emergency / Risk Management Simulation Exercise Design was conducted in July 2021. The course includes adapting the methodology developed for the UN Department of Political & Peacebuilding Affairs / Department of Peace Operations (UNDPPA-DPO) for Crisis Management Simulation Exercises in the Field to support the needs of Georgia's Civil Safety National Plan (Resolution of Government of Georgia N508, 2015). The training material is based on simulation standards of organizations such as the United States Federal Emergency Management Agency,	MS	In progress, but there will be delays in achieving the targets	

									World Health Organization, and European Union.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

7.7 Relevance (*)

Reviewed evidence and stakeholders interviewed confirmed that the project is highly relevant to the government and addressed a highly important topic. The stakeholders interviewed during the MTE expressed the added value of the project and emphasized that it is very crucial to protect and save human lives. The evaluation has as its task to assess “*the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient, and donor*”. The elements of strategic relevance are:

alignment to the UNPSD

The project is fully relevant to UNDP’s commitment to supporting CCA/DRR as defined in its UNPSD 2016-2020, **Outcome B**: By 2020 communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. It is aligned with the UNSDCF 2021-2025: **Outcome 5**: By 2025, all people, without discrimination, enjoy enhanced resilience through improved environmental governance, climate action and sustainable management and use of natural resources in Georgia. **Output 5.2**: Climate-sensitive, resilient and risk-informed development ensured without discrimination in AFOLU, health, water safety, construction, energy and food production sectors to increase adaptive capacities and mitigate the impact of climate change pursuing LDN (Land Degradation Neutrality). The Project is also aligned with the UNSDCF 2021-2025 Outcome 5/CPD 2021-2025 Outcome 2: By 2025, *all people, without discrimination, enjoy enhanced resilience through improved environmental governance, climate action and sustainable management and use of natural resource(s) in Georgia*.

alignment to the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

It is also in line with the UNDP CPD 2016-2020, **Outcome 4 (4.2 and 4.2)**: communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. More specially to **output 4.2**: By 2020, environmental knowledge and formation systems enhanced, including capacities for regular reporting to international treaties. Ultimately, the Project is also part of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021:

Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor,

Outcome 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development,

Outcome 5: Countries can reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including climate change and

Outcome 8: Communities enjoy greater resilience through enhanced institutional and legislative systems for environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and disaster risk reduction. Data and risk-informed development policies, plans, systems, and financing incorporate integrated and gender-responsive solutions to reduce disaster risks, enable climate change adaptation and mitigation, and prevent the risk of conflict.

The project is in line with the new UNDP CPD 2021-2025 Output 2.1: *Environmental governance and institutional capacity enhanced to enable rational, equitable and sustainable use of natural/land resources, to ensure conservation of ecosystems, use of innovative and climate-friendly technologies for inclusive green economy, energy efficiency and clean energy production, and make communities more resilient to environmental shocks*.

relevance to the SDC Programmes

The Project is also linked with SDC’s strategy for DRR work in Georgia. The Project is aligned with the following SDC’s initiatives in Georgia:

- **SDC Caucasus Network for Sustainable Development in Mountain Regions (Sustainable Caucasus)**, the overarching goal of the project is to reduce the

- population's vulnerabilities towards climate-induced hazards and foster regional cooperation on adaptation challenges in the Caucasus.
- **SDC Prevention and Preparedness project** aims at developing the initial multi-hazard mapping methodology including cost-benefit analysis tools for the prioritization of the preventive actions, and
- **SDC-ADA-UN Women – Women's economic empowerment in the south Caucasus.** It aims at supporting women's economic empowerment in Georgia and across the South Caucasus. The project will coordinate its activities with other ongoing SDC/ADA-funded projects on Women's Economic Empowerment to ensure consideration of gender aspects into multi-hazard risk profiling and risk-informed preparedness and response planning with the inclusion of social and gender aspects

relevant to national environmental policies, plans and priorities

The project is fully relevant to Georgia. The project's long-term goal, immediate objectives and expected outcomes, as well as planned activities, are in line with CCA/DRR priorities of Economic Development Policy, BDD, NEAP-3, INDC, National DRR Strategy and Action Plan.

It is in line with the National Plan of Action for Capacity Development in DRR (2015-2019), The National DRR Strategy and Action Plan (2016-2020), The National Plan of Action for Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction based on the Disaster Risk Reduction Capacity Assessment supported by UNDP in 2014, Support the compliance with relevant EU directives under the EU Georgia Association Agreement. Particularly, EU-Georgia Association Agreement (Article 302) requires Georgia to develop accessible, unified special environmental information management systems, and, Annex XXVI to the EUAA obliges Georgia to transpose Article 4, 5, 6 and 7 of EU Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks into national legislation and systems and, implement them including preliminary flood assessment, flood hazard and risk mapping and preparation of flood hazard maps.

The Project also helps Georgia in complying with international obligations mainly:

Priory 1. Understanding disaster risk under **Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030)**. Particularly priority 1. entails that policies and practices for disaster risk management should be based on an understanding of disaster risk in all its dimensions of vulnerability, capacity, exposure of persons and assets, hazard characteristics and the environment. Such knowledge can be leveraged for pre-disaster risk assessment, for prevention and mitigation and the development and implementation of appropriate preparedness and effective response to disasters.

The project contributes to the achievement of **SDG 13. Climate action**, particularly the following goals: Strengthen the resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries; Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning; and Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in the least developed countries and small island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities.

complementarity with existing interventions

The project was designed by expanding work of scope from the ongoing GCF Project, and SIDA component with a focus on multiple-hazard assessment and reducing the vulnerability of local communities in Georgia.

7.8 Effectiveness and Efficiency (*)

Effectiveness is the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

The evaluation of the effectiveness criterion concludes with an overall rating of **satisfactory** with minor shortcomings (**score: 5**). The evaluation of the effectiveness criterion showed that the project is not well on track to achieve its expected results (outcomes, outputs) but has initiated all needed steps to achieve the outcomes and outputs with minor shortcomings. The project implementation resulted in a track record of achievements such as the development of comprehensive multi-hazards assessment methodologies. Moreover, the use of the developed methodologies, and building the capacities at the national and local levels show some delay.

Furthermore, the competent, demand-driven, and participatory approach of the project team make them a trusted partner of key stakeholders providing access to sensitive issues. While the project implementation progresses tackles challenges such as lack of national capacities, resistance to change, and the project's complex technical nature, the COVID19 lockdown adds another obstacle that the project team must take care of. Most of the identified challenges are adequately addressed by the project as measures have been developed to tackle the challenges/problems, which hindered the effective implementation. Key challenges such as lack of national capacities and understanding of the role of each national entity to effectively manage climate change-related disasters are very difficult to effectively address, while tangible results in CCA/DRR will depend on national ownership and capacities of key stakeholders. Commitments to promote ownership, alignment and harmonization, management for development results and mutual accountability are all anchored and reflected in mechanisms to ensure effective project implementation.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of the project strategy is evidenced by the level of satisfaction with the Project progress expressed by many stakeholders during the MTE is high. Stakeholders reported that the level of effectiveness of this Project is high taking into consideration the challenges the project has faced -up until the time of the MTE- in comparison to other projects they have been involved with.

The finding of the MTE is in-line with the Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) which concluded that the project progress indicator²⁶ is 45.8%. In monetary benefits, it leads to generating USD 5.3 mln.

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

Efficiency is the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

The evaluation of the efficiency criterion brought the following findings: On management and administrative arrangements and definition of roles and responsibilities, there is a need to strengthen the project management role as already foreseen with the current vacancy for the position of project chief technical advisor and the team leader. The CTA position has been re-advertised to increase the pool of suitable candidates.

On the analysis of how well have the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness (in comparison with the plan) the evaluation found: The project's use of its resources in terms of technical advice is an efficient approach to ensure good quality and timeliness of intended results. Also, the use of UNDP regional technical advisor, though for a limited time, and the assignments of several international experts to cover the absence of a specialized technical company to undertake one major activity resulted in achieving intended deliverables in terms of quality, quantity but with substantial delays. While most resources have been used efficiently about achieving the

²⁶ Progress indicator is developed by the CBA study to assign the potential benefits. It compares the actual budget spending with the planned expenditures covering the specific activities. The results are used to track the project progress and develop the progress indicator. Cost-Effective Analysis (CEA) of the project "Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Capacities in Georgia" Project. By Givi Adeishvili. 2021.

intended results in terms of timeliness, a few results have not been achieved in time. This is mainly because the project is very complex but also interdependent with the two other initiatives; GCF and SIDA in addition to the impact of the lockdown posed by COVID19 which is outside the project's control.

The CEA made detailed calculations for the Project efficiency and conclude that – according to the medium case scenario analysis²⁷ – the project's efficiency of saving lives is 50%, reduced damages to properties is 10%, and reduced damages to agriculture are 5%.

Overall, it appears the project has been **efficient** for the following reasons:

- The proposed co-financing resources are mobilized and correctly tracked by the project team. According to UNDP ProDoc, the Government of Georgia and GCF will contribute US\$ 64,831,022 as an in-kind and cash contribution. Until the MTE time, around 42% of the total co-financing has been mobilized.
- Consistency and contribution to the UNDP/SDC focal areas objectives and national development strategies
- Involvement of relevant stakeholders through the utilization of some of the existed coordination mechanisms with the GCF and SIDA initiatives (PSC/PB and TWGs).
- Reasonableness of the costs relative to the scale of outputs generated. The cost-effectiveness of the project is considered **Satisfactory (S)**. The inclusion of long-term staff who were involved in the GCF Project and are cost-shared by the GCF project in project implementation helped the Project in enhancing project effectiveness and minimising the cost on the SDC project.
- The M&E of the project was undertaken according to UNDP procedures and it is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**, yet some aspects could have been streamlined like reporting. It was noticed that the SDC project manager prepares several reports for the UNDP/GCF and UNDP/SDC, this is a burden on the project's team.
- Risks and issues identification and management is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**. The Project was affected by many risks and issues more than one time during its implementation those were registered using the UNDP ATLAS system and reported in the annual reports. Yet, it was noticed that this log of risks is very long and needs to be reviewed and quality should be enhanced.
- Project capacity to build needed partnerships during the project's implementation phase is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**. More effort should be put towards enhancing the = specialized community-based organizations participation.
- The Project ensured the representation and participation of women in all the project's activities. The support has also contributed to improving gender mainstreaming within the project activities in both qualitative and quantitative terms – integrating gender-focused perspectives into dialogues and increasing the number of women participating in the training programmes. The involvement of men and women equally into project activities as well as mainstreaming gender in the project's activities are rated as **Satisfactory (S)**.
- The quick shift from the agreed-upon activities into a new set of activities due to COVID-19 facilitated the implementation of the remaining activities and ensured that the fund was utilized as per the need of the stakeholders and in line with the overall project's goal.

However, some aspects were inefficient in project implementation and need the PMU's attention to tackle:

²⁷ Cost-Effective Analysis (CEA) of the Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Capacities in Georgia Project. Section 5.2.4 Sensitivity Analysis. UNDP by Givi Adeishvili. 2021.

- Substantial delay of the project with recruitment and procurement processes mainly for critical positions like the CTA and the procurement of highly technical companies to undertake hazard methodology and hazard mapping. The delay in procuring the services of specialized companies appear to be due to the following reasons: i) a deficiency in developing the request for proposals/ TORs which did not enable specialist companies to apply for the tender, and ii) the limited budget allocated to the project, which was envisaged several years ago, so very specialized well-established companies appear to be not interested to take part of the process.
- The long delay in recruiting consultants/experts, mainly the CTA, due to the need to comply with the UNDP rules and regulations and the need to have the CTA based in Georgia for effective involvement in project implementation.

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

7.9 Sustainability

This section discusses how sustainable project achievements should be over the long term. It includes a review of the management of specific risks such as financial risks, socio-economic risks, institutional framework and governance risks, and environmental risks.

Project risks were identified at the formulation stage and documented in the ProDoc, including the risk category, level of risk, probability of the risk occurring and mitigation measures for each identified risk factor. The ratings of the project risks were low to medium. As discussed in the previous section, the risk log in the ProDoc was not comprehensive and missed several anticipated risks.

A detailed risk log, following the UNDP Risk Log template, was prepared and maintained by the Project team. The identified risks and the overall risk rating were continuously reviewed and major to the log has been taking place continuously. To the IE team, the new risk log (including more than 70 risks) is more comprehensive than the risks log in the ProDoc yet this risk log should be reviewed and updated as some of the identified risks are either issues or challenges.

The MTE believes that risks were correctly and intensively monitored during the implementation phase. Yet, as previously discussed, the new risk log needs to be reviewed, updated and critical risks should be highlighted. According to UNDP risk management, risks rated as critical means they hinder the project implementation. The monitoring of the Project risks is up to the expected level as risks logs were quarterly/regularly updated and mitigation measures were identified as per the UNDP M&E guidelines. Offline risks logs were also maintained and attached to the Annual Reports.

○ Financial Risks to Sustainability

The project was fully dependent on the financial support of the SDC. The Government of Georgia and the GCF also contribute co-financing with a total amount of **US\$ 64,831,022 million**. UNDP CO is implementing several projects under the environment and energy portfolio. For such a technical project with a large component of procurement 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. One of the project's key barriers preventing the implementation of the long-term solution to protect humans and materials from climate change-induced hazards in vulnerable areas. The project baseline conducted at the formulation stage of this project also revealed that the country financial resources to enhance resilience to climate change events in Georgia is underfunded. However, the follow up on the work and the implementation of the plans on the ground are the responsibility of the municipalities with the support of the central government, which in general lacks financial resources. So far, the government is committed to the project objective and has the "instruments" (institutional and legal frameworks) to carry out its programme to reduce the risks of climate change hazards in Georgia. 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.

To ensure and further enhancement of the national capacities to adapt to climate change are achieved the project should be financially sustained post-project, a financial sustainability strategy is proposed to be prepared along with an exit strategy and sustainability plan.

Based on the above discussion, the financial risks are moderate, and sustainability is rated as:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Unlikely (U)
	ML		

○ **Socio-economic Risks to Sustainability**

The project is highly relevant to the needs of the local communities, as these are suffering from capital and human loss due to climate changes hazards. In the project areas, several communities' development programmes have been implemented by different governmental and non-governmental partners and community organizations. The presence of non-governmental organizations including academia help in ensuring the elimination of any socio-economic risks associated with the projects. The MTE team does not see any socio-economic risk to sustainability.

Based on the above-mentioned Socio-economic Risk, risks are negligible and thus sustainability is rated as:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Unlikely (U)
L			

○ **Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability**

As explained in the above section, there seems to be no institutional or governance risk at the local and central levels. Yet, the MTE team considers the lack of coordination among institutions a moderate risk to the operation and sustainability of the project. Two main changes took place at the institutional levels after the development of the project document; the Emergency Management Service that was under Prime Minister by the time of project development, representing the highest level body on the national level for coordination of crises, preparedness and response was restructured in December of 2018 and transferred to the Ministry of Internal Affairs on the one hand and the Crisis Management Center that was part of the EMS at that time to the National Security Council by June 2019. The National Security Council was established in 2018 as the highest-level coordinating and advisory body for the Prime Minister on national security issues. As a result, the project identified two separate stakeholders: Emergency Management Service under the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and National Crisis Management Center under the National Security Council. The PMU will need to keep strong communication and coordination with all stakeholders including these two agencies.

The Institutional framework and governance risks are medium, and sustainability is:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Unlikely (U)
L			

○ Environmental Risks to Sustainability

The review of all the project interventions indicates that the activities will rather enhance the environment. The project's intervention will contribute towards overall environmental enhancement, increased water use efficiency and halting of land degradation. The MTE team sees no environmental risk to sustainability.

The Environmental risks are negligible, and the sustainability is:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Based on the above, risks are negligible and thus sustainability is rated as:

Based on the assessment of the categories above, and the presence of low risks, the overall sustainability rating is:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Unlikely (U)
L			

7.10 Impact

The Project was designed to contribute to the overall impact level objective of the development of a well-established system for multi-hazard risk knowledge to ensure effective climate risk management of all hydro-meteorological hazards in Georgia geographical coverage of the project interventions is nation-wide, particularly 11 major river basins in Georgia: *Enguri, Rioni, Chorokhi-Adjaristskali, Supsa, Natanebi, Khobi, Kintrishi, Khrami-Ktsia, Alazani, Iori, Mtkvari (same as Kura)* focusing on the following hazards: floods, landslides, mudflows, avalanches, hailstorms and droughts.

Project interventions have been tailored to address climate change impacts and were designed to complement the overall initiative funded by the Green Climate Fund to reduce the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide multi-hazard early warning system and risk-informed local action which will serve 1.7 Million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards.

The project was designed to have the following impact: i. standardized and harmonized national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology enable the development of unified risk information on the national level, ii. adequate Institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is in place and implemented to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information; iii. Enhanced long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment provide adequate risk information iv. Multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia, which provides valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning; v. Local (municipal) preparedness to multi-hazard risks is improved through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and the existence of the risk-informed preparedness plans.

The project impact perspective remains unchanged, and the impact potential of project interventions remains very relevant and urgently needed. However, at the time of the MTE, the project technical work is still at its earlier stages and thus the MTE consultant is in no position to define the potential impact at the MTE time.

8. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the evaluation team has ranked the evaluation criteria using the UNDP Scoring Scale, with an overall score of 4: *Moderately Satisfactory, with moderate shortcomings*.

The UNDP Scoring Scale is explained below:

- 6 = Highly satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings
- 5 = Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings
- 4 = Moderately satisfactory (MS). Moderate shortcomings
- 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): Significant shortcomings
- 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): Major problems
- 1 = Highly unsatisfactory (HU): Severe problems.

OVERALL SCORE:

Overall Score	4: Moderately satisfactory (MS), with moderate shortcomings
---------------	---

RELEVANCE:

Overall Rating	5: Satisfactory, with minor shortcomings
----------------	--

Observations

The project is highly relevant to the situational context, tackling key problems at the central and local levels through the two main components/outcomes. The project is well aligned with UNDP and national strategies as well as target group priorities.

Yet, the level these strategies are referred to in the project document is relatively general. The Project is of high relevance in terms of local needs, in line with national and local level strategies and UNDP, SDC and GCF/SIDA priorities. The design of the project has been adequately adapted to the chosen goal and to complement the GCF/SIDA programmes.

The evaluation of the theory of change shows that the hypotheses are plausible, the strategic reference framework is well anchored in the concept and the expected results (outcomes, outputs) are clearly defined. However, there is a need to elaborate the assumptions and risks in line with this theory of change and to set mid-term targets and indicators to allow for proper monitoring of the work progress.

EFFECTIVENESS:

Overall Rating	5: Satisfactory, with minor shortcomings
----------------	--

Observations

The evaluation of the effectiveness criterion concludes with an overall rating of **satisfactory** with minor shortcomings (**score: 5**). The evaluation of the effectiveness criterion showed that the project is not well on track to achieve its expected results (outcomes, outputs) but has initiated all needed steps to achieve the outcomes and outputs with minor shortcomings. The project implementation resulted in a track record of achievements such as the development of comprehensive multi-hazards assessment methodologies. Moreover, the use of the

developed methodologies, and building the capacities at the national and local levels show some delay.

Furthermore, the competent, demand-driven, and participatory approach of the project team make them a trusted partner of key stakeholders providing access to sensitive issues. While the project implementation progresses tackles challenges such as lack of national capacities, resistance to change, and the project's complex technical nature, the COVID19 lockdown adds another obstacle that the project team must take care of. Most of the identified challenges are adequately addressed by the project as measures have been developed to tackle the challenges/problems, which hindered the effective implementation. Key challenges such as lack of national capacities and understanding of the role of each national entity to effectively manage climate change-related disasters are very difficult to effectively address, while tangible results in CCA/DRR will depend on national ownership and capacities of key stakeholders. Commitments to promote ownership, alignment and harmonization, management for development results and mutual accountability are all anchored and reflected in mechanisms to ensure effective project implementation.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of the project strategy is evidenced by the high level of satisfaction with the Project progress expressed by many stakeholders during the MTE. Stakeholders reported that the level of effectiveness of this Project is high taking into consideration the challenges the project has faced -up until the time of the MTE- in comparison to other projects they have been involved with.

EFFICIENCY:

Overall Rating

5: Satisfactory, with minor shortcomings

Observations

The evaluation of the efficiency criterion brought the following findings: On management and administrative arrangements and definition of roles and responsibilities, there is a need to strengthen the project management role as already foreseen with the current vacancy for the position of project chief technical advisor and the team leader. The CTA position has been re-advertised to increase the pool of suitable candidates.

On the analysis of how well have the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness (in comparison with the plan) the evaluation found: The project's use of its resources in terms of technical advice is an efficient approach to ensure good quality and timeliness of intended results. Also, the use of UNDP regional technical advisor, though for a limited time, and the assignments of several international experts to cover the absence of a specialized technical company to undertake one major activity resulted in achieving intended deliverables in terms of quality, quantity but with substantial delays. While most resources have been used efficiently about achieving the intended results in terms of timeliness, a few results have not been achieved in time. This is mainly because the project is very complex but also interdependent with the two other initiatives; GCF and SIDA in addition to the impact of the lockdown posed by COVID19 which is outside the project's control.

Overall, it appears the project has been **efficient** for the following reasons:

- The proposed co-financing resources are mobilized and correctly tracked by the project team. According to UNDP ProDoc, the Government of Georgia and GCF will contribute US\$ 64,831,022 as an in-kind and cash contribution. Until the MTE time, around 42% of the total co-financing has been mobilized.
- Consistency and contribution to the UNDP/SDC focal areas objectives and national development strategies
- Involvement of relevant stakeholders through the utilization of some of the existed coordination mechanisms with the GCF and SIDA initiatives (PSC and TWGs).
- Reasonableness of the costs relative to the scale of outputs generated. The cost-effectiveness of the project is considered **Satisfactory (S)**. The inclusion of long-term staff who were involved in the GCF Project and are cost-shared by the GCF project in project implementation helped the Project in enhancing project effectiveness and minimising the cost on the SDC project.
- The M&E of the project was undertaken according to UNDP procedures and it is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**, yet some aspects could have been streamlined like reporting. It was noticed that the SDC project manager prepares several reports for the UNDP/GCF and UNDP/SDC, this is a burden on the project's team.
- Risks and issues identification and management is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**. The Project was affected by many risks and issues more than one time during its implementation which was registered using the UNDP ATLAS system and reported in the annual reports. Yet, it was noticed that this log of risks is very long and needs to be reviewed and quality should be enhanced.
- Project capacity to build needed partnerships during the project's implementation phase is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**. More effort should be put towards enhancing the = specialized community-based organizations participation.
- The Project ensured the representation and participation of women in all the project's activities. The support has also contributed to improving gender mainstreaming within the project activities in both qualitative and quantitative terms – integrating gender-focused perspectives into dialogues and increasing the number of women participating in the training programmes. The involvement of men and women equally into project activities as well as mainstreaming gender in the project's activities are rated as **Satisfactory (S)**.
- The quick shift from the agreed-upon activities into a new set of activities due to COVID-19 facilitated the implementation of the remaining activities and ensured that the fund was utilized as per the need of the stakeholders and in line with the overall project's goal.

However, some aspects were inefficient in project implementation and need the PMU's attention to tackle:

- Substantial delay of the project with recruitment and procurement processes mainly for critical positions like the CTA and the hiring of highly technical companies to undertake hazard methodology and hazard mapping. The delay in procuring the services of specialized companies appear to be due to: i) a limitation in developing the request for proposals/ TORs which did not enable specialist companies to apply for the tender, and ii) the limited budget allocated to the project,

which was envisaged several years ago, so very specialized well-established companies appear to be not interested to take part of the process.

- The long delay in recruiting consultants/experts, mainly the CTA, due to the need to comply with the UNDP rules and regulations and the need to have the CTA based in Georgia for effective involvement in project implementation.

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

IMPACT (potential):

Overall Rating **3 = Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): Significant shortcomings**

Observations The project impact perspective remains unchanged, and the impact potential of project interventions remains very relevant and urgently needed. However, at the time of the MTE, the project technical work is still at its earlier stages and thus the MTE consultant is not in a position to define the potential impact at the MTE time.

SUSTAINABILITY:

Overall Rating **5: Satisfactory with minor shortcomings**

Observations The evaluation of the sustainability criterion is satisfactory with minor shortcomings. The findings show that there is still room for improvement to ensure that the benefits of the project will continue after it has ended.

On the positive side, the project's systematic approach to standardize and harmonize national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology enables the development of unified risk information on the national level, supported by an adequate Institutional and legal framework for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is in place and implemented to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information provide a solid basis to ensure the sustainability of the CCA/DRR work in Georgia. These will be also complemented with enhanced long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment to provide adequate risk information, which will help in developing multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia, which provides valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning. Finally, the support provided to the local level (municipal) to improve their preparedness to multi-hazard risks through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and the existence of the risk-informed preparedness plans will all contribute to the sustainability of the impacts after the project ends.

Yet, the project lacks a coherent approach to ensure the sustainability of results once it has been ended. This is particularly required considering the policy and legislation implementation gap, the risk of not effectively using the multi-hazard maps and risks profiles and the donor dependence. Furthermore, a lack of a concrete and realistic exit strategy and sufficient mitigation measures on sustainability risks will hinder ensuring sustainability to the full extent possible.

9. Recommendations

The evaluation suggests that the project on oncoming future phases needs to undertake the following measures:

Overall Recommendations:

1. To grant a 12 to 18 months no-cost extension in the project timeframe. This will greatly help in fully achieving the stipulated objectives and outputs of the project. If this no-cost extension cannot be granted, the project team with the support of the TWGs and the Project Board should revisit the overall scope: a focused and less ambitious Results Framework for the entire duration of the second phase should be developed. Nevertheless, the MTE would like to highlight that this second option is tricky and should be examined very carefully as the outputs of the SDC Projects are the inputs for the GCF Project and thus any changes on the deliverables might be greatly affecting the overall aim of the whole programme (**GoG, UNDP CO, SDC, PMU**).

Strengthening effectiveness

While the overall approach of the project demonstrated to be effective in achieving the expected results (outcomes, outputs), the project is still at its earlier stages of implementation and thus it is not easy to provide recommendations at the technical level per output, but the following could be improved in remaining implementation period:

2. To convene, at the earliest, a special meeting of the Technical Working Groups to discuss and guide on the interventions that are lagging. UNDP should also further streamline and accelerate the work to engage a Regional Technical Advisor to further support the implementation of project interventions and develop revised plans. The revised plans developed by the Project should be duly approved by UNDP and the SDC and be implemented at the earliest (**PMU with GoG support**).
3. The assessment methodologies prepared are very complicated for government practitioners to understand and to use/implement in the future. Hence, it is recommended that once these methodologies are implemented with the support of the project, these should be modified, simplified, and translated. Intensive training programmes should be delivered to ensure that concerned stakeholders can use them (**PMU with external technical support**).
4. With the limited time left available, develop a well-designed scientific approach²⁸ promoting the adoption of the standardized and harmonized national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology. To ensure that national institutions can utilize the national multi-hazards mapping and risk assessment methodology, concrete steps need to be put in place (**PMU**).
5. Due to the limited time left, develop a coherent approach fostering the adoption and utilization of the developed institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment implemented to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information. If successful, this approach of fostering the adoption of legal and institutional frameworks should also be applied to other policies and laws (**PMU with the GoG support**).
6. Considering that the project focused the first half of the implementation on developing key methodologies, assessments and background studies, the focus on the second

²⁸ Observe and develop empathy, questioning the assumptions, creating many ideas in brainstorming session, adopting a hands-on approach in piloting and testing, and undertake ongoing experimentation: sketching, piloting, testing, and trying out concepts and ideas.

half needs to be on ensuring that key stakeholders possess the necessary capacities and mechanisms to effectively implement the established methodology and the updated policy and regulatory framework. The work on the capacity building component should be accelerated and made very condensed **(PMU with UNDP CO and SDC support)**.

7. Institutionalize the approach to national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment based on stakeholder interests, capacities and potential to effectively apply the methodologies in the long run. Clear institutional accountability lines should be established to avoid “blame-shifting” in case the methodologies are not implemented coherently **(PMU with UNDP CO and SDC support)**.
8. Ensure that key stakeholders are supported by increasing their capacity to implement their mandates in line with the new legal and institutional framework. This will require training of staff and eventually establishing a ToT approach to increase the sustainability of the Project’s impact but will also require identifying the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder **(PMU)**.

Improving efficiency

Based on the evaluation the proposed setting up of the project team would be:

- Project Manager – oversight, monitoring and management
 - CTA – overall technical advice for the GCF, SIDA, and SDC Projects.
 - Specialist for Outputs 1.1 and 2.1 of the SDC Project: These two outputs are very technical and would need an expert with a technical background in climate change risk modelling/ disaster risk reduction to follow up on the scientific work.
 - Support staff including finance and administrative assistants and M&E officer.
9. Thus, it is recommended to employ a dedicated Specialist at the PMU level for the SDC project to coordinate the implementation of Outputs 1.1 and 2.1 and to support the Project Manager in reviewing and approving the technical reports. Furthermore, there is also a need to compile data on objective level indicators to duly assess the achievement status of project objectives **(UNDP CO to initiate, SDC to support)**.
 10. To further regularize and streamline weekly coordination meetings at the PMU level and prepare mechanisms to address coordination issues between the SDC and GCF funded projects especially with the local and national governments **(PMU, UNDP CO)**.

Increasing potential for impact:

11. To increase the potential for the impact it is recommended to consider the latest research findings on multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology as well as in multi-hazard mapping and risk profiling tools and approaches. Accordingly, the project should continue and potentially expand approaches to enhance national and local levels capacities to utilize the tools developed by the project and to ensure the continuity of the work after the project closure. These approaches demonstrated a high potential for impact **(PMU)**.

Increasing sustainability

12. Given that the project experienced a major delay during the first half of its implementation, the upcoming implementation period should be focused on sustainability. The project team is encouraged to develop a timely and pragmatic exit strategy along with a financial sustainability plan in a participatory manner with key stakeholders involved in the project as well as close coordination with the donors to the project. It should be outlining issues, ways and means to smoothly phase-out and hand over interventions to partners, to ensure sustainability and continuity. The following recommendations should be considered in the upcoming period and could also be included in the exit strategy **(PMU, GoG)**.

- Develop a comprehensive approach on how to ensure the sustainability of the developed policy and legislative framework. Ensure that key stakeholders such as the NEA and MEPA are supported in increasing their capacity to implement its mandate. This will require training of staff and eventually establishing a ToT approach to increase the sustainability of the Project's impact.
 - Develop a step-by-step approach ensuring a smooth transition from UNDP-driven to nationally driven approach to CCA/DRR. This approach should focus on increasing the sustainability of existing technical work being done by national and international experts linking them with the budgets of the relevant institutions and communicating the new approach to institutions.
- 13.** Consider establishing a monitoring mechanism on the implementation of recommendations of the capacity assessments and knowledge management carried within the framework of this project. It is assumed that this would result in an increased implementation rate and improved sustainability of the results (**PMU, GoG**).

10. Lessons learned

The lessons learned are built around the key features of the project that need to be maintained in future phases:

Chief Technical advisors: Physical presence of the Chief Technical advisor(s) for the SDC and GCF Projects has proven to be a major shortcoming for the current management arrangement. The physical presence of the CTAs has a value-added proposition of the project, securing not only effective on-the-job capacity development, direct communication, and follow-up with beneficiaries, but also an added quality assurance. Nevertheless, the project must be mindful of the capacity substitution trap and ensure that there is a clear exit strategy to such involvement.

Flexibility in approach: The project's flexible approach in addressing the emerging needs of the key stakeholders has turned the project into a trusted partner, enabling stakeholders to swiftly address any emerging issues, thus clearing obstacles to a successful accomplishment of the set objectives. In advancing further, the project must capture well and document these key turning moments into project reports. For example, adding Tbilisi municipality to the list of municipalities to be served by the project is a positive strategic move by the project.

Established methodologies: The project's efforts in establishing methodologies suitable for Georgia would enhance the capacities at the national level to tackle climate change-related disasters as well as it will give the research communities approved methodologies to further examine and implement. This will enhance science–decision makers-practitioners' interactions with one another much more effectively and at the same time add to institutional transparency and accountability towards the citizens. During the next phase, the project must ensure a higher degree of sustainability of the use of such tools and platforms once the project has ended.

Establishing and maintaining a comprehensive approach to CCA/DRR: While the project is intended to establish a comprehensive approach on addressing gaps in the CCA/DRR management and developing the corresponding legislative framework, there is the need to develop a more coherent approach to ensuring the sustainability of the newly established multi-hazard mapping, risk methodologies, multi-hazards profiles and local preparedness to the multi-hazard system. This is due to the significant policy and legislation gap and the lack of capacities to effectively prepare and respond to climate change-induced hazards.

Increasing impact: While establishing an enabling environment for CCA/DRR, intervention areas providing for more impact such as standardizing and harmonizing national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology enables the development of unified risk information on the national level, complemented with enhanced long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment provide adequate risk information, multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia, which provides valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning should be prioritized in this complex context of Georgia.

The next step should be on establishing and implementing adequate institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment to provide a clear structure for the development of risk information; as well as improving local (municipal) preparedness to multi-hazard risks through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and the existence of the risk-informed preparedness plans.

Demonstrating competence and gaining trust: The solid competencies of the project team provided the project with access to get involved in sensitive issues and gain the trust of key stakeholders. This approach should be maintained in the remainder of the project implementation. However, as stated above, the project is very technical and complex, thus, a dedicated in-country CTA would have an added value to support the project and the development of its technical deliverables.

Keeping all partners informed: Although the project board/steering committee convene twice a year, it was noticed that the Project does not share the changes immediately with all

stakeholders but wait for the PB to discuss the changes and secure the board approval. To enhance transparency and project accountability, it is crucial to communicate all issues, changes and/or potential risks with all concerned stakeholders to ensure that they are well informed about the project and its progress and to ensure their support, if and when needed.

Long-term commitment: The project collaborates with many stakeholders on highly complex issues and thus requires longer-term commitment to ensure the impact of the sustainability approach.

11. Annexes

11.1 MTE ToR

Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through /GPN ExpRes

Services/Work Description: Project Mid-term Evaluation

Project/Programme Title: Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia

Consultancy Title: International Consultant for Mid-term Project Evaluation

Duty Station: Based with travels to Tbilisi, Georgia

Duration: Short-term consultancy up to 30 consultancy days in total during September 2021 – November 2021, with one mission of 5 days

Expected start date:

1. BACKGROUND

Due to the diverse and complex terrain of the Caucasus mountains, its significant influence and the influence of the Black Sea and Caspian Sea on the climate and weather of the region, Georgia is exposed to various climate-induced hazards including floods and flash floods, climate-induced geological hazards (including landslides, mudflow, debris flows), droughts, soil erosion, severe winds, hailstorms and avalanches. Furthermore, according to Georgia's 2nd and the 3rd National Communications, the frequency, intensity and geographical spread of extreme hydro meteorological hazards will increase under climate change and may result in significant impacts on key sectors including agriculture, critical infrastructure (transportation networks, buildings, roads, water supply, energy installations), natural resources and eco-systems, glaciers and forests.

Consequently, to address the existing development challenges, UNDP designed a program aimed at reducing exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards reduced through a well-functioning nation-wide multi-hazard early warning system and risk-informed local action. The program encompasses three interrelated projects funded by SDC, under which the current position is being announced, Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Swedish Government (SIDA). The GCF funded interventions are targeting expansion of the hydro-meteorological network & modelling capacities and improving community resilience through implementation of EWS & risk reduction measures. The project will provide critical climate risk information that would enable the Government of Georgia to implement number of nation-wide transformative policies and actions for reducing exposure and vulnerability of the population to climate-induced hazards. The project will thus catalyse a paradigm shift in the national climate risk management, climate-proofed disaster risk reduction and early warning approaches. SIDA project will contribute to the public awareness raising and structural measure components.

The project Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia, funded by SDC, is contributing to an overall goal of reducing the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide Multi-Hazard Early Warning System (MHEWS) and risk-informed local action serving 1.7 Million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards. The impact hypothesis of the project is as follows: i. standardized and harmonized national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology enables development of

unified risk information on national level, ii. adequate Institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is in place and implemented to provide clear structure for development of risk information; iii. Enhanced long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment provide adequate and sufficient risk information iv. Multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia, which provides valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning; v. Local (municipal) preparedness to multi-hazard risks is improved through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and existence of the risk-informed preparedness plans.

Issues to be addressed by the project and its goals and objectives are in line with SDG (Sustainable Development Goal) 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts and in particular, with its targets 13.1 through 13.3, calling for strengthening resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries (target 13.1), Integrating climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning (target 13.2) and improving education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning (target 13.3).

Scope of the project is national covering 11 river basins and 7 climate induced hazards: flood, drought, avalanche, windstorm, hailstorm, landslide and mudflow. Total budget USD 5,020,270.22 which is considered as co-financing to GCF funded project.

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK

The objective of the assignment is to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the project outputs (listed below) in terms of their Relevance, Impact, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability Gender, Theory of Change or Results Framework, and provide recommendations for any improvements. Additional focus will be placed on assessing the design and coherence of the project, including the design of the log frame matrix/project theory, the strengths and weaknesses in terms of planning, management, and implementation and monitoring and the extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender mainstreaming) were applied.

The project outcome/outputs to be evaluated:

Outcome 1 -The Georgian authorities have the financial, technical and human capacities to establish a nation-wide multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting

- Output 1.1 Multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology is developed and institutionalized on the national level.
- Output 1.2 Institutional and legal frameworks are in place to roll-out the standardized hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology.
- Output 1.3 Knowledge on multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is available and enhanced.

Outcome 2 -Vulnerable people, communities and regions in Georgia have increased resilience and face fewer risks from natural and climate change threats to their livelihoods

- Output 2.1 Nation-wide, multi hazard maps and risk profiles based on risk assessment are developed.

- Output 2.2. Municipal level multi-hazard response and preparedness capacities are enhanced.

Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions:

The evaluation will assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project interventions, in line with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria. To support the analysis the following indicative questions are proposed but could be broadened and agreed within inception report:

Relevance:

- Is the project relevant for the main beneficiary?
- Are the expected results/outputs of the project consistent with the outcome, immediate impact and overall goal/impact (as part of the analysis of the logframe matrix/project theory)?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) or will be likely to achieve it/them?
- To what extent has the project already achieved its expected results/outputs or will be likely to achieve them?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
- To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? • To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management? 	
<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes? • To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives? 	

The response to the above questions should be followed by evaluation findings and consequent specific short- and long-term recommendations that could be undertaken by UNDP, national partners and/or the stakeholders.

- These analyses have to be done for each output and for the overall project.
- The evaluator is responsible for refining the evaluation methodology, evaluation questions, carrying out the evaluation and delivering UNDP Georgia with a draft report and a final report.
- The key stakeholders, those involved in the implementation, those served or affected by the project and the users of the evaluation should be involved in the evaluation process.
- Finalize the evaluation report, including incorporation of feedback from UNDP, the donor and stakeholders.

3. Expected Outputs and deliverables

The Consultant may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative or qualitative methods it deems appropriate to conduct the project mid-term evaluation. Methods should include desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. However, a combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The International consultant is expected to revise the methodological approach in consultation with key stakeholders as necessary. The International Consultant should present both quantitative data and qualitative findings and data.

The consultant will work in a team with national evaluator who will provide technical support with organizing meetings with national stakeholders, providing written and verbal translation as needed, and any other inputs required for the assignment.

The main tasks of the consultant will include:

1. Elaboration of **Inception report** – The report should include detailed description of appropriate methodology to be applied during the evaluation, interviews/meetings to be conducted, as well as the work plan/evaluation schedule and evaluation matrix to be used during the course of the assignment, while being guided by the set of evaluation questions as presented above. A list of interviewees should be included into the work schedule submitted by the Consultant. Inception Report should be approved by UNDP Georgia (Suggested template for Inception Report provided in Annex 1).

Evaluation should be done through a combination of techniques, including

- ☐ Desk study review of all relevant project documentation
- ☐ Extended interviews with project stakeholders
- ☐ Extended interviews with project partners
- ☐ Meetings/interviews with project consultants and experts
- ☐ Data triangulation and quality control

2. Desk review – Perform a comprehensive documentary analysis of the background documents as well as the project deliverables. Evaluation should include but not be limited to the list of documents presented in **Annex 2**.

3. Interviews with: stakeholders according to the work plan and methodology provided; project consultants and experts (can be done remotely)

- I. Conduct interviews/meetings with the project partners, beneficiaries according to the work plan provided
- II. Conduct the interview/meetings with the stakeholders according to the work plan and
- III. Conduct interviews/meetings with the project consultants, experts and other contractors (can be done remotely).

4. Elaborate and submit Draft Report –the report shall be prepared in English and include the lessons learned and recommendations. The proposed outline of the report is given in **Annex 3**. The report should meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in Annex 4.

5. Submit Final Report - Based on the draft report and the comments provided by UNDP, stakeholders and donor, the evaluator will produce a final report. The final report provides the complete content of the report as per the main outline proposed in Annex 3. Upon completion of the draft final report, UNDP and other stakeholders' feedback will provide additional feedback. The final report will be completed by the evaluator 10 days after UNDP provides the feedback.

If it is not possible to travel to the country, due to COVID 19 restrictions, for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account and conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with UNDP.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many governments and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

The assignment envisages one mission to Georgia, but If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom, teams etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national

evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultant will be hired support the evaluation and undertake interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

Deliverables

1. Inception report that includes methodology and evaluation workplan/schedule and evaluation matrix
2. Draft report with the findings, lessons learned and strategic recommendations.
3. Final report incorporating feedback from UNDP, the donor and stakeholders.
4. Presentation of the final report to UNDP, the donor and stakeholders.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

Evaluation Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'. The consultant 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 consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners."

4. Institutional arrangements/reporting lines

The Evaluators' Team (international and local consultants) will work under the overall oversight of UNDP's commissioning unit (Energy and Environment Team Leader and M&E specialist). The Project Manager will provide necessary information for the evaluation and will be the primary point of contact for the evaluators however PM will not be involved in evaluation process. UNDP project staff will be providing contact details of stakeholders and providing all the logistical support as needed. During the 5-day mission to the country, office space could be provided to team of international and national evaluators.

5. Experience and qualifications

I. Academic Qualifications: At least Master's degree in social sciences, public administration, environmental and climate change fields. (minimum requirement);

II. Years of experience:

- At least 5 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with evaluation of development interventions at national and/or international level (minimum requirement);
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting evaluations for climate change related projects (minimum requirement)
- Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as of participatory M&E methodological and practical considerations in conducting evaluations of development interventions is required (minimum requirement)
- Experience of working in climate change, DRR, environmental spheres is an asset.
- Experience of conducting project evaluations for international organizations, including UNDP is an asset

III. Language: Proficiency in both spoken and written English

IV. Competencies:

Corporate competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards.
- Understanding of the mandate and the role of UNDP would be an asset.
- 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.

Functional competencies:

- Strong communication and analytical skills.
- Demonstrated skills in drafting reports.
- Ability to work under pressure with several tasks and various deadlines.
- Actively generates creative, practical approaches and solutions to overcome challenging situations.
- Excellent writing, presentation/public speaking skills.
- A pro-active approach to problem-solving.
- Computer literacy.

Leadership and Self-Management skills:

- Builds strong relationships with the working group and with the project partners; focuses on impact and results for the project partners and responds positively to feedback.
- Cooperates with working group effectively and demonstrates strong conflict resolution skills.
- Consistently approaches work with energy, positivity and a constructive attitude.
- Demonstrates strong influencing and facilitation skills.
- Remains calm, in control and good humoured under pressure.
- Demonstrates openness to change, new ideas and ability to manage ambiguity.
- Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills.

- Demonstrates ability to transfer knowledge and competencies.
- Is able to work independently and hurdle competing priorities.

Conflict of interest:

To ensure impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation, as well as to avoid the conflict of interest, UNDP will not consider the applications from the candidates that have had prior involvement in the design, formulation, implementation or evaluation of the above-indicated project.

6. Payment Modality

The payment schedule is given below and will be made upon satisfactory completion/submission and approval of the deliverables by UNDP:

20% - upon successful submission of Inception report and acceptance of the report by UNDP.

80% - upon successful submission of Final Evaluation Report and acceptance of the report by UNDP (including presentation to UNDP and main stakeholders).

11.2 Mid-Term Evaluation Matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub questions	Data sources	Data-collection methods/tools	Indicators/ standard	success	Methods for data analysis
Relevance	How well have the Programme in general and the SDC-project aligned with government and agencies priorities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">To what extent has MHEWS’s selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context?Has SDC-project been influential in influencing national policies on climate change adaptation?To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?To what extent was the project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021), CPD (2016-2020), UPSD 2016-2020, SDGs, SDC and GCF strategic programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none">ProDoc and other related documents, (AWPs, programme and project documents) & interviews.Interaction with stakeholders.CCA/DRR policy and strategic papers, Reports.Technical deliverables.interviews with government partners, organizations working on the subject (including other stakeholders).Consultations notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Project ProDoc and interviews.Desk review, reports & virtual and in-person interviewsReview of relevant documents, strategic papers, Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Targeted communities with improved community resilience.Adaptation measures presented in CCA and DRR strategies and action plans to be developed under the programme/project.Inclusion of the government of Georgia in the formulation process.Strategy and national priorities/similarities.Adequacy of the EW schemes and community-based climate risk management with needs indicators available.Level of integration of lessons learned on UNDP strengths and weaknesses in its programming process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Desk study and interview.Desk review (project documents, review/evaluation reports, government strategies and policies, external organizations working on Climate change, adaptation, disaster risk reduction/manage ment environment, and vulnerable groups.Review of Consultations notes, Focus Group Discussions & key	

					-Extend CCS involvement in the formulation & coordination process.	Informant Interviews, etc.
Effectiveness	What evidence is there that the programme/project has contributed to an improvement in improving community resilience, awareness, and capacity, including institutional strengthening?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in helping improve climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction efforts in Georgia? To what extent have outcomes been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement. What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have the programme partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome? What were the positive or negative, intended, or unintended, changes brought about by SDC-project's work? What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews, documents, reviews and launching of the different events/training/public awareness sessions/events. Interview with GOG institutions, technicians, and representatives of benefiting communities. Interviews on effects and how access to knowledge has changed? Training packages are produced and distributed to different target groups. Feedback of participating staff, students, youth, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project ProDoc and interviews. Desk review, reports & interviews Review of relevant policy and strategic papers, Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend CCS involvement in the formulation & coordination process. Level of target groups mobilization. Number of adaptation plans and community climate resilience developed, approved, and adopted. Number of community resilience measures implemented. Enhanced capacity of targeted groups to use data, information & knowledge sharing platforms. Level of satisfaction of the networking and advocacy work at the community level. Number of training programmes in multi-hazards risk/ climate risk management and percentage of youth engagement in these programmes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review (AWP, results framework, technical and financial reports, agreements (LOA), minutes of meetings. Performance and capacity assessments, partnership and communication strategies, reports on other environment programmes) Consultation notes and Key Informant Interviews Focus group discussions with target beneficiaries.

		<i>SDC-project performance?</i>	<i>local communities in the new capacity-building programme. -Key lessons and how knowledge have been applied and shared across different teams and target groups;</i>		<i>- Percentage of the programme on launching of a nationwide outreach campaign on CRM on TAT. -Defining of measures applying MCA. Successful implementation of MCA on the ground.</i>	
Efficiency	<i>Are the project's approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcomes?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?</i> ○ <i>Has there been an economic use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)?</i> ○ <i>Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that the project has in place help to ensure that activities and outputs were managed efficiently and effectively?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -<i>New indicators are included in the national monitoring plan.</i> -<i>Level of information proposing bankable actions adaptation investment.</i> -<i>Survey targeted youth sector representatives before and after project intervention.</i> -<i>Documents on Georgia strategies and policy</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Desk study and interview</i> <i>Desk review, reports & interviews</i> <i>Review of relevant policy and strategic papers, Reports</i> <i>A desk study, interview & consultation</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -<i>Extent of CCA policy analysis conducted.</i> -<i>Level of Cost-effectively & efficiently associated with output and outcomes.</i> -<i>Existence of an analysis of various delivery results.</i> -<i>Local measures to be implemented designed and implemented.</i> - <i>The existence of UNDP's NIM framework</i> -<i>Number of staff and experts' in place.</i> -<i>Evolution of cost-effectiveness ratio (e.g. Partner & calculable, staff interventions costs).</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Desk review (project reports, reports of the partners, prospective reports on security, donor's strategy in the country)</i> <i>Desk review (technical report, partners reports, capacity assessment)</i>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Were alternative approaches considered in designing the programme? ○ Are UNDP CO and Regional Office support sufficient? ○ Role of the Project team in steering the day-to-day work? 	framework (CCA, DRM, etc...		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Gaps between planned timeframe and actual implementation. -Average cost by the beneficiary. - Beneficiaries benefit from improved flood protection through 1 structural flood protection investment -HR is required for the implementation of the different activities 	
Sustainability	What is the likelihood that the SDC-funded project interventions are sustainable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What mechanisms have been set in place by the SDC-funded project to support the government of Georgia to adapt to changing climate and build resilience made through these interventions? ○ To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national and local stakeholders, been developed, or implemented? 	<p>ProDoc and documents; other related documents, (AWPs, annual quarterly reports) interview, interaction with target beneficiaries</p> <p>Consultations notes & key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Financial Reports. UNDP CDRs.</p>	<p>A desk study, interview & consultation</p> <p>Consultation and interviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Extent of Inclusion in the local planning process. -Process used to foster national and local ownership and capacity development. -Level of enhanced capacity of targeted beneficiaries to use data, information & knowledge sharing platforms. -Level of capacity building programme delivered. - Level of awareness enhanced. -Existence of National outreach campaign on CRM on TAT. 	Desk review (project reports, reports of the partners, prospective reports on CCA/DRM, donor's strategy in the country), etc.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support? ○ What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)? ○ What opportunities for financial sustainability exist? ○ How has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? 	Co-financing commitments. Delivery of the GCF project.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number of private sector knowledge exchange programmes launched events. -Number of surveys targeting - Additional high-risk communities with CBEWS and CBCRM - Community consultation groups with at least 50% representation of women; Ratio of women employed in CBDRM employment guarantee schemes/small-grants at least 50% - Action Plan or Exit Strategy. 	
Impact	What has happened because of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries over the project's timeframe? ○ How many people have been affected? Women? Youth? Students and teachers? 	ProDoc and documents; other related documents, (AWPs, annual quarterly reports) interview and interaction with target beneficiaries	A desk study, interview & consultation Consultation -- interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - coverage for high-risk communities with CBEWS and CBCRM actions. - % increase of crop yields and household income for target communities due to reduced losses and damages from hazards. 	Desk review (AWP, results in framework, technical and financial reports, MoU/LOAs, minutes of meetings.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Were there contributions to changes in policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, including observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.)?</i> ○ <i>Were there contributions to changes in socio-economic status (income, health, well-being, etc.)?</i> ○ <i>Discuss any unintended impacts of the project (both positive and negative) and assess their overall scope and implications.</i> 	<p><i>Consultations notes & key Informant Interviews</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i># of targeted beneficiaries reporting enhanced protection from climate-related natural disasters resulting from Fund investments (disaggregated by gender).</i> - <i># of training conducted for local authorities, grassroots NGOs and target communities in multi-hazard climate risk management including the number of participants and the percentage share of female participants.</i> - <i># of networking events including the number of communities covered networking activities, and the number and percentage of women who participated.</i> - <i>Number of teachers trained in multi-hazard risk management, using a guideline prepared under the project and training modules including the</i> 	<p><i>Performance and capacity assessments, partnership and communication strategies, reports on other environment programmes)</i></p> <p><i>Consultation notes and Key Informant Interviews</i></p> <p><i>Focus group discussions with target beneficiaries.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact. ○ Assess any real change in gender equality, e.g. access to and control of adaptation measures, decision-making power, etc. 			percentage share of females	
Gender Equality	<i>To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the SDC funded project?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To what extent has Project promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects? ○ How did the programme promote gender equality, human rights, and human development in the delivery of outputs? 	<i>ProDoc documents; other related documents, (AWPs, annual quarterly reports) interview, interaction with target beneficiaries/ Women</i> <i>Consultations notes & key Informant Interviews (KII)</i>	<i>A desk study, interview & consultation</i> <i>Consultation -- interviews</i> <i>KII, FDG Questionnaires</i>	<i>-Data disaggregated by gender.</i> <i>-Number of women participating in the various stages of the project including in the public awareness, training programmes and the piloting of the adaptation measures.</i> <i>- # of targeted beneficiaries reporting enhanced protection from climate-related natural disasters resulting from Fund investments (disaggregated by gender).</i> <i>- # of training conducted for local authorities, grassroots NGOs and target</i>	<i>Desk review (project reports, reports of the partners, prospective reports on security,</i>

					<p>communities in multi-hazard climate risk management including the number of participants and the percentage share of female participants.</p> <p>- # of networking events including the number of communities covered networking activities, and the number and percentage of women who participated.</p> <p>- Number of teachers trained in multi-hazard risk management, using a guideline prepared under the project and training modules including the percentage share of females.</p>	
Human Rights	<i>To what extent have poor, indigenous and local peoples, women, and other disadvantaged and marginalized</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>How did the Project promote human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?</i> 	<i>Desk review consultation notes</i>	<i>Review of Annual, quarterly report & Consultation Notes</i>	<p>-Data disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>-Number of women participating in the various stages of the Project.</p> <p>-Extent of women ability to raise their voices during the project activities and to</p>	<i>Desk review (minutes of meetings, content training & project documents, reports by partners, civil society reports, women groups)</i>

	groups benefitted from the Project's interventions?				<p>access the project outputs and basic services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community consultation groups with at least 50% representation of women. - Ratio of women employed in CBDRM employment guarantee schemes/small-grants at least 50% 	
--	---	--	--	--	---	--

11.3 List of Documents Reviewed

1	AWP 2021 MHEWS-SDC
2	AWP 2020 -Revision G#2
3	AWP 20202- 2021 MHEWS-SDC version of 19.1
4	AWP G03
5	AWP G04
6	CDR-GEF SDC- 2021 Q2 not signed
7	CDR- GCF- SDC- 2020
8	CDR-SDC-I-IV 2019
9	Final UNDP CCA AWP with explanatory notes
10	Initial Budget- Climate Adaptation Phase I-SDC
11	List of Consultants
12	Technical Specifications_Landslide_monitoring system
13	Desk Review Report_Landslid-mudflow
14	Desk review Report- Drought
15	Desk review report- hydraulic modeling
16	Avalanche mapping methodology
17	Data availability report – windstorm and hailstorm
18	Data availability Report
19	Deliverable – Guidance for data analysis for flood hazard
20	Deliverable 2-3 LiDAR
21	Deliverable_11_Scorecard_flood_hazard modelling
22	Des review report- windstorm and hailstorm
23	Desk research report – avalanches
24	Drought hazard mapping method
25	Guidance for data analysis and quality assessment – Draft
26	Guidance – drought – data
27	Methodology for flood hydro modelling
28	Methodology for windstorm and hailstorm hazard mapping
29	Report data availability Draft V2_VM
30	Czech Globe Work Plan - Final
31	MHEWS_GEORGIA_task 2.1 and 2.2
32	MHEWS_GEORGIA_task 2.3
33	MHEWS_GEORGIA_task 2.4 and 2.5
34	MHEWS_GEORGIA_task 2.6 final
35	MHEWS_GEORGIA_task 2.7 final
36	Brief paper _critical infrastructure
37	Brief paper Damage and loss
38	Brief paper _NSDI
39	Brief paper _Ordinance 452

40	Brief paper_State Comensation Mechanism
41	MHEWS_Georgia_Deliverable 2.1 2.2
42	Phase 2.4 and 2.5 Comments
43	Task 2.3
44	Task 2_6 Review of O&M
45	Task 2_7 Review existing status of integrating climate-induced flood and drought
46	Task 3.1_Legal and institutional framework
47	Task 3.2 SOP on MHEWS Institutional Framework
48	Task 3.3 Georgia Observing system maintenance procedure
49	A 1.3 DRM D6_Scorecard narrative report
50	D2_Scorecard narrative report LS MF draft
51	D2_Scorecard_NEA_MHMM_LS_MF
52	Scorecard Disaster risk data management
53	Scorecard narratives report on DR data management
54	Scorecard template_preparedness final
55	Scorecard _NEA _Hydraulic Modeling
56	Deliverable 2. Situation analysis of risk management
57	Deliverable 3. Review of Georgia Emergency Management Plan
58	Deliverable 4 Risk MGT course slides
59	Deliverable 4 Risk MGT instructor Gid
60	Kerins-Guinia Work Plan
61	11 documents/ TOT in simex design
62	11 items Deliverable 11 Methodology for Emergency Risk Management
63	Gender Action Plan with baseline
64	Gender resource plan for 2021
65	LOA between UNDP and EsM
66	LOA UNDP SLF
67	LOA UNDP SLF signed by UNDP
68	LOA NEA UNDP SDC ENG signed
69	UNDP NEA Letter of Agreement
70	UNDP NEA LOA SDC Signed by both
71	Narrative interim report
72	NEA's final narrative report
73	Infographics folder
74	Media outreach folder
75	Public events folder: 2019 IDDR and 2020 Science day
76	Thematic TAWG Inforgarphic (ENG)
77	Ammended CSA
78	ProDoc SDC Revised

79	ProDoc SDC amended
80	Scanned signed prodoc-Climate adaptation
81	Scanned signed project document GCF full doc
82	SIDA ProDoc only TAT
83	Progress report 2019
84	Updated stakeholder analysis
85	Interim financial report 2019 for SDC
86	AWP 2020 Final
87	Interim Progress Report 2020 with 5 annexes
88	Annual financial report SDC- 2019
89	AWP 2021 MHEWS – SDC
90	End of Year progress report 2020
91	Financial report 2020
92	Resource planning terms of reference
93	SDC overall risk register December 220
94	AWP 2021 MHEWS -SDC
95	Mid-year financial report 2021
96	Mid-year Progress Report 2021 - final
97	Consolidated progress report 2019
98	Consolidated semiannual progress report
99	Consolidated annual progress report 2020
100	Consolidated semi-annual progress report 2021
101	TOR PSC NPD GCF SDC SIDA Final
102	Risk Log
103	SDC Overall risk register June 2021
104	TOR Back stopper UNDP revisions
105	Annex 1. Swiss Back stoppers' Feedback
106	Reponses to SCO comments on progress report
107	GCF SDC SIAD SC meeting Note Feb 2021
108	GCF SDC SIAD SC meeting Note July 2021
109	Inception workshop folder
110	List of consultants
111	Meetings trainings SDC 7 9 2021
112	Meetings_trainigs_SDC
113	Narrative interim report 2021
114	Program organogram
115	SC meeting notes Feb 2019
116	SC meeting notes Dec 2019
117	SC meeting notes July 2020

118	Workshop meetings
119	Cost-Effective Analysis (CEA) of the project “Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Capacities in Georgia”. by Givi Adeishvili December 2021

11.4 The final list of interviewees

#	Name	Organization
1.	Anna Chernyshova	UNDP
2	Nino Antadze	UNDP
3	Khatuna Chanukvadze	UNDP
4	George Tsagareishvili	NEA
5	Irakli Jeiranashvili	NEA
6	Merab Gaprindashvili	NEA
7	Giorgi Gaprindashvili	NEA
8	Ioseb Kinkladze	NEA
9	Salome Lomadze	PMU
10	Nino Sherozia	PMU
11	Davit Samunashvili	PMU
12	Nana Chabukiani	UNDP
13	Tornike Phulariani	UNDP/SIDA
14	Khatuna Zaldastanishvili	SIDA
15	Giorgi Ghibradze	Crisis Management Coordination Center, under the National Security Council
16	Ketevan Skhireli	UNDP/GCF
17	Nina Shatberashvili	NGO Sustainable Caucasus
18	Devin Kerins	International DRM expert
19	Nino Barkaia	Emergency Management Service
20	Zurab Javakhishvili	Dean of Earth Sciences Department, Ilia State University
21	Jiří Kolman, Pavel Cincera	Czech Globe
22	Bikash Ranjan Dash	International Capacity Assessment expert
23	Tsivtsivadze Tamar	SDC
24	David Tchitchinadze	SDC
25	Daniel	SDC
26	Jemal Kolashvili	EMS/MIA

11.5 MTE 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 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 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 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 components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the 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

11.6 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.

MTE 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 () on ()

Signature:

11.7 Signed MTE Final Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

11.8 Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTE report.