UNDP-GCF project titled 'Enhancing Climate Resilience of India's Coastal Communities'

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)
For procuring the services of an International Consultant to conduct the Interim Evaluation

Project Title:	**UNDP-GCF project titled 'Enhancing Climate Resilience of India's Coastal Communities'**
Scope of Advertisement:	International
Type of Contract:	Individual Consultant
Post Type:	International Consultant
Duty Station:	Home-based (with mission travel if possible)
Expected Areas of Travel:	10 Target landscapes in the three states - Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Odisha
Languages:	English
Duration of Contract:	35 working days spread over 12.5 weeks
Start Date	Immediately after concluding Contract Agreement

1.0   INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation (IE) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) supported Green Climate Fund (GCF) financed project "Enhancing Climate Resilience of India's Coastal Communities" (PIMS 5991 /GCF FP084) implemented through the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and the nodal departments of the target State governments which is to be undertaken in 2022. The project is implemented in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and Maharashtra, to enhance the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities to climate change through ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA). The project was started on 28th June 2019, though full implementation commenced in September 2019 and is currently in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation (IE).

2.0   PROJECT BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) project- on "Enhancing Climate Resilience of India's Coastal Communities" supports the Government of India and the state governments in the project states of Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and Maharashtra, to enhance the resilience of vulnerable coastal

communities to climate change through ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA). The project combines GCF grant finance with significant leveraged co-finance from central and state governments to shift the paradigm towards a new approach, integrating ecosystem-centred and community-based approaches to adaptation into coastal management and planning by the public sector, the private sector and civil society.

The project supports the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and the nodal departments of the target State governments, to enhance the resilience of the lives and livelihoods of the most vulnerable populations, particularly women, in the coastal areas of India to climate change and extreme events, using an ecosystem-centered and community-based approach in three target states. This project as well contributes towards the achievement of climate priorities outlined in India's National Action Plan on Climate Change (2008), the State Action Plans, as well as commitments outlined in India's Nationally Determined Contributions (2015).

The Climate Change, Resilience and Energy portfolio at UNDP is currently working in various thematic areas of climate change adaptation and mitigation; disaster management and resilience; and access to clean and efficient energy. The project works at national, state and community levels to enhance capacities for ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and enable climate policy and finance shifts to catalyse climate action in all of India's coastal states and union territories.

The project will enhance the resilience of coastal communities throughout India, through the implementation of interventions under the following inter-linked outputs:

- Output 1: Enhanced resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems and their services;

- Output 2: Climate adaptive livelihoods for enhanced resilience of vulnerable coastal communities; and

- Output 3: Strengthened coastal and marine governance and institutional frameworks for climate resilient management of coastal areas.

The above will be achieved through interventions outlined below in target landscapes in the three states - Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Odisha:

- Protect and restore ecosystems such as mangroves and seagrass

- Help communities adopt climate-adaptive livelihoods and value chains

- Mainstream EbA principles into coastal planning and governance, enabling intersectoral coordination for addressing climate risk across all of India's coastal states.

Being half –way the project life, this IE will assess progress towards and likelihood of achievement of outcomes and impacts and recommend strategies that will enhance delivery of intended project results commensurate with the investments made.

3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The IE will assess implementation of the project 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 IE will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

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 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** – seek 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 IE 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 incorporate d 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.

4.0   INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The IE team, consisting of an International Consultant (lead consultant) and two National Consultants (one is responsible to look at activities associated with ecosystem and community-based adaptation to climate change and one for climate resilient livelihoods and institutionalisation related components), must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The national consultants to provide the local content while the international consultant will be the Lead Consultant to ensure the deliverables are realized.

The IE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline funding proposal submitted to 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 is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] 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.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful IE. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have

---

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

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. If possible (given the COVID restrictions) the IE team is expected to conduct field missions to selected landscape project states of Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and Maharashtra where the IE team should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification, 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 above-mentioned parties 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 final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the IE must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the IE team.

The final IE report should describe the full IE 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 IE 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, limitations due to COVID-19 pandemic, 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 IE report.

5.0 DETAILED SCOPE OF THE IE

The IE team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the IE 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.

5.1 Project Strategy

5.1.1 Project design:

i) 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.

ii) 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?

iii) Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

iv) Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?

v) 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.

vi) If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

5.1.2 Results Framework/Log frame:

i) Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

ii) Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?

iii) 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.

iv) Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

v) 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.

vi) 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.

5.2 **Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency**

i) Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed and reviewed during project initiation?
ii) Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
iii) Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
iv) Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
v) How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project??
vi) Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted? Reconstruct the ToC, if appropriate, aligning it with the GCF ToC format.
vii) Verify the mitigation impact that the project has achieved. Analyse the GHG emissions achieved (including indirect emissions). Has an appropriate MRV system for GHG emission been established and implemented?
viii) 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?
ix) Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
x) What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
xi) 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)?
xii) How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
xiii) How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
xiv) To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
xv) Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
xvi) To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
xvii) Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project applies adaptive management?
xviii) What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

5.3 Progress Towards Results

5.3.1 Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:
  i) By assessing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
  ii) Assess the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator[2]	Base line Level[3]	Level in 1st APR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[4]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[5]	Achievement Rating[6]	Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved
Fund Level Impact 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Fund Level Impact 2:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							

---

[2] Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards
[3] Populate with data from the Project Document
[4] If available
[5] Colour code this column only
[6] Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Outcome	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Output 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Output 2:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Output 3:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
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 reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- 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.

5.4 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

5.4.1 Management Arrangements:

i) 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.

ii) Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.

iii) Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

5.4.2 Work Planning:
   i) Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
   ii) Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
   iii) Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.
   iv) Assess the feasibility of completing the proposed activities within the given project timeline (if extension was sought for any project milestone; please consider the revised timelines as well)

5.4.3   Financing and Co-financing
   i) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
   ii) Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
   iii) 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.)?
   iv) 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?
   v) 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-finance[7]. Discuss whether co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, have been fulfilled, as applicable.
   vi) Conduct an analysis of materialized co-financing and implications for project scope and results. If co-finance is not materialising as planned (timed and/or amount), discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.
   vii) Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

5.4.4 Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
   i) Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?

---

[7] https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf

ii) Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?

iii) To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?

iv) 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.

5.4.5 <u>Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems</u>:

i) 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?

ii) Discuss any quality assuring mechanisms being used (e.g. ISO standard, government accreditations, international certificates, etc.)

iii) Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems?

iv) 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?

5.4.6 <u>Stakeholder Engagement</u>:

i) Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

ii) 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?

iii) Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

iv) Is a grievance mechanism in place? If so, assess its effectiveness

5.4.7   Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

i) Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?

ii) Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
   o   The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.

- o The identified types of risks[8] (in the SESP).
- o The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).

iii) Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

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

5.4.8 Reporting:

i) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.

ii) 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?)

iii) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

iv) Assess the efficiency, timeliness, and adequacy of reporting requirements

5.4.8 Communications:

i) 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?

ii) 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?)

iii) 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.

---

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

5.5   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

5.5.1 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)?

5.5.2 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?

5.5.3 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.

5.5.4 Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

5.6 Country Ownership

i)   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?

ii)   How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?

iii) To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?

iv) 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?

v) Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

5.7 Gender equity

i) Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?

ii) Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?

iii) Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?

iv) Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?

v) How do the results for women compare to those for men?

vi) Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?

vii) To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?

viii) Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

ix) How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

5.8 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.

5.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative

i) 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.

ii) Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?

iii) What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

iv) Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change?[9]

5.10 Replication and Scalability

i) What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
ii) 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?
iii) What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
iv) Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
v) What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

5.11 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

The IE 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 IE 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.

5.12 Ratings

The IE 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

---

[9] See Section '9.4 Major Changes and Restructuring' in the GCF Programming Manual

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. IE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *the Enhancing Climate Resilience of India's Coastal Communities project.*

Measure	IE Rating[10]	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6.0   TIMEFRAME (DURATION OF WORK)

The total duration of the IE will be approximately 30 working days over a period of 11.5 weeks. A National Consultant will complement the Lead/International Consultant for a period of 30 working days over the same period. The tentative IE timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	TIME PERIOD
I. Desk Review and Inception Report		
Document review and preparation of IE Inception Report	5 days	15th June-20th June 2022
Addressing comments and finalizing IE Inception Report	…	20th-22nd June 2022

---

10 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

II. Field (Virtual is possible, depending on COVID situation in the country) Mission and Data Collection		
IE field mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, project site visits	14 days	23rd June- 7th July 2022
Presentation of initial findings of the IE mission	3 day	8h -10 July 2022
III. Report Writing		
National Consultants draft their reports and submit them to the Lead Consultant	8 days	11th-18th July 2022
Lead Consultant reviews National Comsultants' reports and develops draft IE report #1	5 days	25-30 July 2022
Circulation of draft IE report #1 for comments by Commissioning Unit	…	1st August 2022
Incorporation of comments on draft IE report #1 + Submission of draft IE report #2	3 days	5th-8th August 2022
Circulation of draft IE report #2 for comments	…	9th August 2022
Consolidation of comments by Commissioning Unit	…	18th-22nd August 2022
Incorporation of comments on draft IE report #2 by IC + Submission of final IE report + completed Audit Trail by IC (Report length should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes)	3 days	23rd-25th August 2022
Conducting a Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)	…	TBD WE have some time reserve (September) until October 1 here

7.0 IE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**IE Inception Report**	Preparing evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the IE report, and options for site visits	by 20 June 2022	Research, Collation of information, and compiling of the report

2	**Presentation**	consolidating and presenting the Initial Findings	by 10 July 2022	Presenting the initial findings to Project Management and Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft IE Report #1**	Preparation of the full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	1 August 2022	Preparation and sharing of the 1st draft to Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
4	**Draft IE Report #2**	Preparation full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	9 August 2022	Preparation and sharing of the 2nd draft to Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
4	**Final IE Report***	Preparation of a revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	25 August 2022	Preparation and sharing of the final report to Commissioning Unit
5	**Concluding Stakeholder Workshop** (optional)	Supporting the the project team in conducting the concluding stakeholder workshop 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 IE report	Support the Project Team and Commissioning Unit

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

8.0 IE 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 the UNDP Country Office (CO) in India, during this assignment, the IE team will report to the Monitoring and Evaluation Focal Point in Commissioning Unit who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.

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

9.0 TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of three independent consultants will conduct the IE - one Lead consultant (International with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and two National team experts, from the country of the project with expertise in the relevant area. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The National Consultants will be expected to conduct field missions in the project landscapes. The IE lead consultant (International Consultant) will be designated team leader and shall be responsible for the overall design and writing of the IE report and as well as the overall quality of the final report submitted to UNDP with a field mission if possible. However, the National Consultants shall support the Lead in drafting the report including all the data gathered from the field mission and interviews. The two national evaluators and a lead IE consultant will be recruited separately; however, all three consultants shall form a team carrying out this IE, under the overall guidance of the Lead consultant and overall management of the Commissioning Unit.

The selection of international consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas: The weight to all preferred qualifications apart from the minimum academic qualifications and experience are shown in the Technical Evaluation Criteria below.

Qualifications for the International Consultant
- A Master's degree in natural sciences; with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change, or other closely related field.
- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.

- Familiarity with India's development, environment, climate change and other relevant policy frameworks.
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Natural Resource Management and Climate Change.
- Experience working in Asia region and/or India.
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years.
- Minimum of 4 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on Conservation Science, Natural Resource Management and Climate Change.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Natural Resource Management and Climate Change, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Demonstrable analytical skills.
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

10.0 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.

11.0 PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Instalment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained	Percentage of Payment
1st Instalment	Satisfactory delivery of the final IE Inception Report	UNDP CO	20%
2nd Instalment	Satisfactory delivery of the draft IE report #1	UNDP CO	50%

Instalment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained	Percentage of Payment
3rd Instalment	Satisfactory delivery of the Final IE report + completed Audit Trail	UNDP CO and UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)	30%

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%[11]:

i) The final IE report includes all requirements outlined in the IE TOR and is in accordance with the IE guidance.

ii) 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).

iii) The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

iv) RTA approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)

12. APPLICATION PROCESS

The candidate will be selected through the GPN roster.

12.1 Documents to be included in the application process

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications **in one single PDF document:**

1) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[12]); indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

13.0 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL:

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as

---

[11] 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

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

30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

13.1 Selection Criteria

Qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

  i) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
  ii) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals is:
     - Technical Criteria weight is 70%
     - Financial Criteria weight is 30%

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required)	**70%**	100
Understanding the Scope of Work; comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal		30
Minimum educational background		15
Minimum years of experience		30
Additional competences (agriculture and Environment /M&E)		25
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer X100)	**30%**	30
Total Score	**Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score *30%**	

* It is a mandatory criterion and shall have a minimum of 50%

13.2 Recommended presentation of technical and financial proposals

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the IC Standard Bid Document (SBD). The financial proposals should be ALL inclusive.

14.0 QUALIFICATIONS

14.1 Academic Qualifications:

Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in natural sciences; with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field

14.2 Experience:

  i) Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in natural resource management and climate change.

ii) Minimum of 4 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on Conservation Science, Natural Resource Management and Climate Change.
iii) Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.
iv) Familiarity with India's development, environment, climate change and other relevant policy frameworks.
v) Experience of conducting Project evaluations within the United Nations system will be considered an asset.

14.3 Competencies:
i) Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies: (15%)
ii) Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (15%)
iii) Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GCF Climate Change focal areas, (15%)
iv) Experience working with project evaluations; (15%).
v) Experience working in South Asian countries; (10%)
vi) Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate change, environment conservation, biodiversity, Livelihood, ecosystem management or food security experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (10%)
vii) Excellent communication skills; (10%)
viii) Demonstrable analytical skills; (10%)

14.4 Language and other skills:
Proficiency in both spoken and written English

14.5 Compliance of the UN Core Values:
i) Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards,
ii) Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
iii) Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability,
iv) Treats all people fairly without favoritism,
v) Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

15.0 CONFIDENTIALITY

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

ANNEX A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

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

The following documents will also be available:
12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
15. Project site location maps

ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[13]

Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
- IE time frame and date of report
- Region and countries included in the project
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- IE team members

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Project Information Table

Executive Summary *(2-3 pages)*
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary
- IE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendations Summary Table

---

[13] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

Introduction *(2-3 pages)*

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

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

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

Findings *(12-14 pages)*

4.1 Project Strategy
- Project Design
- Results Framework/Log frame

4.2 Relevance

4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency

4.4 Progress Towards Results
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
- Comprehensive assessment of impact of COVID-19 on project implementation

4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Financing and Co-financing
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Reporting
- Communications

4.6 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

- Environmental risks to sustainability

    4.7   Country Ownership

    4.8   Innovativeness in results areas

    4.9   Unexpected results, both positive and negative

    4.10   Replication and Scalability

    4.11   Gender Equity

Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned *(4-6 pages)*

    Conclusions

5.1
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the IE's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2   Lessons Learned
- Concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned based on specific evidence presented in the report, to be used to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions, as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.

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

Annexes
- IE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- IE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed IE final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft IE report

ANNEX C: IE EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Do the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level? To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?	Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives. Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities Addressing gaps in capacity framework.	National policies, Project Document	Document analysis
How relevant the project's intended outcomes? How relevant is the involvement of different partners in the Project implementation given the institutional and policy framework for environment and food security sectors in India?	Degree to which the project supports national environmental and development objectives	Project documents and evaluations	Document analysis
Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?	Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies	Government of India, UNDP, Project Management	Interviews

A r e counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for India? To what extent is the project in line with GCF operational programs	Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities Coherence UNDP and GCF operational programming	Project partners and relevant stakeholders UNDAF, UNDP/GCF Programming statements	Interviews Document analysis

Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?

What expected outputs have been achieved thus far?	Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators	PIR 2017 Interviews	Document analysis Site Visits Interviews
To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? What have the products, such as studies, policy recommendations, dissemination campaigns, etc., affected [keeping in mind that this is a midterm review and several if not many products are still in the implementation or planning process]			

Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in the field of livelihoods, Climate Change and sustainable environment management in the project districts? How is the Project addressing fragmentation of environment management policies, and institutional scattering considering this fragmentation? How is the Project contributing to avoiding fragmentation across policies and cross-cutting mandates? What other partners can be involved in the Project in a meaningful way to streamline the issue and by-pass or address the institutional and policy fragmentation of the environment and climate change in the project districts?		Project outcomes Norms, polic debated, adopted	Document analysis Stakeholders interviews
How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to environment and climate change in the project districts? How has the project incorporated gender issues	Involvement of (direct and indirect) beneficiaries in project development and implementation Incorporation of gender dimension	Project outputs and outcomes	Interviews Site visits

as the relate to environment and climate change in the project districts?	Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.). Effect of project aspects implemented at sites		
What is causing delays in implementation and delivery of outputs of the Project?	Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of Interim and actual achievements	Findings in project documents, achievement indicators	Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially) Site visits observation
In what outputs? Where are the implementation 'bottlenecks'? How can these issues be solved? What changes need to be implemented?			Stakeholder interviews
Partnerships for implementation	Working relationship between PMU, UNDP, and other strategic partners as well as donors Board functions	Findings in project documents (PIRs, minutes of meetings) Indications in interviews	Document analysis Stakeholder interviews
In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?	Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic	Government of India, Project team, UNDP	Interviews

Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project	Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach Role of committees in guidance Harness effectiveness by analysing how project's results were met vis-à-vis intended outcomes or objectives Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results	Project partners and relevant stakeholders	Document analysis
Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and could adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?	Policies adopted / enacted Policies implemented Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn	Policy documents contain sustainability factors (policy adopted, implemented) Budget arrangements (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes	Documentation analysis Stakeholder interviews

	Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?	Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues	Project documents
	How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results?	Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	Government of India, Project team, UNDP
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long term project results?			
Sustainability possibilities Does the Project have an exit strategy? What components should an exit strategy have for this project?	In what way, may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future?	See indicators in project document results framework and log frame	Project documents and reports
Social sustainability factors	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project' s long-term objectives?	Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained	Government of India, Project team, UNDP

Political/financial sustainability	Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	Evidence that particular practices will be sustained	Government of India, Project team, UNDP;
Replicability	Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	Evidence that particular practices will be sustained	Government of India, Project team, UNDP

ANNEX D: UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATORS/INTERIM EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

Evaluators/Consultants:

i) Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

ii) 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.

iii) Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

iv) Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

v) Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

vi) 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.

vii) Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

viii) Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

ix) Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

x)

IE Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: __**Mikhail Paltsyn**_____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.
Signed_____
Signed at _____ *Date*__September 15 2022_____

ANNEX E: IE RATING SCALE

Rating scale for performance

Rating	Explanation
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Satisfactory (S)	Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Unsatisfactory (U)	Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

Rating Scale for Sustainability

Rating	Explanation
Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained
Highly Unlikely (HU)	Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure

Progress Towards Results Rating Scale

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".

Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
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)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

ANNEX F: IE Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP- NCE RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

UNDP-NCE Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Principal Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

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

To the comments received on (*date*) from the IE of *Enhancing Climate Resilience of India's Coastal Communities Project"*) **(UNDP Project ID-***(PIMS 5991)*

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):

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