

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-Term Evaluation of the CAF-GEF project

Andes Adaptation to the Impacts of Climate Change on Water Resources Project (AICCA)

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AICCA	Andes Adaptation to the Impacts of Climate Change on Water Resources Project
CAF	banco de desarrollo de América Latina
CAF TM	CAF Team Manager
CC/CV	Climate Change / Climate Vulnerability
CONDESAN	Consortium for Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion
CORPOBOYACA	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Boyacá
EA	Executive Agency
ELECTAUSTRO	Electro Generadora del Austro
ETAPA EP	Empresa Municipal de Telecomunicaciones Agua Potable Alcantarillado y Saneamiento de Cuenca
FSP	Stand-alone Full-sized Project
GEF	Global Environmental Fund
GEFTF	Global Environment Facility Trust Fund
GTM-NDC	Grupo de Trabajo Multisectorial para la implementación de las NDC
HR & GE	Human Resources and Gender Equality
IDEAM	Institute for Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies
LDCF/SCCF	Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MADS	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia
MAAE	Ministry of Environment and water of Ecuador
MERNNR	Ministry of Energy and Non-Renewable Natural Resources
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation
MINAM	Ministry of Environment of Peru
MMAyA	Ministry of Environment and Water of Bolivia
MTR	Mid Term Review
NFP	National Focal Points
NSC	National Steering Committee
NTL	National Technical Leader
PASF	Programa Amazonia Sin Fuego
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMC	Program Management Costs
PRODOC	Project Document
RAC	Regional Advisory Committee
RotI	Review of Outcomes to Impacts
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
ToC	Teory of Change
ToRs	Terms of Reference
UCR	Regional Coordination Unit

**CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO DE LA ECORREGION ANDINA (CONDESAN) ANDES ADAPTATION TO
THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN WATER RESOURCES PROJECT (AICCA)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	1
1. Project General Information	1
2. Project rationale	1
3. Project objectives and components.....	2
4. Executing Arrangements	3
5. Project Cost and Financing.....	5
6. Implementation Issues.....	9
II. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION	10
1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation	10
2. Overall Approach and Methods	10
3. Key Evaluation principles	12
4. Evaluation criteria	13

INDEX OF TABLES

TABLE 1. PROJECT SUMMARY.....	1
TABLE 2. PROJECT BUDGET.....	5
TABLE 3. CUMULATIVE FINANCIAL EXPEDITURE BY MARCH 30TH, 2020- BY TECHNICAL COMPONENT	7
TABLE 4. CUMULATIVE FINANCIAL EXPEDITURE BY MARCH 30TH 2020 - BY COUNTRY PROGRAMME	8
TABLE 5. SCHEDULE OF THE EVALUATION	23

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1. Project General Information

Table 1. Project Summary

CAF Project ID	CAF01/GEF5384	Expected accomplishments	
CAF approval date	June 16, 2016	Project type	FSP
GEF project ID	5384	Focal areas	Climate Change, Biodiversity
GEF approval date	May 30, 2017	GEF strategic priority/objective	CC-SP1, CC-SP2, CC-SP3, BD-SP2 CC-SP1, CC-SP2, CC-SP3, BD-SP2
Countries	Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador y Perú	Actual star date	March 1 st , 2018
Expected start date	March 1 st , 2018	Actual completion date	February 28th, 2022
Planned completion date	February 28th, 2022	Actual expenditures reported as of March 8th of 2018 to December 31st of 2019:	US\$1'688,973.63
Planned project budget at approval	US\$67,877,858	GEF grant expenditures reported as of	
GEF allocation	US\$9,696,621	Secured co-financing as date	
Expected co-financing	US\$58,181,237	Date of financial closure	
Disbursement as of March 26, 2018 April 4, 2018 Jan 18, 2019 Jan 22, 2019 Jan 24, 2019 Aug 29, 2019 Sep 3, 2019 Sep 4, 2019 Dec 31st, 2019	US\$51,761.75 US\$250,000.00 US\$50,560.50 US\$1,201.25 US\$712,662.10 US\$98,211.69 US\$224,374.90 US\$51,761.75 US\$ 509,802.33	Date of last revision	
No of revisions		Mid-term evaluation (actual date)	
Mid-term review/evaluation planned date	March 2020	Terminal evaluation (actual date) where applicable	
Date of last steering committee meeting	Jun 4, 2019	Total co-financing realized as of March 8th of 2018 to June 30th of 2019:	US\$ 70,981,658.11 ¹

2. Project rationale

1. The proposed project is a regional operation, which will include as beneficiaries the countries of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. These Andean region countries constitute a unique group of nations who share a strong historical past, an inter-related present, and a challenging future. Three of them are amongst the short list of mega diverse countries in the world, one with critical ecosystems that span over regions and frontiers. Their economies rely significantly on renewable and non-renewable natural resource-based wealth (oil, gas, mining, and also banana, cocoa, coffee, palm oil and others). The four countries have dramatic topography, with unique basins that span from the heights of glaciated mountains (all countries have peaks at over 4,600 meters above sea level), some of which rapidly descend towards the lowlands along the Pacific coast to the West and the Amazon to the East. The implications of upstream activity of these steep basins are large for many of the ecosystems and economies that depend upon them.

¹ Government initiatives co-financing the AICCA project are currently under implementation, thus the estimated co-financing for the project has increased.

3. Project objectives and components

2. The Andes Adaptation to the Impact of Climate Change on Water Resources Project (*Adaptación a los Impactos del Cambio Climático en Recursos Hídricos en los Andes*, AICCA) is designed to generate and share data, knowledge, and experience on climate-change adaptation measures and strategies to enhance resilience against climate variability. The project's findings are designed to inform policies in selected sectors. The project also includes pilot investments in priority areas in the four Andean countries: Bolivia (urban stormwater drainage), Colombia (highland agricultural systems), Ecuador (small and medium-sized hydroelectric power generation), and Peru (small-scale irrigation).

The AICCA project is financed by SCCF (US\$8.46 million) and GEFTF (US\$1.24 million), implemented by CAF, and executed by CONDESAN. Its total duration is 48 months, and it includes the following four components:

Component 1: Generation and exchange of knowledge and technology transfer (US\$2.13M in total financing: US\$0.85M from GEF SCCF, US\$0.17M from GEFTF and US\$1.11M from matching government contribution). This component aims to strengthen the scientific and technical foundations of climate-related policies, strategies, programs, and management instruments in the program's targeted sectors and transfer the skills and technology necessary to address the implications of climate change and climate variability (CC/CV). Activities financed under the component include: (i) integrating hydrological modeling under CC/CV projections vulnerability analysis into impact analyses of fragile ecosystems to generate knowledge on the impact of CC/CV in the selected sectors; (ii) designing and implementing curricula and training programs to promote knowledge transfer and build administrative capacity in the selected sectors; and (iii) formulating local development strategies, land-use plans, sector policies, and enhanced regulatory frameworks that incorporate clearly defined and effective efforts to address anthropogenic threats to biodiversity at the watershed level.

Component 2. Mainstreaming of climate change considerations into policies, strategies, and programs (US\$2.22M in total financing: US\$0.90M from GEF SCCF, US\$0.13M from GEFTF and US\$1.19M from matching government contribution). This component supports a review of the existing management instruments in selected sectors to improve the mechanisms that decision-makers rely on to make rational and informed choices that effectively promote CC/CV resilience. The component finances: (i) the development of guidelines for public investment in specific sectors as well as standards for territorial management and land-use planning at the national level that integrate CC/CV considerations; (ii) the elaboration of subnational policy instruments that support CC/CV resilience, including an integrated urban drainage-management plan for the Municipality of Cochabamba in Bolivia to the design of a program that monetizes environmental services in the Lake Tota basin; (iii) the design of a methodology to for mainstreaming climate considerations into the design and implementation of strategies, programs, and projects at the national and sectoral levels; and (iv) the development of technical standards and guidelines for biodiversity conservation and climate-change adaptation to be incorporated into management plans for watersheds and protected areas.

Component 3. Design and implementation of adaptation measures in priority sectors (US\$62.2M in total financing: US\$5.88M from SCCF, US\$0.88M from GEFTF and US\$55.44M from matching government contribution). This component supports the implementation of pilot investments in selected sectors designed to both generate direct benefits and enhance resilience to climate change. Analyzing the impact of these pilot investments will also generate critical knowledge on operationalizing CC/CV resilience policies. This component finances: (i) the design and implementation of specific adaptation measures, such as sector-specific upstream watershed levels and groundwater recharge levels, which incorporate proven technologies, such as the controlled flow of stormwater discharge downstream, flood control and groundwater recharge, participatory assessments of the water footprint of different agricultural management practices, flow and sediment control, and the restoration and rehabilitation of degraded

ecosystems; (ii) the design and implementation of systems to monitor and assess the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the adaptation initiatives; and (iii) the development and implementation of targeted interventions to protect fragile ecosystems and watersheds and to address threats to biodiversity in project-intervention areas, including the restoration and recovery of degraded ecosystems, the removal of cattle from alpine tundra areas (*páramos*), the development and implementation of best practices for productive activities such as animal husbandry, agriculture, and agro-forestry, the development of fire-prevention plans for alpine tundra areas and associated habitats, and the formation, training, and equipping of fire brigades to prevent and control forest fires.

Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring, and Evaluation. (US\$1.3M in total financing: US\$0.83M from SCCF, US\$0.05 from GEFTF and US\$0.44 from co-financing CAF and CONDESAN). This component supports region-wide coordination systems designed to ensure efficient, high-quality program implementation, regular monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of intermediate and final results, and the wide dissemination of analytical findings and lessons learned. The component also encompasses fiduciary risk management mechanisms and other safeguards. It finances the operations of a Regional Coordination Unit based in Lima, Peru, which provides implementation support to participating countries in the areas of procurement, financial management and disbursements, as well as technical assistance with the implementation of the other project components and regular communications with National Focal Points in each country. The component facilitates project M&E, results assessments, and the dissemination of lessons learned.

Regional activities are embedded in all four project components but budgeted under Component 1. Regional activities include: (i) the promotion of knowledge exchange, capacity-building through international workshops, and cross-country collaboration via existing regional platforms; (ii) the dissemination of lessons learned through online media, print media, and information sessions; and (iii) analytical work designed to generate further knowledge and scale up successful interventions at the regional level.

4. Executing Arrangements

3.1 GEF Implementing Agency

CAF in its capacity of GEF Implementing Agency is in charge of providing technical and administrative supervision and monitoring to the AICCA project. CAF supervision aims at ensuring that the project meets its objectives and achieves the expected results and outcomes in an efficient and effective manner. To fulfil this role CAF has assigned a project task manager and a project supervisor to the AICCA regional project.

Project Task Manager:

- Inform the GEF Secretariat whenever there is a risk in changes to the co-financing and/or strategic priorities of the project as well as of risks that could affect the attaining of project objectives, scale and scope promised in the approved PRODOC.
- Rate annually the progress achieved in the execution of project activities in accordance with the PIP and PRODOC using the PIR;
- Approve documents prepared by the Executing Agency before publication;
- Facilitate an independent mid-term review/evaluation of the project
- As required, facilitate access to information, advisory services, technical and professional support available within CAF and assist the Executing Agency in accessing the advisory services of other organizations when necessary and possible.
- Ensure that the executing agency organizes a final independent evaluation and submits its report to CAF and the GEF Evaluation Office

Project Supervisor

- Act as liaison between CONDESAN and the CAF Task Manager assigned to the project;
- Supervise, monitor and coordinate with the Executing Agency the execution of project activities and streamline the administrative, financial and technical reporting requirements of the project.
- Having as basis the PIP, Acquisition Plan and PRODOC; review and provide feedback to the quarterly, half-year and annual reports produced by the Executing Agency;
- Supervise the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation plan;
- Prepare periodic monitoring and supervision reports for CAF
- Support the execution of an independent mid-term and final review/evaluation of the AICCA Project

3.2 Executing Agency

The Executing Agency of the project is the Consortium for Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion (CONDESAN). CONDESAN has two operational levels in the project:

3.2.1 Regional level

A Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) was established in Lima and is made up of a Regional Coordinator that has the support of a Financial / Acquisitions subunit (formed by the Regional Administrator of CONDESAN located in the Ecuador office; the Administrative Coordinator of CONDESAN office in Peru and an administrative assistant, also located in Peru). The Executive Director of CONDESAN is also supporting the RCU as technical advisor. The RCU is responsible to consolidate and foster the regional dimension of the project; it promotes a bidirectional process (top-down as well as bottom-up), to secure the supranational character of the results, based on validated experiences at national level. It is responsible for the fiduciary oversight and reporting of the project, including financial management and procurement consolidation according to the project's operational manual and procurement plan. It is also responsible of regional monitoring and evaluation (M&E), provides and coordinates technical advice, and coordinates and assists overall orientation concerning project conception, strategies, criteria and methodologies, as well as organizes and supports regional activities.

3.2.2 National level

In each country there is a National Technical Leader (NTL) and a project team, all supported by the CONDESAN country offices; in the case of the country teams of Peru, Colombia and Bolivia by the Lima Office and for the Ecuadorian team by the Quito Office. The teams are composed as follows:

- A) Bolivia (2)
- A National Technical Leader
 - A Local Technical Specialist in Climate Change
 - A Technical Specialist in Storm Drainage
- B) Colombia (8)
- A National Senior Technical Leader and a National Technical Assistant
 - A Meteorologist, a Hydrologist, a Specialist in Geographic Information Systems and a Social specialist
 - A Local Technical Professional, and a Local Technical Expert
- C) Ecuador (6)
- A National Technical Leader and a National Technical Assistant
 - A Specialist in Water and Energy, a Specialist in Governance and Territorial Development
 - Two Local Technical Leaders, one in the Napo province and the other in the Azuay province
- D) Perú (4)
- A National Technical Leader and a National Technical Assistant
 - A Specialist on Climate Change

- A Specialist in Agriculture and Climate Change

In terms of governance, the project institutional implementation structure is also divided into two collaborative levels, regional and national. At the regional level there is an advisory body (Regional Advisory Committee – RAC), integrated by the National Focal Points (NFP) of each country, the RCU (Executive Director of CONDESAN and the Regional Coordinator) as a Committee Secretary, and a Delegate of CAF as an observer.

The lead liaison ministry in each country will chair a National Steering Committee (NSC) consisting of primary project stakeholders at the national level, that will coordinate with the RCU and a delegate of national offices of CONDESAN.

5. Project Cost and Financing

4. The Project has obtained GEF-SCCF financing for US\$8.46 million, plus Ecuador-specific GEF TF resources for US\$1.24 million. The majority of resources (US\$6 million in GEF funds) will be devoted to investments. Counterpart funding from the participating governments and private hydro-electric operators is estimated at US\$58.18 million. CONDESAN as the executing agency will contribute resources in the form of thematic expertise and overhead costs to the extent of US\$200,000 and CAF in the amount of US\$235,000 in kind. Table 1

Table 2. Project Budget

COMPONENT	SCCF US\$	GEFTF US\$	TOTAL GEF project Funds US\$	Co-financing Governments + other Contribution US\$	Total
COMPONENT 1	850,286.00	170,000.00	1,020,286.00	1,109,615.00	2,129,901.00
BOL	180,000.00		180,000.00	155,350.00	335,350.00
COL	120,286.00		120,286.00	608,181.00	728,467.00
ECU	150,000.00	170,000.00	320,000.00	106,084.00	426,084.00
PER	200,000.00		200,000.00	240,000.00	440,000.00
UCR	200,000.00		200,000.00		200,000.00
COMPONENT 2	879,381.00	134,500.00	1,013,881.00	1,193,167.00	2,207,048.00
BOL	233,000.00		233,000.00	155,350.00	388,350.00
COL	258,881.00		258,881.00	746,732.00	1,005,613.00
ECU	187,500.00	134,500.00	322,000.00	51,085.00	373,085.00
PER	200,000.00		200,000.00	240,000.00	440,000.00
COMPONENT 3	5,895,796.00	882,537.00	6,778,333.00	55,443,453.00	62,221,786.00
BOL	1,444,500.00		1,444,500.00	4,511,356.00	5,955,856.00
COL	1,458,333.00		1,458,333.00	2,120,097.00	3,578,430.00
ECU	1,552,963.00	882,537.00	2,435,500.00	45,362,000.00 ²	47,797,500.00
PER	1,440,000.00		1,440,000.00	3,450,000.00	4,890,000.00
COMPONENT 4	831,158.00	52,963.00	884,121.00	435,002.00	1,319,123.00
Project Management Cost - UCR PMC	361,131.00	52,963.00	414,094.00		414,094.00
Monitoring & Evaluation - UCR M&E	470,027.00		470,027.00		470,027.00
Co-financing - Executing Agency (CONDESAN)			-	200,000.00	200,000.00
CO-financing Implementing Agency - CAF			-	235,002.00	235,002.00
Total	8,456,621.00	1,240,000.00	9,696,621.00	58,181,237.00	67,877,858.00

Between March 2018 and December 2019, the AICCA project has a cumulative expenditure of US\$2,068,386.17 which represents 16% of the total budget of the project (US\$9,696,621.00). Per component expenditure is distributed as follows: Component 1 US\$304,135.17 (29%), Component 2 US\$ 225,841.58 (21%), Component 3 US\$1,190,400.80 (17%) and Component 4 US\$348,008.62 (39%). At the country level, the cumulative expenditure is as follows: 6.8% for Bolivia (US\$127,089.93) of

² From Hydroelectric Operators

US\$1,857,500.00), 23% for Colombia (US\$440,474.59) of US\$1,837,500.00, 20% for Ecuador (US\$636,082.45 of US\$3,077,500.00); 26% in Peru (US\$495,771.09 of US\$ 1,840,000.00), and 35% for the Regional Coordination Unit (US\$368,968.11 of US\$1,053,921.00). Table 2 and 3 provide an overview of the financial execution by component and at the country level.

Table 3. Cumulative financial expenditure by June 30th 2020 - by Technical Component

AICCA Budget Line			GEF-approved budget		Actual expenditures incurred*						Cumulative expenditures to-date	Cumulative unspent balance to-date
			Total project budget	Current ¹ year budget	Cumulative expenditures from previous period	Jul-Sep Qtr 1	Oct-Dec Qtr 2	Jan-Mar Qtr 3	Apr-Jun Qtr 4	Current year total		
99	COMPONENT 1		\$ 1.021.800,00	\$ 599.581,67	\$ 95.899,91	\$ 33.392,54	\$ 91.157,97	\$ 83.684,75	\$ 102.545,73	\$ 310.780,99	\$ 406.680,90	\$ 615.119,10
		BOL	\$ 180.000,00	\$ 167.249,91	\$ 8.198,09	\$ 113,14	\$ 9.244,64	\$ 20.490,29	\$ 21.728,92	\$ 51.576,99	\$ 59.775,08	\$ 120.224,92
		COL	\$ 145.800,00	\$ 136.345,87	\$ 9.454,13	\$ 5.348,27	\$ 35.390,00	\$ 25.000,00	\$ 15.000,00	\$ 80.738,27	\$ 90.192,40	\$ 55.607,60
		ECU	\$ 320.000,00	\$ 108.945,70	\$ 37.767,88	\$ 19.109,74	\$ 40.605,30	\$ 19.735,97	\$ 11.791,81	\$ 91.242,82	\$ 129.010,70	\$ 190.989,30
		PER	\$ 176.000,00	\$ 111.839,67	\$ 27.160,33	\$ 1.181,38	\$ 5.918,03	\$ 18.458,49	\$ 54.025,00	\$ 79.582,90	\$ 106.743,23	\$ 69.256,77
		UCR	\$ 200.000,00	\$ 75.200,52	\$ 13.319,48	\$ 7.640,01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.640,01	\$ 20.959,49	\$ 179.040,51
99	COMPONENT 2		\$ 1.030.200,00	\$ 536.530,36	\$ 30.973,82	\$ 27.197,81	\$ 89.314,31	\$ 78.355,64	\$ 161.716,51	\$ 356.584,27	\$ 387.558,09	\$ 642.641,91
		BOL	\$ 210.000,00	\$ 60.241,00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.900,00	\$ 3.800,00	\$ 4.600,00	\$ 15.300,00	\$ 15.300,00	\$ 194.700,00
		COL	\$ 211.200,00	\$ 135.600,00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.000,00	\$ 12.000,00	\$ 40.000,00	\$ 58.000,00	\$ 58.000,00	\$ 153.200,00
		ECU	\$ 322.000,00	\$ 118.550,00	\$ 21.113,18	\$ 12.077,63	\$ 38.021,08	\$ 21.295,99	\$ 20.926,98	\$ 92.321,68	\$ 113.434,86	\$ 208.565,14
		PER	\$ 287.000,00	\$ 222.139,36	\$ 9.860,64	\$ 15.120,18	\$ 38.393,23	\$ 41.259,65	\$ 96.189,53	\$ 190.962,59	\$ 200.823,23	\$ 86.176,77
99	COMPONENT 3		\$ 6.760.500,00	\$ 2.652.684,43	\$ 424.315,43	\$ 192.791,98	\$ 255.631,72	\$ 314.121,67	\$ 293.285,62	\$ 1.055.830,99	\$ 1.480.146,42	\$ 5.280.353,58
		BOL	\$ 1.467.500,00	\$ 418.701,00	\$ 38.212,30	\$ 10.952,08	\$ 12.021,64	\$ 17.157,75	\$ 16.552,15	\$ 56.683,62	\$ 94.895,92	\$ 1.372.604,08
		COL	\$ 1.480.500,00	\$ 781.807,36	\$ 119.412,64	\$ 45.185,54	\$ 92.882,18	\$ 89.801,83	\$ 57.684,74	\$ 285.554,29	\$ 404.966,93	\$ 1.075.533,07
		ECU	\$ 2.435.500,00	\$ 925.246,35	\$ 126.499,95	\$ 84.394,45	\$ 88.389,98	\$ 127.071,30	\$ 72.854,03	\$ 372.709,76	\$ 499.209,71	\$ 1.936.290,29
		PER	\$ 1.377.000,00	\$ 526.929,72	\$ 140.190,54	\$ 52.259,91	\$ 62.337,92	\$ 80.090,79	\$ 146.194,70	\$ 340.883,32	\$ 481.073,86	\$ 895.926,14
99	COMPONENT 4		\$ 884.121,00	\$ 273.374,34	\$ 220.622,73	\$ 43.000,59	\$ 42.227,08	\$ 42.158,22	\$ 38.563,06	\$ 165.948,95	\$ 386.571,68	\$ 497.549,32
		UCR PMC	\$ 414.094,00	\$ 103.521,98	\$ 144.519,90	\$ 26.791,97	\$ 26.744,29	\$ 26.702,79	\$ 25.695,72	\$ 105.934,77	\$ 250.454,67	\$ 163.639,33
		UCR M&E	\$ 470.027,00	\$ 169.852,36	\$ 76.102,83	\$ 16.208,62	\$ 15.482,79	\$ 15.455,43	\$ 12.867,34	\$ 60.014,18	\$ 136.117,01	\$ 333.909,99
TOTAL			\$ 9.696.621,00	\$ 4.062.170,80	\$ 771.811,89	\$ 296.382,92	\$ 478.331,08	\$ 518.320,28	\$ 596.110,92	\$ 1.889.145,20	\$ 2.660.957,09	\$ 7.035.663,91

Table 4. Cumulative financial expenditure by June 30th 2020 - by Country Programme

Country	GEF-approved budget		Actual expenditures incurred*						Cumulative expenditures to-date	Cumulative unspent balance to-date
	Total project budget	Current year budget	Cummulative expenditures from previous period	Jul-Sep Qtr 1	Oct-Dec Qtr 2	Jan-Mar Qtr 3	Apr-Jun Qtr 4	Current year total		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H=D+E+F+G		
Bolivia	\$ 1.857.500,00	\$ 646.191,91	\$ 46.410,39	\$ 11.065,22	\$ 28.166,28	\$ 41.448,04	\$ 42.881,07	\$ 123.560,61	\$ 169.971,00	\$ 1.687.529,00
Component 1	\$ 180.000,00	\$ 167.249,91	\$ 8.198,09	\$ 113,14	\$ 9.244,64	\$ 20.490,29	\$ 21.728,92	\$ 51.576,99	\$ 59.775,08	\$ 120.224,92
Component 2	\$ 210.000,00	\$ 60.241,00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.900,00	\$ 3.800,00	\$ 4.600,00	\$ 15.300,00	\$ 15.300,00	\$ 194.700,00
Component 3	\$ 1.467.500,00	\$ 418.701,00	\$ 38.212,30	\$ 10.952,08	\$ 12.021,64	\$ 17.157,75	\$ 16.552,15	\$ 56.683,62	\$ 94.895,92	\$ 1.372.604,08
Colombia	\$ 1.837.500,00	\$ 1.053.753,23	\$ 128.866,77	\$ 50.533,81	\$ 134.272,18	\$ 126.801,83	\$ 112.684,74	\$ 424.292,56	\$ 553.159,33	\$ 1.284.340,67
Component 1	\$ 145.800,00	\$ 136.345,87	\$ 9.454,13	\$ 5.348,27	\$ 35.390,00	\$ 25.000,00	\$ 15.000,00	\$ 80.738,27	\$ 90.192,40	\$ 55.607,60
Component 2	\$ 211.200,00	\$ 135.600,00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.000,00	\$ 12.000,00	\$ 40.000,00	\$ 58.000,00	\$ 58.000,00	\$ 153.200,00
Component 3	\$ 1.480.500,00	\$ 781.807,36	\$ 119.412,64	\$ 45.185,54	\$ 92.882,18	\$ 89.801,83	\$ 57.684,74	\$ 285.554,29	\$ 404.966,93	\$ 1.075.533,07
Ecuador	\$ 3.077.500,00	\$ 1.152.742,05	\$ 185.381,01	\$ 115.581,82	\$ 167.016,36	\$ 168.103,26	\$ 105.572,82	\$ 556.274,26	\$ 741.655,27	\$ 2.335.844,73
Component 1	\$ 320.000,00	\$ 108.945,70	\$ 37.767,88	\$ 19.109,74	\$ 40.605,30	\$ 19.735,97	\$ 11.791,81	\$ 91.242,82	\$ 129.010,70	\$ 190.989,30
Component 2	\$ 322.000,00	\$ 118.550,00	\$ 21.113,18	\$ 12.077,63	\$ 38.021,08	\$ 21.295,99	\$ 20.926,98	\$ 92.321,68	\$ 113.434,86	\$ 208.565,14
Component 3	\$ 2.435.500,00	\$ 925.246,35	\$ 126.499,95	\$ 84.394,45	\$ 88.389,98	\$ 127.071,30	\$ 72.854,03	\$ 372.709,76	\$ 499.209,71	\$ 1.936.290,29
Perú	\$ 1.840.000,00	\$ 860.908,75	\$ 177.211,51	\$ 68.561,47	\$ 106.649,18	\$ 139.808,93	\$ 296.409,23	\$ 611.428,81	\$ 788.640,32	\$ 1.051.359,68
Component 1	\$ 176.000,00	\$ 111.839,67	\$ 27.160,33	\$ 1.181,38	\$ 5.918,03	\$ 18.458,49	\$ 54.025,00	\$ 79.582,90	\$ 106.743,23	\$ 69.256,77
Component 2	\$ 287.000,00	\$ 222.139,36	\$ 9.860,64	\$ 15.120,18	\$ 38.393,23	\$ 41.259,65	\$ 96.189,53	\$ 190.962,59	\$ 200.823,23	\$ 86.176,77
Component 3	\$ 1.377.000,00	\$ 526.929,72	\$ 140.190,54	\$ 52.259,91	\$ 62.337,92	\$ 80.090,79	\$ 146.194,70	\$ 340.883,32	\$ 481.073,86	\$ 895.926,14
UCR	\$ 1.084.121,00	\$ 348.574,86	\$ 233.942,21	\$ 50.640,60	\$ 42.227,08	\$ 42.158,22	\$ 38.563,06	\$ 173.588,96	\$ 407.531,17	\$ 676.589,83
Component 1	\$ 200.000,00	\$ 75.200,52	\$ 13.319,48	\$ 7.640,01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.640,01	\$ 20.959,49	\$ 179.040,51
Component 4 PMC (4.1)	\$ 414.094,00	\$ 103.521,98	\$ 144.519,90	\$ 26.791,97	\$ 26.744,29	\$ 26.702,79	\$ 25.695,72	\$ 105.934,77	\$ 250.454,67	\$ 163.639,33
Component 4 M&E (4.2)	\$ 470.027,00	\$ 169.852,36	\$ 76.102,83	\$ 16.208,62	\$ 15.482,79	\$ 15.455,43	\$ 12.867,34	\$ 60.014,18	\$ 136.117,01	\$ 333.909,99
TOTAL	\$ 9.696.621,00	\$ 4.062.170,80	\$ 771.811,89	\$ 296.382,92	\$ 478.331,08	\$ 518.320,28	\$ 596.110,92	\$ 1.889.145,20	\$ 2.660.957,09	\$ 7.035.663,91

6. Implementation Issues

5. Project implementation challenges reported in the first PIR (March 2018 – June 2019):

- Between March 2018 and June 2019, the AICCA project spent a total of US\$772,016.63, or 40% of the total budget allocated for the period (US\$1,906,947.62). The project achieved 27 out of 53 goals reflecting a technical execution rate of 51%.
- The substantial gap between the design phase (2013) and actual start of the project implementation phase (2018) which required the aligning of project activities with the new regulatory context and reengaging key stakeholders in project implementation.
- The time required to finetune the process of developing, revising and approving ToRs and technical documents. At the startup of implementation the ToR preparation process took an average of two months, as most ToRs are for specific technical studies and require contributions from various public institutional counterparts. To secure local ownership, The National Technical Leader and the Regional Coordination Unit carefully reviewed these contributions and integrated them into each ToR. This process often required more time than initially planned, which further delayed the execution of the respective activity. The team has since then implemented a more efficient workflow process to expedite the preparation of ToRs.
- Late appointment of key project staff (e.g. administrative coordinator and M&E expert) and insufficient man-hours effectively allocated to key project activities including the setup and implementation of the M&E system and the development of key regional products (e.g. Gender Mainstreaming Strategy and the Project Communication Plan)
- Delayed development and full set up of the M&E operational system for the project which led to the late training of project teams in the application of the M&E tools and quality issues and delays in the delivery of technical and financial reports.
- Delays in hiring the project team. The Regional Coordinator was hired as of March 2018, and the National Technical Leaders from July to August 2018.

Issues identified in the first semester of the second fiscal year (July 2019 – December 2019):

- Delayed development and approval of the mechanisms for the implementation of the adaptation measures in private properties.
- A technical execution rate of 82% (67 goals achieved out of 82 planned for year 2) but a financial execution of only 19% of the budget planned for the period July 2019 -June 2020.
- At the national level, the following risks are considered substantial 1) Government change stage and associated social problems affect the implementation of project activities within the established schedule; 2) Delay in decision-making and approval of project management documents by key actors, focal points and members of national committees; 3) Delays in product approvals and reports that delay payments and the execution of activities concatenated to these deliverables; 4) Delays in the validation and approval of the guidelines for the implementation of climate change adaptation interventions in private properties by the implementing agency; 5) Officials designated as Technical Counterparts / Regional Focal Points are subject to rotations due to political transitions, generating delays in the review and approval of consulting products, delaying budget execution; and, 6) Delays in the approval of national guidelines or policies for

the incorporation of climate change criteria, inputs that the project should use in the documents that it must prepare or update, mainly in Colombia and Peru.

- At the regional level, the main risk is the substantial increase in time in the review and approval of national terms of reference and products, and delays in product reviews and approvals and therefore in delays in product payments, affecting budget execution.

II. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

6. The Mid-term Evaluation of the “Andes Adaptation to the Impacts of Climate Change on Water Resources Project (AICCA)” is undertaken approximately half way through project implementation to assess performance to date (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency) and determine the likelihood of the project achieving its intended outcomes and impacts, including their sustainability.

7. The MTE has four primary purposes (i) assess the project performance to date (in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency); (ii) provide evidence of results achieved and determine the likelihood of the project achieving its intended outcomes and impacts at country and regional levels, (ii) identify the challenges and risks to achievement of the project objectives and to derive improving actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact and sustainability.

8. In addition, the MTE is expected to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results, accomplishments and lessons learned among CAF, CONDESAN and the project partners: Ministry of Environment and Water of Bolivia (MMAyA); in Colombia, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia (MADS), Institute for Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM) and the Regional Autonomous Corporation of Boyacá (CORPOBOYACA); in Ecuador, Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador (MAAE), Ministry of Energy and Non-Renewable Natural Resources (MERNNR), Water Secretariat of Ecuador (SENAGUA); and in Perú Ministry of Environment (MINAM) and Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MINAGRI).

2. Overall Approach and Methods

9. The Mid-term Evaluation of the Project will be conducted by a team of consultants under the overall responsibility and management of CAF Task Manager and in consultation with the and Project Supervisor CONDESAN and key partners in each country. The evaluation team will be integrated by a Lead Senior Consultant and a team of local experts based at each country programme and in charge of the data collection and analysis process. The lead consultant will be in charge of the preparation of the reports submitted to CAF ensuring that all evaluation criteria and questions are adequately covered. It will be an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation process. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the evaluation team maintains close communication with the project team and promotes information exchange throughout the evaluation implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the evaluation findings.

10. The evaluation will include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The evaluation will appreciate how information generated by the M&E system during project implementation is being used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensuring sustainability. The evaluation will as well assess, give

an opinion and provide recommendations to any change proposed by the Executing Agency and country partners to the outputs, outcomes and impact stipulated in the Project Document. The evaluation will be framed under GEF-5 programming strategy and priorities.

11. The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

(a) A desk review of:

- Relevant background documentation:
 - a) Operational Manual of the Project and its annexes:
 - Project Governance Document.
 - Project document (PRODOC).
 - Report Preparation Manual.
 - CAF Selection, Acquisition and Purchasing Manual.
 - Per diem scale of the project.
 - b) Letter of commitment of co-financing from governments and other contributors.
 - c) Letters of delegation of National Focal Points
 - d) Inter-institutional Cooperation Agreements
 - e) Technical Counterpart Designations

- Project design documents
- Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, the logical framework and its budget;
- Project reports such as six-monthly progress and financial reports, Audit reports; quarterly progress reports, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence etc.;
- Project outputs (See Annex 1)
- Evaluations/reviews of similar projects

(b) Interviews (individual or in group) with:

- CAF Task Manager
- CAF Project supervisor
- CAF Fund Management Officer;
- CONDESAN Executive Director
- Project management team: project Regional Coordinator and regional and national teams
- Project partners, including: National Focal Point and/or technical counterpart of the Ministry of Environment and Water of Bolivia (MMAyA), Departmental Autonomous Government of Cochabamba (GADC), Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia (MADS), Institute for Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM), Regional Autonomous Corporation of Boyacá (CORPOBOYACA), Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador (MAAE), Ministry of Energy and Non-Renewable Natural Resources (MERNNR), Water Secretariat of Ecuador (SENAGUA), Ministry of Environment of Peru (MINAM), Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation of Peru (MINAGRI), Gobierno Regional de Piura (Perú), Gobierno Regional de Ancash (Perú), Gobierno Regional de Cajamarca (Perú), Universidad de Cuenca, Empresa Municipal de Telecomunicaciones Agua Potable Alcantarillado y Saneamiento de Cuenca - ETAPA EP, Empresa Eléctrica Quito, Electro Generadora del Austro – ELECTROAUSTRO.
- Relevant resource persons

(c) Field visits:

- Field visits to project sites by the evaluation team at each country programme³

³ Field visits will be organized and undertaken taking into consideration travel restrictions issued by each country due to COVID-19

- Travel Reports from the Project Manager, CONDESAN

(d) Other data collection tools: Quarterly Progress Report, Control and follow-up consultancies format by country, List of events, trainings, diffusion material register, Documentary repository, Format of project implementation locations (Fichas de sitio), Supervision reports, among others.

3. Key Evaluation principles

12. Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification was not possible, the single source will be mentioned. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

13. The evaluation will assess the project with respect to a minimum set of evaluation criteria grouped in five categories: (1) Strategic Relevance; (2) Attainment of objectives and planned result, which comprises the assessment of outputs achieved, effectiveness and likelihood of impact; (3) Sustainability and replication; (4) Efficiency; and (5) Factors and processes affecting project performance, including preparation and readiness, implementation and management, stakeholder participation and public awareness, country ownership and driven-ness, financial planning and management, CAF supervision and backstopping, and project monitoring and evaluation. The evaluation consultants can propose other evaluation criteria as deemed appropriate.

14. **Ratings.** All evaluation criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Guidance on how the different criteria should be rated and how ratings should be aggregated for the different evaluation criterion categories should be based upon the Result Based Management GEF Trust Fund and LDCF/SCCF Reporting Guidelines of the GEF, 2012 <file:///C:/Users/Usuario/Dropbox/AICAA/Manual%20Operativo/Version%20final%20y%20aprobada/M&E%20proyecto/Taller%20Lima/GEF%20AMR%20Reporting%20Guidelines%20-%202012.pdf>

15. **Baselines and counterfactuals.** In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the project intervention, the evaluators should consider the difference between *what has happened with*, and *what would have happened without*, the project. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions, trends and counterfactuals in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. It also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions, trends or counterfactuals is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

16. **The “Why?” Question.** As this is a Mid-term Evaluation particular attention should be given to **identifying implementation challenges and risks to achieving the expected project objectives and sustainability**. Therefore, the “Why?” question should be at the front of the consultants’ minds all through the evaluation exercise. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of “what” the project performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance was as it was, i.e. of processes affecting attainment of project results (criteria under category F – see below). This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project. In fact, the usefulness of the evaluation will be determined to a large extent by the capacity of the consultants to explain “why things happened” as they happened and are likely to evolve in this or that direction, which goes well beyond the mere review of “where things stand” at the time of evaluation.

17. A key aim of the evaluation is to encourage reflection and learning by CAF staff, CONDESAN staff and project team and key project stakeholders. The consultants should consider how reflection and learning

can be promoted, both through the evaluation process and in the communication of evaluation findings and key lessons.

18. Communicating evaluation results. Once the consultants have obtained evaluation findings, lessons and results, the CAF Task manager will share the findings and lessons with the Executing Agency and key stakeholders. Evaluation results should be communicated to the key stakeholders in a brief and concise manner that encapsulates the evaluation exercise in its entirety. There may, however, be several intended audiences, each with different interests and preferences regarding the report. The Task Manager will plan with the consultants which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key evaluation findings and lessons to them. This may include some or all of the following: a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, the preparation of an evaluation brief, a power point presentation or interactive presentation.

4. Evaluation criteria

A. Strategic relevance

19. The evaluation will assess, in retrospect, whether the project's objectives and implementation strategies were consistent with global, regional and national environmental issues and needs. The evaluation will assess whether the project was in-line with the GEF Climate Change Adaptation and Biodiversity Conservation focal area's strategic priorities and operational programme(s).

20. The evaluation will also assess the project's relevance in relation to CAF's mandate and its alignment with CAF's policies and current strategies (Vice Presidency for Sustainable Development Programmatic Areas / Focal Areas / Green Agenda/ and all related CAF Safeguards. The evaluation will assess whether the project makes a tangible/plausible contribution to any of the strategic and thematic areas of CAF. The magnitude and extent of any contributions and the causal linkages should be fully described.

21. The evaluation should assess the project's alignment / compliance with CAF's policies and strategies and environmental and social safeguards specified in the PRODOC. The evaluation should provide an assessment in terms of progress and results so far achieved of the following:

(a) Alignment with the Strategic Plan. The outcomes and achievements of the project should be briefly discussed in relation to the objectives of the CAF strategic plan/ focal areas.

(b) *Gender balance.* Ascertain to what extent project design, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to and the control over natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation. Are the project intended results contributing to the realization of international GE (Gender Equality) norms and agreements as reflected in the CAF Gender Policy, Strategy and Safeguards, as well as to regional, national and local strategies to advance HR & GE?

(c) *Inclusion of indigenous people's issues, needs and concerns.* Ascertain to what extent the project has applied the CAF environmental and social safeguards

(d) *Regional Cooperation and knowledge management.* This is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between developing countries and relates directly to the regional activities specified under the first component of the Project. Briefly describe and assess the level of implementation of activities related to knowledge development, sharing and exchange and any aspects of the project that could be considered as examples of South-South Cooperation.

(e) *Safeguards.* Whether the project has adequately considered environmental, social and economic risks and established whether they were vigilantly monitored. Was the safeguard management instrument

completed, implemented and monitored and were CAF requirements complied with? 22. Based on an analysis of project stakeholders, the evaluation should assess the relevance of the project intervention to key stakeholder groups.

B. Achievement of Outputs

23. The evaluation will assess, for each component, the projects' success in producing the programmed outputs (products and services delivered by the project itself) and milestones as per the PRODOC and any modifications/revisions later on during project implementation, both in quantity and quality, as well as their usefulness and timeliness.

24. Briefly explain the reasons behind the success (or failure) of the project in producing its different outputs and meeting expected quality standards, cross-referencing as needed to more detailed explanations provided under Section F (which covers the processes affecting attainment of project results). Were key stakeholders appropriately involved in producing the programmed outputs?

C. Effectiveness: Attainment of Objectives and Planned Results

25. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project's objectives were effectively achieved or are expected to be achieved.

26. The Theory of Change (ToC) of a project depicts the causal pathways from project outputs (goods and services delivered by the project) through outcomes (changes resulting from the use made by key stakeholders of project outputs) towards impact (long term changes in environmental benefits and living conditions). The ToC will also depict any intermediate changes required between project outcomes and impact, called 'intermediate states'. The ToC further defines the external factors that influence change along the major pathways; i.e. factors that affect whether one result can lead to the next. These external factors are either drivers (when the project has a certain level of control) or assumptions (when the project has no control). The ToC also clearly identifies the main stakeholders involved in the change processes.

27. The evaluation will reconstruct the ToC of the project based on a review of project documentation and stakeholder interviews. The evaluator will be expected to discuss the reconstructed ToC with the stakeholders during evaluation missions and/or interviews in order to ascertain the causal pathways identified and the validity of impact drivers and assumptions described in the ToC. This exercise will also enable the consultants to address some of the key evaluation questions and make adjustments to the TOC as appropriate (the ToC of the intervention may have been modified / adapted from the original design during project implementation).

28. The assessment of effectiveness will be structured in three sub-sections:

(a) Evaluation of the achievement of outcomes as defined in the reconstructed ToC. These are the first level outcomes expected to be achieved as an immediate result of project outputs. For this project, the main question will be to what extent the project has contributed to [(i) actionable research findings generated and validated with the selected sub-sectors; (ii) packages of information, research data and experiences on adaptation to CV/CC shared regionally; (iii) major public investment proposals per country that have incorporated the implications of climate variability and change in the selected sectors (number) attributed to project; and (iv) Pilot investments supported by the project undertaken according to defined criteria. Additional questions would be to what extent the project [i) reducing the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change; (ii) strengthening institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation; and (iii) integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes].

(b) Assessment of the likelihood of impact using a Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) approach. The evaluation will assess to what extent the project has to date contributed, and is likely in the future to further generate strong climate change scientific evidence to fill gaps of information that can be used in policies that in turn lead to positive changes environment and human wellbeing. The evaluation will also

consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead to unintended negative effects (project documentation relating to Environmental, Social and Economic. Safeguards)

(c) Evaluation of the achievement of the formal project overall objective, overall purpose, goals and component outcomes using the project's own results statements as presented in the Project Document. This sub-section will refer back where applicable to the preceding sub-sections (a) and (b) to avoid repetition in the report. To measure achievement, the evaluation will use as much as appropriate the indicators for achievement proposed in the Logical Framework (Logframe) of the project, adding other relevant indicators as appropriate. Briefly explain what factors affected the project's success in achieving its objectives, cross-referencing as needed to more detailed explanations provided under Section F. Most commonly, the overall objective is a higher-level result to which the project is intended to contribute. The section will describe the actual or likely contribution of the project to the objective.

(d) The evaluation should, where possible, disaggregate outcomes and impacts for the key project stakeholders. It should also assess the extent to which HR and GE were integrated in the Theory of Change and results framework of the intervention and to what degree participating institutions/organizations changed their policies or practices thereby leading to the fulfilment of HR and GE principles (e.g. new services, greater responsiveness, resource re-allocation, etc.)

D. Sustainability and replication

29. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived results and impacts after the external project funding and assistance ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of benefits. Some of these factors might be direct results of the project while others will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not under control of the project but that may condition the sustainability of benefits. The evaluation will ascertain that the project has put in place an appropriate exit strategy and measures to mitigate risks to sustainability. The reconstructed ToC will assist in the evaluation of sustainability, as the drivers and assumptions required to achieve higher-level results are often similar to the factors affecting sustainability of these changes.

30. Four aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

(a) **Socio-political sustainability.** Are there any social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project results and progress towards impacts? Is the level of ownership by the main stakeholders sufficient to allow for the project results to be sustained? Are there sufficient government and other key stakeholder awareness, interests, commitment and incentives to incorporate and institutionalize climate variability and climate change considerations into management approaches, methodologies, planning tools, experiences, and guidelines? Did the project conduct 'succession planning' and implement this during the life of the project? Was capacity building conducted for key stakeholders? Did the intervention activities aim to promote (and did they promote) positive sustainable changes in attitudes, behaviours and power relations between the different stakeholders? To what extent has the integration of HR and GE led to an increase in the likelihood of sustainability of project results?

(b) **Financial resources.** To what extent are the continuation of project results and the eventual impact of the project dependent on financial resources? What is the likelihood that adequate financial resources will be or will become available to use capacities built by the project? Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project results and onward progress towards impact?

(c) **Institutional framework.** To what extent is the sustenance of the results and onward progress towards impact dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? How robust are the institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. required to sustaining project results and to lead those to impact on human behaviour and environmental resources, goods or services?

(d) Environmental sustainability. Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher-level results that are likely to affect the environment, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits? Are there any foreseeable negative environmental impacts that may occur as the project results are being up-scaled?

31. Catalytic role and replication. The catalytic role of CAF interventions is embodied in their approach of supporting the creation of an enabling environment and of investing in pilot activities which are innovative and showing how new approaches can work. CAF also aims to support activities that upscale new approaches to a national, regional or global level, with a view to achieve sustainable global environmental benefits. The evaluation will assess the catalytic role played by this project, namely to what extent the project has:

(a) catalysed behavioural changes in terms of use and application, by the relevant stakeholders, of capacities developed;

(b) provided incentives (social, economic, market based, competencies etc.) to contribute to catalysing changes in stakeholder behaviour;

(c) contributed to institutional changes, for instance institutional uptake of project-demonstrated technologies, practices or management approaches;

(d) contributed to policy changes (on paper and in implementation of policy);

(e) contributed to sustained follow-on financing (catalytic financing) from Governments, private sector, donors etc.;

(f) created opportunities for particular individuals or institutions (“champions”) to catalyse change (without which the project would not have achieved all of its results).

32. Replication is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated (experiences are repeated and lessons applied in different geographic areas) or scaled up (experiences are repeated and lessons applied in the same geographic area but on a much larger scale and funded by other sources). The evaluation will assess the approach adopted by the project to promote replication effects and determine to what extent actual replication has already occurred, or is likely to occur in the near future. What are the factors that may influence replication and scaling up of project experiences and lessons?

E. Efficiency

33. The evaluation will assess the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. It will describe any cost- or time-saving measures put in place in attempting to bring the project as far as possible in achieving its results within its (severely constrained) secured budget and (extended) time. It will also analyse how delays, if any, have affected project execution, costs and effectiveness. Wherever possible, costs and time over results ratios of the project will be compared with that of other similar interventions. The evaluation will also assess the extent to which HR and GE were allocated specific and adequate budget in relation to the results achieved.

34. The evaluation will give special attention to efforts by the project teams to make use of/build upon preexisting institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency. For instance, the *Programa Amazonia Sin Fuego (PASF)* in Ecuador, the Project of *Construcción de las Torrenteras de Silala Omereque – Mula Mayu* in Bolivia, and the Project of *Implementación del componente de planificación de la política nacional para la gestión integral del recurso hídrico* in Colombia.

F. Factors and processes affecting project performance

35. Preparation and readiness. This criterion focusses on the quality of project design and preparation. Were project stakeholders adequately identified and were they sufficiently involved in project development and ground truthing e.g. of proposed timeframe and budget? Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Are potentially negative environmental, economic and social impacts of projects identified? Were the capacities of executing agencies properly considered when the project was designed? Was the project document clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities) and enabling legislation assured? Were adequate project management arrangements in place? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? What factors influenced the quality-at-entry of the project design, choice of partners, allocation of financial resources etc.? Were any design weaknesses mentioned in the Project Review Committee minutes at the time of project approval adequately addressed?

36. Project implementation and management. This includes an analysis of implementation approaches used by the project, its management framework, the project's adaptation to changing conditions and responses to changing risks including safeguard issues (adaptive management), the performance of the implementation arrangements and partnerships, relevance of changes in project design, and overall performance of project management. The evaluation will:

(a) Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been followed and were effective in delivering project milestones, outputs and outcomes. Were pertinent adaptations made to the approaches originally proposed?

(b) Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of project management and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project.

(c) Assess the role and performance of the teams and working groups established and the project execution arrangements at all levels.

(d) Assess the extent to which project management responded to direction and guidance provided by the CAF Task Manager and supervisor and project steering bodies including

(e) Identify operational and political / institutional problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project, and how the project tried to overcome these problems.

37. Stakeholder participation, cooperation and partnerships. The Evaluation will assess the effectiveness of mechanisms for information sharing and cooperation with other CAF projects and programmes, external stakeholders and partners. The term stakeholder should be considered in the broadest sense, encompassing both project partners and target users as public officials, decision makers at national and subnational levels, scientific community and local beneficiaries of project products. The ToC and stakeholder analysis should assist the evaluators in identifying the key stakeholders and their respective roles, capabilities and motivations in each step of the causal pathways from activities to achievement of outputs, outcomes and intermediate states towards impact. The assessment will look at three related and often overlapping processes: (1) information dissemination to and between stakeholders, (2) consultation with and between stakeholders, and (3) active engagement of stakeholders in project decision making and activities. The evaluation will specifically assess:

(a) the approach(es) and mechanisms used to identify and engage stakeholders (within and outside CAF) in project design and at critical stages of project implementation. What were the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches with respect to the project's objectives and the stakeholders' motivations and capacities?

(b) How was the overall collaboration between different units of CAF involved in the project? What coordination mechanisms were in place? Were the incentives for internal collaboration in CAF adequate?

(c) Was the level of involvement of the CAF Executives at each country in project design, planning, decision-making and implementation of activities appropriate?

(d) Has the project made full use of opportunities for collaboration with other projects and programmes including opportunities not mentioned in the Project Document? Have complementarities been sought, synergies been optimized and duplications avoided?

(e) What was the achieved degree and effectiveness of collaboration and interactions between the various project partners and stakeholders during design and implementation of the project? This should be disaggregated for the main stakeholder groups identified in the inception report.

(f) To what extent has the project been able to take up opportunities for joint activities, pooling of resources and mutual learning with other organizations and networks? In particular, how useful are partnership mechanisms and initiatives such as supporting Governments priorities in sectors where alliances at different levels (national, sub-national, local) have already been formed and multi-sector planning activities are already on their way to build stronger coherence and collaboration between participating organisations? (For example, the Grupo de Trabajo Multisectorial para la implementación de las NDC (GTM-NDC) in Peru and its equivalent in Ecuador).

(g) How did the relationship between the project and the collaborating partners (institutions and individual experts) develop? Which benefits stemmed from their involvement for project performance, for CAF and for the stakeholders and partners themselves? Do the results of the project (strategic programmes and plans, monitoring and management systems, sub-regional agreements etc.) promote participation of stakeholders, including users, in environmental decision making?

38. Communication and public awareness. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of any public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project to communicate the project's objective, progress, outcomes and lessons. This should be disaggregated for the main stakeholder groups identified in the inception report. Did the project identify and make use of existing communication channels and networks used by key stakeholders? Did the project provide feedback channels?

39. Country ownership and driven-ness. The evaluation will assess the degree and effectiveness of involvement of government / public sector agencies in the project, in particular those involved in project execution and those participating in project Steering Committee, Institutional cooperation agreements for the implementation of adaptation measures preparation of studies and production of scientific evidence, policy development: (a) To what extent have Governments assumed responsibility for the project and provided adequate support to project execution, including the degree of cooperation received from the various public institutions involved in the project? (b) How and how well did the project stimulate country and local ownership of project outputs and outcomes? (c) How and how well did the countries supported the inclusion and guidelines of the norms and guidelines of the Environmental and Social Safeguards for the CAF / GEF Project Manual, including gender safeguards.

40. Financial planning and management. Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. The assessment will look at actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. The evaluation will:

(a) Verify the application of proper standards (clarity, transparency, audit etc.) and timeliness of financial planning, management and reporting to ensure that sufficient and timely financial resources were available to the project and its partners;

(b) Assess other administrative processes such as recruitment of staff, procurement of goods and services (including consultants), preparation and negotiation of cooperation agreements etc. to the extent that these might have influenced project performance;

(c) Present the extent to which co-financing has materialized as expected at project approval (see Table 1). Report country co-financing to the project overall, and to support project activities at the national level in particular. The evaluation will provide a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the different project components.

(d) Describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective. Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.

41. Analyse the effects on project performance of any irregularities in procurement, use of financial resources and human resource management, and the measures taken CAF to prevent such irregularities in the future. Determine whether the measures taken were adequate.

42. Supervision, guidance and technical backstopping. The purpose of supervision is to verify the quality and timeliness of project execution in terms of finances, administration and achievement of outputs and outcomes, in order to identify and recommend ways to deal with problems which arise during project execution. Such problems may be related to project management but may also involve technical/institutional substantive issues in which CAF has a major contribution to make.

43. The evaluators should assess the effectiveness of supervision, guidance and technical support provided by the different supervising/supporting bodies including:

(a) The adequacy of project supervision plans, M&E systems, inputs and processes;

(b) The realism and candour of project reporting and the emphasis given to outcome monitoring (results-based project management);

(c) How well did the different guidance and backstopping bodies play their role and how well did the guidance and backstopping mechanisms work? What were the strengths in guidance and backstopping and what were the limiting factors?

44. Monitoring and evaluation. The evaluation will include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The evaluation will assess how information generated by the M&E system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensuring sustainability. M&E is assessed on three levels:

M&E Design. The evaluators should use the following questions to help assess the M&E design aspects:

- Arrangements for monitoring: Did the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? Have the responsibilities for M&E activities been clearly defined? Were the data sources and data collection instruments appropriate? Was the time frame for various M&E activities specified? Was the frequency of various monitoring activities specified and adequate?
- How well was the project logical framework (original and possible updates) designed as a planning and monitoring instrument?
- SMART-ness of indicators: Are there specific indicators in the log frame for each of the project objectives? Are the indicators measurable, attainable (realistic) and relevant to the objectives? Are the indicators time-bound?
- Adequacy of baseline information: To what extent has baseline information on performance indicators been collected and presented in a clear manner? Was the methodology for the baseline data collection explicit and reliable? For instance, was there adequate baseline information on pre-existing accessible information on global and regional environmental status

and trends, and on the costs and benefits of different policy options for the different target audiences? Was there sufficient information about the assessment capacity of collaborating institutions and experts etc. to determine their training and technical support needs?

- To what extent did the project engage key stakeholders in the design and implementation of monitoring? Which stakeholders (from groups identified in the inception report) were involved? If any stakeholders were excluded, what was the reason for this? Was sufficient information collected on specific indicators to measure progress on HR and GE (including sex-disaggregated data)?
- Did the project appropriately plan to monitor risks associated with Environmental Economic and Social Safeguards?
- Arrangements for evaluation: Have specific targets been specified for project outputs? Has the desired level of achievement been specified for all indicators of objectives and outcomes? Were there adequate provisions in the legal instruments binding project partners to fully collaborate in evaluations?
- Budgeting and funding for M&E activities: Determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

(b) M&E Plan Implementation. The evaluation will verify that:

- the M&E system was operational and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period;
- PIR reports were prepared (the realism of the Task Manager's assessments will be reviewed)
- Half-yearly Progress & Financial Reports were complete and accurate;
- Risk monitoring (including safeguard issues) was regularly documented
- the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs.

G. The Evaluation Team

45. The profile of the evaluation team carrying out the assessment is described in Annex 2 of these ToRs. The lead evaluator should have 15 years of technical / evaluation experience, including of evaluation large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach; and a broad understanding of large-scale, consultative assessment processes and factors influencing the use of assessments and/or scientific research for decision-making.

46. The lead consultant will work with local consultants based at each country programme and in charge of the data collection and analysis processes. The lead consultant will be in charge of the identification and contracting of the local consultants and be in charge of the preparation of the main report ensuring that all evaluation criteria and questions are adequately covered.

47. By undersigning the service contract with CAF, the lead consultant and evaluation team certify that they have not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project's executing or implementing units.

H. Evaluation Deliverables and Review Procedures

48. The evaluation team will prepare an inception report (see Annex 3 of ToRs for Inception Report outline) containing a thorough review of the project context, project design quality, a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, the evaluation framework and a tentative evaluation schedule.

49. It is expected that a large portion of the desk review will be conducted during the inception phase. It will be important to acquire a good understanding of the project context, design and process at this stage. The review of design quality will cover the following aspects: (see Annex 4 for the detailed Guidelines and project evaluation matrix):

- Strategic relevance of the project
- Preparation and readiness;
- Financial planning;
- M&E design;
- Complementarity with CAF strategies and programmes;
- Sustainability considerations and measures planned to promote replication and up-scaling.

50. The inception report will present a draft, desk-based reconstructed Theory of Change of the project. It is vital to reconstruct the ToC before most of the data collection (review of progress reports, in-depth interviews, surveys etc.) is done, because the ToC will define which direct outcomes, drivers and assumptions of the project need to be assessed and measured – based on which indicators – to allow adequate data collection for the evaluation of project effectiveness, likelihood of impact and sustainability.

51. The inception report will also include a stakeholder analysis identifying key stakeholders, networks and channels of communication. This information should be gathered from the Project document and discussion with the project team.

52. The evaluation framework will present in further detail the overall evaluation approach. It will specify for each evaluation question under the various criteria what the respective indicators and data sources will be. The evaluation framework should summarize the information available from project documentation against each of the main evaluation parameters. Any gaps in information should be identified and methods for additional data collection, verification and analysis should be specified. Evaluations/reviews of other large assessments can provide ideas about the most appropriate evaluation methods to be used.

53. Effective communication strategies help stakeholders understand the results and use the information for organisational learning and improvement. While the evaluation is expected to result in a comprehensive document, content is not always best shared in a long and detailed report; this is best presented in a synthesised form using any of a variety of creative and innovative methods. The evaluator is encouraged to make use of multimedia formats in the gathering of information e.g. video, photos, sound recordings. Together with the full report, the evaluator will be expected to produce an executive summary of key findings and lessons.

54. The inception report will also present a tentative schedule for the overall evaluation process, including a draft programme for field visits and tentative list of people/institutions to be interviewed.

55. The inception report will be submitted for review and approval by CAF before any further data collection and analysis is undertaken.

56. When data collection and analysis has almost been completed, the evaluation team will prepare a short note on preliminary findings and recommendations for discussion with the CAF TM . The purpose of the note is to allow the evaluation team to receive guidance on the relevance and validity of the main findings emerging from the evaluation.

57. The main evaluation report should be brief (no longer than 40 pages – excluding the executive summary and annexes), to the point and written in plain English. The report will follow the annotated Table of Contents outlined in Annex 3. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used (with their limitations). The report will present evidence-based and balanced findings, consequent conclusions, lessons and recommendations, which will be cross-referenced to each other. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in footnote or annex as appropriate. To avoid repetitions in the report, the author will use numbered paragraphs and make cross-references where possible.

58. Review of the draft evaluation report. The evaluation team will submit a zero-draft report to the CAF Task Manager and revise the draft following the comments and suggestions made by the TM.

59. Once a draft of adequate quality has been accepted, the TM will share this first draft report with the Executing Agency, who will alert CAF in case the report would contain any blatant factual errors. The EA will then forward the first draft report to the other project stakeholders, Steering Committee (National Focal Points) and National Technical Coordinators for their review and feedback to the observations outlined in the report. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. It is also very important that stakeholders provide feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Comments would be expected within two weeks after the draft report has been shared. Any feedback to the draft report will be sent to the EA for collation. The EA will provide the comments to CAF TM who after reviewing them will provide to the evaluation team for consideration in preparing the final draft report, along with its own views.

60. The evaluation team will submit to CAF the revised draft report in English to CAF including a Recommendations Implementation Plan in the format of a table no later than 2 weeks after reception of stakeholder comments. The evaluation team will prepare a response to comments, listing those comments not or only partially accepted by them that could therefore not or only partially be accommodated in the final report. They will explain why those comments have not or only partially been accepted, providing evidence as required. This response to comments will be shared by the TM with the EA and interested stakeholders to ensure full transparency. The TM will share this draft version with the GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office for their inputs and comments

61. Once the draft report has been reviewed by the GEF Secretariat, the TM will share the draft report with the evaluation team to finalize the evaluation report.

62. Submission of the final evaluation report. The final report shall be submitted by Email to the CAF Task manager in English and through a brief presentation to the EA and key project stakeholders. Special attention will be given to the recommendations identified in the Evaluation and the plan outlined for their implementation. The TM will share the report and share it with the interested Divisions within CAF. The final evaluation report will be published on the CAF website.

63. The CAF TM will assess the ratings in the evaluation report based on a careful review of the evidence collated by the evaluation team and the internal consistency of the report. Where there are differences of opinion between the evaluator and CAF TM on project ratings, both viewpoints will be clearly presented in the final report. The CAF TM ratings will be considered the final ratings for the project.

64. The Recommendations Implementation should be completed and updated at regular intervals by the Executing Agency. After reception of the Recommendations Implementation Plan, the EA is expected to complete it and return it to the TM within one month. (S)he is expected to update the plan every six month until the end of the tracking period. As this is a Mid-term Evaluation, speedy implementation of the recommendations is key and the period over which recommendation implementation will be tracked is therefore limited to one year, with two update points at 6 and 12 months after completion of the implementation plan.

65. Unless specified differently, all working documents will be submitted in Spanish. Final deliverables listed in this section of the ToRs will be submitted in English.

1. Logistical arrangements

66. This Mid-term Evaluation will be undertaken by an evaluation team contracted by CAF. The team of consultants will work under the overall responsibility of the CAF and will consult with the TM and Supervisor on any procedural and methodological matters related to the evaluation. It is, however, the responsibility of the consultants to arrange for their travel in country, obtain documentary evidence, plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, and any other logistical matters related to the assignment within the available budget for the evaluation. The CAF, CONDESAN as Executing agency and

project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the evaluation team to conduct the evaluation as efficiently and independently as possible.

67. The budget available for executing the Mid-term Evaluation is USD 30,000.00. The budget includes fees, per diems for travel expenses and ground transport at each of the four countries where the assessment will be undertaken.

J. Schedule of the evaluation

68. Table 3 below presents the tentative schedule for the evaluation. The total duration of the MTR will be 96 days approximately and will not exceed 3 months from the time of hiring the evaluation team. The provisional schedule of the MTR is as follows:

Table 5. Schedule of the evaluation

Days (calendar)	Activities	Responsible
7	Review of project documentation and preparation of the Inception Report	Evaluation team
4	Review of the Inception Report	CAF
20	Evaluation (including field visits to each project implementation area (4 countries))	Evaluation team
1	Presentation of short note and preliminary findings and recommendations to CAF	Evaluation team
10	Preparation of the zero-draft report	Evaluation team
5	Review of the zero-draft report	CAF
3	Revised draft report and sharing with EA	Evaluation team
14	Review and feedback of the draft report by the executing agency and project stakeholders	Executing Agency & Project Stakeholders
11	Review of draft report and submission of revised report	Evaluation team
14	Review by GEF Secretariat and GEF evaluation office	GEF
5	Incorporation of the audit trail from the data offered in the draft report and Finalization of the MTR report.	Evaluation team
1	Presentation of the final report to EA and Project Stakeholders	Evaluation team
1	Publication of the Report on the CAF website	CAF