

Interim Evaluation Terms of Reference for UNDP-supported GCF-financed projects

Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to [UNDP Procurement Website](#)

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: International Consultant

Duty Station: Home based

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 21 March, 2022

Duration of Contract: 30 working days (21 March through 21 August, 2022)

2. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation (IE) of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project titled Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate Information in Georgia (PIMS #5846) implemented through the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA), which is to be undertaken in 2022. The project started on 12/10/2018 and is in its 4th year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Due to the complex mountainous terrain and climate, Georgia is subject to both geological and hydro-meteorological hazards. According to Georgia's 2nd and 3rd National Communications and other studies, under climate change the frequency, intensity and geographical spread of extreme hydrometeorological hazards will increase. Georgia's INDC estimates economic losses from climate-induced hazards without adaptation measures for the period 2021-2030 to be \$US 10-12 billion, while the cost of adaptation measures is estimated to be 1.5-2 billion USD.

To date, hydrometeorological hazard risk management has relied on the limited and expensive hard structural protection measures; emergency response with limited reliance on forecasts and early warning of the population; post event compensation and relocation of victims, resulting in eco-migrants; and post event recovery and risk reduction. In order to adapt to climate change, Georgia needs to adopt a proactive integrated climate risk management (CRM) approach centred around risk reduction, prevention, and preparedness through the establishment of a multi-hazard early warning system and an enhanced use of climate information in planning and decision-making across all sectors.

To address the barriers, with funding from Green Climate Fund (GCF), Swiss and Swedish governments, UNDP Georgia and Government of Georgia are implementing 7-year program dedicated to Reducing the Risk of Climate-Driven Disasters since 2019. The program includes three inter-related on-going projects, including: GCF funded, 7-year project entitled: "Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate

Information in Georgia” (hereafter GCF project). SDC funded 5-year project “Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia” and SIDA funded 4-year project on “Improved Resilience of Communities to Climate Risks”. The program is implemented under National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA) playing an executing entity’s/implementing partner’s role for it. In addition, the project will be implemented in collaboration with a multiplicity of stakeholders: the National Environment Agency (NEA), the Environmental Information and Education Center (EIEC), the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure (MRDI), as well as local governments. The project implementation spans a period of seven years (2018-2025).

An overall objective of the project is 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 and risk-informed local action. The GCF project will provide critical climate risk information that would enable the Government of Georgia to implement a 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. The project innovation and transformative change will also include (a) participatory “Last Mile” communication solutions tailored to the needs of local communities, including Community-based Early Warning Systems (CBEWSs); (b) increasing implementation capacities for carrying out cost-effective risk reduction and community resilience measures through such innovative approaches as watershed/floodplain restoration, agroforestry, etc., and combination of structural and non-structural protection measures aimed at reducing exposure and increasing effectiveness of the early warning; (c) combining best available science and local knowledge for vulnerability assessment, hazard and risk mapping, disaster modelling and forecasting; (d) (e) carrying out a comprehensive community, municipal and national-wide awareness raising, education and capacity development activities on multi-hazard risk reduction, including preparedness, response and Early Warning Systems (EWSs). As a result, the project will directly benefit up to 1.7 Million people (40% of the population) currently at risk from hydrometeorological hazards.

The total amount of the GCF funding constitutes 27 million USD, the project is co-financed by the Government of Georgia (GoG) with 38 million USD and by Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) funded project: Strengthening Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia with 5 million USD. Besides, the project is topped up the project Improved Resilience of Communities to Climate Risks (IRCCR) funded by Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) with 3.6 million USD.

Further information about the project can be found here: <https://open.undp.org/projects/00094354>

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

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

The IE results will be used by UNDP Georgia to strengthen existing project through improving the performance of the project and making timely changes if necessary. Furthermore, the IE will serve as an accountability tool as it will provide stakeholders and partners with impartial assessment of the project.

The IE will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the following evaluation criteria from the [GCF IEU TOR](#) (GCF/B.06/06) and [draft GCF Evaluation Policy](#), along with [guidance](#) provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Additional evaluation criteria can be assessed, as applicable. The IE must assess the following

- **Implementation and adaptive management** – seeks to identify challenges and propose additional measures to support more efficient and effective implementation. The following aspects of project implementation and adaptive management will be assessed: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.
- **Risks to sustainability** – seeks to assess the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The assessment of sustainability at the Interim Evaluation stage considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The IE should validate the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Reports, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date.
- **Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency** - seeks to assess the appropriateness in terms of selection, implementation and achievement of FAA and project document results framework activities and expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts).
- **Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities** - looks at how GCF financing is additional and able to amplify other investments or de-risk and crowd-in further climate investment.
- **Gender equity** - ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts of climate change are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioural changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to climate change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making.
- **Country ownership of projects and programmes** - examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the GCF investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes.
- **Innovativeness in results areas** - focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and the extent to which the project interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways.
- **Replication and scalability** – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporated in independent evaluations).
- **Unexpected results, both positive and negative** - identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (governments, stakeholders, civil society, AE, GCF, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.

3.1 The project outcome/outputs to be evaluated

The project outcomes and outputs to be evaluated as part of independent evaluation are as follows:

Output 1: Expanded hydro-meteorological observation network and modelling capacities secure reliable information on climate-induced hazards, vulnerability and risks.

Activity 1.1: Procurement, installation and operationalization of new hydro meteorological monitoring equipment.

Activity 1.2: Climate sensitive hazard and risk maps used in planning and zoning.

Activity 1.3: Identification and application of approach and tools for gender-sensitive socio-economic vulnerability assessments.

Activity 1.4: Multi-hazard disaster risk data repository centralizing information management, applying relevant data protocols and with an accessible knowledge portal in place.

Output 2: Multi-hazard early warning system and new climate information products supported with effective national regulations, coordination mechanism and institutional capacities.

Activity 2.1: Policy, regulatory and legal frameworks in place and institutional capacities built for enhanced use of climate information and MHEWS.

Activity 2.2: Design and introduction of MHEWS covering all 11 river basins of Georgia (including last-mile coverage).

Activity 2.3: Access and use of tailored climate weather information products and advise to farmers/agricultural enterprises.

Activity 2.4: Climate-informed multi-hazard risk management (MHRM) responsive system in place: including basin-level multi hazard risk management plans and municipal-level multi-hazard response and preparedness plans.

Output 3: Improved community resilience through the implementation of the MHEWS and priority risk reduction measures.

Activity 3.1: Participatory community-based adaptation planning reinforced through community-based early warning schemes and community-based climate risk management.

Activity 3.2: Public awareness and capacity building to effectively deliver climate risk information for communities and local first-responders.

Activity 3.3: Implementation of project selected from 13 short listed sites for location specific priority risk reduction interventions.

For the Theory of Change and Logical Framework of the project see Annex H.

4. INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The IE team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The IE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, FAA, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based assessment).

The IE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach⁴⁵ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders and beneficiaries.

⁴⁵ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful IE. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the Interim Evaluator is expected to conduct field mission to project site in Georgia. Specific locations to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection (government data/records, field observation visits, CDM verifications, public expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

The specific design and methodology for the IE should emerge from consultations between the IE team and the main stakeholders regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the IE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The IE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the IE report.

The evaluator is expected to apply desk review as well as field data for the purposes of the evaluation. The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits, data to be used and the analysis strategy in the IE must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, main stakeholders and the IE team. The preliminary list of potential interview respondents is provided in the Annex I.

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

Considering all the safety measures enforced by the Government of Georgia to stop the spread of the Covid-19 virus, most of the activities envisaged by the interim evaluation methodology might have to be conducted remotely. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country by the time of the data collection, workshops and meetings are planned, the international consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account and conducts 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 the UNDP's commissioning unit.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the Interim Evaluation team to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the GCF investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to GCF investment.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe and Theory of Change:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary and/or develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis. Ensure that the indicators (gender-disaggregated) are SMART, aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the [GCF programming manual](#).
- Evaluate the Theory of Change (ToC) proposed by the project during the inception and design phases in comparison to the approach, relevance, actions, interventions, practicality, and current context. Foresee the way forward and propose necessary adjustments.

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted? Reconstruct the ToC, if appropriate, aligning it with the [GCF ToC format](#).
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?

- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

- Assess the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁴⁶	Baseline Level ⁴⁷	Level in 1 st APR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁴⁸	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁴⁹	Achievement Rating ⁵⁰	Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved
Fund Level Impact:	Indicator:							
Outcome 1:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes and outputs analysis:

- Assess whether the total number of beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries of the project has been properly calculated.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By assessing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

⁴⁶ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴⁷ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴⁸ If available

⁴⁹ Colour code this column only

⁵⁰ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Include a comprehensive assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on different aspects of project implementation. Assess the impact on results delivery, overall funded activity performance along with a plan of action to address these.

iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the FAA/Funding proposal. Have changes been made and have these been approved by GCF? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

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

Financing and Co-financing:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate and impact on the project.
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: Is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Comment on the use of different financial streams (parallel, leveraged, mobilized finance), as applicable in the context of the project – see GCF policy on co-finance⁵¹. Discuss whether co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, have been fulfilled, as applicable.
- Conduct an analysis of materialized co-financing and implications for project scope and results. If co-finance is not materialising as planned (timing and/or amount), assess mitigation measures, and discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?

⁵¹ <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf>

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Discuss any quality assuring mechanisms being used (e.g. ISO standard, government accreditations, international certificates, etc.)
-
- Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
 - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks⁵² (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans,

⁵² Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

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

Reporting:

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

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

v. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the FAA and Funding proposal, APRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

vi. Country Ownership

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

vii. Gender equity

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

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

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

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions? What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
- Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change?⁵³

x. Replication and Scalability

- Assess the effectiveness of exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints? Is there a need for recalibration?

- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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

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

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

The Interim Evaluation will also include a separate section with a concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned (new knowledge gained from the project, context, outcomes, even evaluation methods; failures/lost opportunities to date, what might have been done better or differently, etc.). Lessons should be based on specific evidence presented in the report and can be used to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions, as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.

The Interim Evaluation report's findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned need to consider gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues.

Ratings

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

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate Information in Georgia)

Measure	Interim Evaluation Rating ⁵⁴	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	

⁵⁴ Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings; 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings; 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings; 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings; 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings; 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings, Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

Ratings for Sustainability: 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability; 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability; 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability; Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

12. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be approximately (30) working days over a time period of 5 months. The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Desk review and Inception Report		
Document review and preparation of Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report; Submission of IE Inception Report (Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission)	5 days	March 30, 2022
Mission and Data Collection		
IE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	8 days	April 27, 2022
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the Interim Evaluation mission	1 day	April 28, 2022
Report Writing		
Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #1	7 days	May 15, 2022
Incorporation of comments on Draft IE Report #1; Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #2	5 days	May 31, 2022
Incorporation of comments from Draft IE Report #2 and Finalization of IE report + completed audit trail from feedback on draft report	3 days	July 8, 2022
Concluding Stakeholder Workshop	1 day	July 26, 2022

The timeline of the activities will be detailed in the inception report including flexibility and delays in the timeframe for the evaluation, with additional time for implementing evaluation virtually recognising possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19.

13. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing & Due Date	Responsibilities
1	Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report	Proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the Interim Evaluation report, and options for site visits	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: March 30, 2022	Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: April 28, 2022	Interim Evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft IE Report #1	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: May 15, 2022	Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
4	Draft IE Report #2	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	May 31, 2022	Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
5	Final Interim Evaluation Report* + Audit Trail	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft July 8, 2022	Interim Evaluation Team sends final report Commissioning Unit
6	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional; strongly encouraged)	Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key actions in response to the report.	Within 1-2 weeks of completion of final Interim Evaluation report July 26, 2022	Led by Interim Evaluation team or Project Team and Commissioning Unit

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

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 current 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 due to circumstances beyond his/her control.

14. INTERIM EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Monitoring & Evaluation Focal Point of the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's IE is UNDP Georgia Country Office. During this assignment, the Interim Evaluation team will report to the Commissioning Unit who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.

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

15. TEAM COMPOSITION

Interim Evaluation will be undertaken by a team consisting of "Team Leader" (international), and a national support team member. International evaluator will lead evaluation process, while the local evaluator will provide the Team leader with a). National level contextual understanding and insights that contribute to effective review of the project progress and challenges, b) practical translation, logistical and organizational support particularly during the field mission.

The required qualifications and competencies of international evaluator are as follows:

Education

- At least Master's degree in social sciences, public administration, environmental and climate change fields or other closely related field. (Max. 10 points)

Work Experience

- At least 5 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with evaluation of development interventions at national and/or international level, including experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies and applying of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (**minimum requirement**) (Max. 20 points);
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting evaluations for climate change related projects (**minimum requirement**) (Max. 20 points);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate adaptation is an asset;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English

16. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct (see ToR Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). The evaluation team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluation team 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 without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

17. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

30% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report

70% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation report by the Commissioning Unit, UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor and UNDP NCE Principal Technical Advisor +submission of completed Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 70%⁵⁵:

- v) The final IE report includes all requirements outlined in the IE TOR and is in accordance with the IE guidance.
- vi) The final IE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other IE reports).
- vii) The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
- viii) RTA approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)

⁵⁵ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the IE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the IE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default