

**Final Evaluation Report for the Community Based Adaptation Programme**

**(CBA)**

**Project PIMS 3508**

**Evaluation time frame: October – November 2012**

**Regions included in the project: Global**

**Countries included in the Project: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Guatemala, Jamaica,**

**Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Samoa, and Viet Nam**

**GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program: GEF Strategic Priority Piloting  
an Operational Approach to Adaptation/ Strategic Priority on Adaptation**

**(SPA)**

**Implementing Partner and other project partners: UNDP, UNV, GEF, UNOPS,**

**GEF SGP and Governments of the Ten Pilot Countries**

**Evaluation Consultant: Maria Onestini**

---

April, 2013

## **Acknowledgements**

An external consultant prepared this report. The evaluation consultant would like to acknowledge and thank all who graciously shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews and consultations that took place as part of this process. In particular, the consultant would like to thank Mr. Charles Nyandiga and Ms. Anna Lisa Jose for their support and openness throughout the evaluation and the SGP National Coordinators and the UNV's based in the pilot countries for their contributions and valuable support.

In addition, to the project management staff, the evaluator would like to recognize excellent contributions from Mr. Delfin Ganapin, the GEF SGP Global Manager, Mr. Nick Remple of the Communities Resilience and Sustainability Team, Ms. Diana Salvemini of the COMDEKS Project, Ms. Lucy Wanjiru of UNDP Gender Team, Mr. Alan Fox of the UNDP Evaluation Office, Mr. Charles McNeill and Ms. Jennifer Laughlin of Energy and Environment Team, all from UNDP New York. Similarly, thanks are extended to the Multi Donor Trust Funds (MDTF), and Ms. Mari Matsumoto, Portfolio Advisor.

Furthermore, the consultant would like to recognize the valuable contributions made by Mr. Ghulam Isazcai, Mr. Oliver Wittershagen, and Ms. Daniela Tarizzo of UNV.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Project Summary Table.....	5
Brief Project Description.....	6
Evaluation Rating Table.....	7
Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons.....	9
iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	12
1. Introduction.....	13
Purpose of the Evaluation.....	13
Scope and Methodology.....	13
Structure of the Evaluation Report.....	14
2. Project description and development context.....	15
Project Start and Duration.....	15
Problems that the Project Sought to Address.....	15
Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project.....	15
Baseline Indicators Established.....	15
Main Stakeholders.....	16
Expected Results.....	18
3. Findings.....	19
3.1 Project Design / Formulation.....	19
Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic / Strategy; Indicators).....	19
Assumptions and Risks.....	21
Planned stakeholder participation.....	21
Replication approach.....	22
UNDP comparative advantage.....	22
Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector.....	23
Management arrangements.....	23
3.2 Project Implementation.....	24
Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) .....	24
Project Finance.....	24
Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation.....	24

UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution: coordination, and operational issues .....	25
3.3 Project Results .....	26
Overall results (attainment of objectives) .....	26
Relevance .....	26
Effectiveness and Efficiency .....	31
Country-level local interventions .....	34
Cross-cutting Issues: Volunteering and Volunteerism .....	36
Cross-cutting Issues: Gender .....	37
Instruments and Knowledge Management Products .....	37
Country and local ownership .....	38
Mainstreaming .....	38
Sustainability .....	39
Impact .....	39
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons .....	41
5. Annexes .....	45

ii. Executive Summary

**Project Summary Table**

Project Title:	Community - Based Adaptation Programme (CBA)			
GEF Project ID:	3508		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	54763	GEF financing:	4.5	4.5
Country:	Global	IA/EA own:		0
Region:		Government:	.965	.965
Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation	Other:	1.55 (UNV <sup>1</sup> ), 0.375 Ausaid 0.4 (GOJ), 0.19(GOS)	1.55 (UNV), 0.375 (Ausaid) 0.4 (GOJ), 0.19 (GOS)
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP4-Cross cutting capacity building;  OP3- Integrated Land and Water multiple focal area	Total co-financing:	2.2	2.2
Executing Agency:	UNOPS	Total Project Cost:	6.7	6.7
Other Partners involved:	UNV, GEFSG, UNOPS, 10 Governments of pilot Countries.	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		18 February 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: February 2013	Actual: March 2013

<sup>1</sup> This contribution includes US\$ 1million from the Government of Japan.

## **Brief Project Description**

It is increasingly recognized that small communities, particularly in developing countries, are likely to be the most severely affected by climate change impacts and yet are least equipped to cope and adapt. This pilot project was designed to implement community-based projects that sought to enhance the resiliency of communities, and/or the ecosystems on which they rely on for their livelihood, to climate change negative impacts. It essentially created small-scale 'project/policy laboratories' and generated knowledge about how to achieve adaptation at the local level in developing countries.

In ten participating countries throughout different regions, a portfolio of community-level and community based adaptations projects were developed and implemented. The community projects took place in the following countries: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Samoa, and Vietnam.

The Community – Based Adaptation Programme also aimed at leveraging lessons learned from community projects to promote replication of successful community practices, and integration of lessons learned into policies that promote increased community adaptive capacity. This project, moreover, assisted in responding to the different partners' internal needs for concrete experience with local-scale climate change adaptation, as well as the growing needs of countries for ground-level experience and clear policy lessons.

The CBA Programme is collaboration between several different institutions that has been led by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) since 2008, with the GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) as the main delivery mechanism. In 2009, the UN Volunteers partnered with UNDP and GEF SGP to enhance community mobilization, recognize and promote volunteers' and volunteerism as a contribution to community-based adaptation and ensure inclusive participation throughout the CBA Programme. The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) is the primary donor while co-financing partners include UNV, the Government of Japan, the Government of Switzerland, and Government of Australia (AusAid).

## Evaluation Rating Table

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Comments	
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>		
Overall quality of M&E	<b>MS</b>	
<i>M&amp;E design at project start up</i>	<b>MS</b>	
<i>M&amp;E Plan Implementation</i>	<b>MS</b>	
<b>IA &amp; EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	<b>HS</b>	
<i>Implementing Agency Execution</i>	<b>HS</b>	
<i>Executing Agency Execution</i>	<b>HS</b>	
<b>Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	<b>HS</b>	
<i>Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)</i>	<b>R</b>	
<i>Effectiveness</i>	<b>HS</b>	
<i>Efficiency</i>	<b>HS</b>	
<b>Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).</b>		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	<b>L</b>	
<i>Financial resources</i>	<b>ML</b>	
<i>Socio-economic</i>	<b>L</b>	
<i>Institutional framework and governance</i>	<b>ML</b>	
<i>Environmental</i>	<b>L</b>	
<b>Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)</b>		
Community livelihoods and improvement of ecosystem status	<b>S</b>	
Vulnerability reduction of communities and their ecosystems	<b>S</b>	
Progress towards vulnerability reduction/status change in lifestyles and attitudes of project beneficiaries	<b>S</b>	
<b>Overall Project Results</b>	<b>S</b>	

The above chart attempts to rate the general project performance according to the scales stipulated by the Global Environmental Facility. These are used to assess monitoring and evaluation systems, outcomes, execution, and impact as well as overall project results. For these topics, a scale with these definitions is used as follows:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings
- Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings
- Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings
- Not applicable (N/A)
- Unable to assess (U/A).

Project sustainability is rated along a different scale, defined by the following standards:

- 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.
- Not Applicable (N/A)
- Unable to Assess (U/A).

## Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

The CBA Programme has been a very successful project, not only in regard to the pioneering of community-based approaches to climate change adaptation by vulnerable communities in developing countries, but also in terms of results and possible replication and scaling up. The following is a list of lessons learned and recommendations that are drawn from the information available.

### *Lessons learned*

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Much of the success of local activities was due to the fact that they were designed to address local needs, vulnerabilities, and perceptions, with the aim of sustaining livelihoods while adapting to climate change.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The approach of the CBA Programme and its projects (non-paternalistic, generating and building capacity and is community centered and driven in terms of planning, prioritizing activities, implementing and participatory evaluation of the actions on the ground) has been a key positive factor for success and effectiveness. Participatory approaches have ensured all voices to be heard, ensured ownership/accountability, which leads to sustainability when the project is over. Additionally, when the grantees have been empowered and skilled, become leaders and teach neighboring communities to replicate the environmental solutions leading to socio-economic impacts and further sustainable environmental impacts.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The application of community mobilization and participatory research Tools, instruments, knowledge products, and implementation methodologies have been successful when they are simple and easily comprehended by local community members to ensure that local groups are mobilized and local needs are addressed.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The incorporation of gender issues was a key positive aspect of the local to global activities, which were aggregated into knowledge management products for global dissemination.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Gender mainstreaming gave visibility of climate change issues upon women and worked towards equitable adaptation issues.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Since CBA projects are community based and managed, the civil society participation in all aspects of projects stages and simultaneous involvements of all sectors and demography's in the communities, especially the most vulnerable ones such as disabled, the poor and voiceless, need to be fully recognized and made to contribute in identifying current and future vulnerabilities to climate change. In addition, they should all be involved in formulating the response strategies and eventual monitoring of the projects. It is also important that volunteer work which, were key inputs in the process of CBA projects, contributed significantly to the success and provided opportunities for replication of the CBA projects.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The highly technical and complex application process should be commensurate with the capacities of the local communities to complete the process successfully. There was difficulty and also the application process was too technical and complex for the communities involved.</li></ul>

<p>But since one of the project's outputs is to build capacities of NGOs and communities, these were properly achieved.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Global partners' relations and inter-linkages were stressed at times, straining working relationships among the global partners and at the same time confounding national and local components of the Programme. Global partners' relations and expectations should be clearly marked and delineated from the projects' onset, defining working relationships, inputs by each partner, and joint visibility.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitoring processes were highly complex, multiple, and not commensurate with the sort of projects and the local capacities in project management. Out of this realization, the project management reviewed the monitoring and evaluation requirements immediately after the project launch in 2008. In addition, further simplification on the processes and a clear understanding of roles of partners (UNV, SGP and UNDP) required further modification and simplification which was carried out at the Global inception workshop in Jamaica (2009) based on feedback from field staff.</li> </ul>

***Recommendations for future actions***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Local climate change adaptation initiatives should be firmly anchored not only on technical knowledge but also on approach.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mainstreaming and scaling-up of the projects must be fully planned from the project design stages and properly resourced.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The incorporation of gender, volunteerism, and other cross cutting issues should be integrated into the design stage in order for them to be truly woven into the Programme and its activities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The methods for grant making and application processes for local activities such as those that were expected from this type of projects should be simplified and made commensurate with the aptitudes and abilities of communities a project or program is attempting to reach, especially given that capacity building in itself is also a deliverable and which requires adequate more time.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Global partners' relations and expectations should be clearly marked and delineated from the projects' onset, defining working relationships, inputs by each partner, and joint visibility.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Local activities should continue to build upon local needs, vulnerabilities and perceptions, and members of communities and other locally based actors should work to ensure synergies of efforts towards the implementation of measures that leads to adapting to impacts of climate change while sustaining livelihoods.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It would be of interest in future projects and programmes to assess the role of volunteerism , in all its forms, in the different community-based climate adaptation approaches as well as to set a value to it in order to provide volunteerism with a thorough visibility.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It would be useful to organize events to highlight the CBA initiative, its successes, not only to communicate this, but also to encourage networking among actors involved in climate change adaptation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In future, projects such as this one require that monitoring processes need to be streamlined to</li> </ul>

<p>take into considerations capacities of communities and to make it commensurate with the level of sophistication of project being monitored, by in-building ways and means to address local capacity needs.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitoring and other related vulnerability reduction assessments instruments should be structured and harmonized into one in order to avoid the use of multiple instruments or methods for assessing and monitoring various aspects of the project activities for local level interventions such as for CBA project. The augmented instrument or methodology in use for community based adaptation to climate change should not only be aimed at being streamlined in CC issues, but should also include cross cutting matters such as gender and other issues to avoid multiplicity of different types methodologies for assessing different aspects of the project.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Instruments, methodologies, and knowledge management products could be of benefit to the communities and other future practitioners if they are made highly understandable for such target groups, adapting and tailoring them to the different needs and abilities (for example, language, literacy rates, etc.).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To sustain project activities in the future, clear attempts should be made to build linkages among projects while being implemented and between the communities who are the beneficiaries of the projects with local and national authorities where this does not occur organically, and or reinforce this aspect when it does take place, in order to provide impulses to mainstream adaptation into policies.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Building strong linkages with municipal authority increases the chances of internalization of policy and sustainability. Therefore, the support of local and national governmental authorities needs to continue to be built, as it is already being practiced in the project, through a more targeted approach by enhanced outreach and communication of current results and achievements in order to sustain the results achieved during the pilot period.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It would be desirable that the implementation of the findings of this pilot program, in the future, should consider planning and generating several projects in a particular local area to have a greater critical mass of projects impacts in order to be easy to identify larger scale lessons, enjoy economies and benefits of greater impact, and have more leverage regarding adaptation policies.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is recommended that a much more simplified process that leads to the transformation of communities' attitudes, thinking and understanding on climate change impacts of the local communities should be facilitated, in a smoother and quick manner by the project during the initial trainings without compromising the technical quality required. This initial training is necessary because 'adaptation' to CC is a new concept for these communities and in some cases, for the countries involved in the project</li> </ul>

### **iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations**

ALM	Adaptation Learning Mechanism
CBA	Community-Based Adaptation
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CC	Climate Change
COP	Conference of Parties
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NCC	National Coordinating Committee
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
NSC	National Steering Committee
SIDS	Small Islands Developing States
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SPA	Strategic Priority on Adaptation
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

# 1. Introduction

## Purpose of the Evaluation

The general purpose of this final evaluation is to assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, mainstreaming, impact, sustainability and timeliness of the project's implementation. Furthermore, this evaluation has also (as do all evaluations for GEF financed projects) have these complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments.
- To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities.
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.
- To contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit.
- To gauge the extent of project convergence with other priorities within the UNDP country program, including poverty alleviation, and reducing disaster risk and vulnerability, as well as crosscutting imperatives on empowering women and supporting human rights.<sup>2</sup>

## Scope and Methodology

Since this is a final evaluation, it serves the purpose of a summative assessment at the completion (or near completion) phase of the Community – Adaptation Project. Given that this is a summative evaluation conducted at the end of this initiative, it also has imbedded as a scope to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced. It is intended, also, to provide information about the substance of the project itself. Furthermore, it must be noted that the scope of the evaluation is of the project throughout its whole life span.

---

<sup>2</sup> UNDP EVALUATION GUIDANCE FOR GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS VERSION FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATORS. (FINAL DRAFT, MARCH 17TH 2011).

The scope of the evaluation is also circumscribed as an assessment of the Programme all-together or as a unity. It is not the mandate of this evaluation to examine the projects' components individually. The mandate is to evaluate the Programme as a whole.

The methodology and approach utilized in this exercise closely follows the guidelines proposed for this type of assessments. The evaluation has aimed at gathering, processing, and providing evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, as indicated in relevant guidelines. Furthermore, then, an approach that is participatory and consultative has been followed, involving not only project teams, program partners, but also other national and local stakeholders.

The data collection was based on standard evaluation methods, among them instruments such as questionnaires, interviews, document review and direct observation. For the questionnaires to be used in teleconferences and meetings, the criteria were operationalized in semi-structured instruments with open-ended questions asked to the relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, questionnaires were developed, aimed at different stakeholders. Since this evaluation was mostly desk-based, it relied heavily on different sources of information, and knowledge management products such as project documents and reports, manuals, policy briefs, project videos, etc.

As part of the data gathering stage, a mission to United Nations Headquarters took place in order to hold fact-finding meetings with program staff and relevant UN officials involved in the CBA Programme. A list of stakeholders contacted is appended to this report.

With regard to scope and methodology, some limitations must be pointed out. First, there were no field visit to a project site or a selected sampling of sites envisaged before the completion of the assessment. In addition, since the evaluation took place at the same time as the completion and wrap-up of the CBA's different components, much of the country specific documentation was only made available within the very last phases of this exercise. Furthermore, the timing of the whole evaluation was rather tight in terms of the period and resources. All of the above could, foreseeable, have hindered to some degree the robustness of the data gathered and the capacity to process the information obtained.

### **Structure of the Evaluation Report**

This evaluation report follows standard suggested UNDP/GEF evaluation reports structure. The evaluation report describes selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis as well as the rationale for their selection, acknowledging constraints and limitations. This report contains a description of the CBA Programme, followed by the development context in which the project was implemented. Next, there are descriptions of design and project formulation, as well as process aspects. The program results are also described. The report goes on to provide an analysis, following the criteria relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, mainstreaming, impact as well as sustainability, and timeliness of the project's implementation. The Programme's overall performance was also rated. Lastly, the evaluation report contains a series of lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations for the future.

## **2. Project description and development context**

### **Project Start and Duration**

The project formally began upon the signature of the Project Document on February 18 2008. Its operational closing date is March of 2013 with financial closure in June 2013.

### **Problems that the Project Sought to Address**

The basic problem the project sought to address is how communities in developing countries can adapt to the negative climate change impacts they experience. The impacts of climate change are experienced most severely by poor and vulnerable communities. These communities are central to the design and implementation of adaptation measures and processes. Communities need to adopt or develop innovations to current practice and enhance their own innovation skills as a fundamental part of adaptive management to meet changing conditions.

### **Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project**

The immediate and development objective of the project as a whole has been to foster communities' resiliency and local sustainable development in light of climate change-related vulnerabilities. It has aimed at fostering adaptive capacity objectives at the local level of vulnerable developing country communities. Furthermore, the CBA Programme had immediate and development objectives to improve local institutional capacities to manage natural resources sustainably in the face of climate change within communities.<sup>3</sup>

### **Baseline Indicators Established**

Besides the baseline analysis carried out as part of the CBA Programme's preparation, in each of the countries the Programme fostered activities to conduct baseline indicator measurements with the target communities. A baseline vulnerability valuation was carried out using the Vulnerability Reduction Assessment as an instrument for this exercise. The baseline VRA was used as a required component of each of the interventions given that the information generated was intended to be used in evaluating and monitoring each individual community project. As part of community-level inception of each project, appropriate baseline indicators were identified as a result of VRA consultations.

---

<sup>3</sup> These aims, as indicated in the Project Document, would also link to appropriate UNDAF outcomes. It has been specifically indicated that "Country-drivenness is a key principle behind the CBA programme, and community-driven interventions are leveraged to contribute to national climate change adaptation priorities. This is ensured through CBA National Coordinating Committees in each country, which consider CBA project proposals for approval based on criteria including technical feasibility, project quality, and consistency with national adaptation priorities" [www.undp-alm.org](http://www.undp-alm.org) .

## Main Stakeholders

The stakeholders in the project can be considered at three levels: local, national and global, as indicated initially in the Project Document and as involved throughout the project's life span. A typology of key stakeholders is indicated in the table below.

**Table 1 CBA's Stakeholders**

<p><b>Global Level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ GEF</li><li>▪ GEF SGP</li><li>▪ UNDP</li><li>▪ UNOPS</li><li>▪ UNV</li><li>▪ Other Partners</li></ul>
<p><b>National Level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ National Coordinating Committee (NCC)</li><li>▪ SGP Country Programme</li><li>▪ Government focal points</li><li>▪ National UN Volunteers</li><li>▪ International UN Volunteers</li><li>▪ National IA project staff</li><li>▪ NGO's</li><li>▪ Other development partners</li></ul>
<p><b>Local Level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Community Groups</li><li>▪ NGOs</li><li>▪ CBOs</li><li>▪ Local governments</li><li>▪ Trade associations</li><li>▪ Farmers associations</li></ul>

- Women’s groups
- Other local stakeholders

***Institutional arrangements***

Below is a table of management arrangements throughout the 5-year project period which is useful in contextualizing the implementation arrangements and complexities experienced in the project.

<p>In 2008 the implementation of the CBA Project, a five-year global initiative that was designed and led by UNDP, began. GEF is the primary funder with GEF SGP used as the delivery mechanism in 9 out of 10 countries. In Bangladesh, a GEF non-SGP country, the projects were delivered through the UNDP country office through its Local Disaster Risk Reduction Fund of the UNDP/GoB Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board members included: GEF, UNV, UNDP and GEF SGP</li> <li>• Global Project Management Unit: Project Coordinator and Programme Associate in NY headquarters</li> <li>• National Project Management: GEF SGP National Coordinators and Programme Associates/ Assistants</li> </ul>
<p>In 2009 UN Volunteers partnered with UNDP and GEF SGP in 7 out of the 10 countries (Bolivia, Guatemala, Jamaica, Morocco, Namibia, Niger and Samoa). National UNVs were hired for 6 countries, while an International UNV was hired for Morocco. At the global level, the Adaptation and Volunteerism Specialist stationed in Dakar, Senegal, was part of PMU and reported both to the CBA PC and a UNV focal point in Bonn.</p> <p>This arrangement remained through June 2011. The A&amp;V Specialist was replaced in an interim basis by a focal point at UNV headquarters and in</p>
<p>In 2012, UNV HQ focal point changed and a Volunteerism M&amp;E Specialist joined on March 2012.</p>

As seen in the above table, the project applied the ‘UN as ONE’ approach which allowed complementarity of institutional and technical strengths. However, as like any other multi-layer group, the dynamics may cause bottlenecks. It is crucial that partners’ relations and expectations are clearly marked and delineated from the projects’ onset, working relationships and inputs are clearly defined, and joint visibility is upheld. This should happen in all levels: global, national, and local. Furthermore, partners’ global fund raising efforts should be based on strong partnership agreements between associates that bring to the table their institutional and technical strengths.

All in all, the project, notwithstanding its limitations and problems, has been a very successful Programme. In order to reinforce initial benefits and build upon them, future directions should reinforce the positive aspects of the community-based approach and build upon what has been achieved. Efforts should be made to sustain the community-based approach, building on and strengthening local capacities to deal with climate change adaptation. The CBA Programme has generated awareness that community based approaches to climate change adaptation are feasible, cost effective and can accommodate the fairly complex rigors required from science based projects. These

are the strengths this project has demonstrated and should build upon for future CBA projects, scaling-up and mainstreaming lessons from such small initiatives.

### **Expected Results**

The expected results of the CBA Programme were various and at different levels. First of all, it was expected that the on-the-ground projects would provide evidence of the potential for building community resilience to the negative impacts of climate change through a community based approach aimed at reducing vulnerability to these impacts. Analysis of the evidence would provide lessons learned for wider application, adaptive management and policy inputs. At the same time, in order to achieve enhanced resilience across broader geographic areas, it would be necessary to construct a system for replicating and mainstreaming the lessons and good practices identified. It was also expected that the CBA Programme would foster the incorporation of crosscutting issues, such as gender and volunteerism in community action. Furthermore, it was also expected that each local project could contribute to the Programme's overall results based on a detailed results framework.

### 3. Findings <sup>4</sup>

#### 3.1 Project Design / Formulation

##### Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic / Strategy; Indicators)

The Logical Framework methodology is a tool to facilitate a project’s conceptualization, design, implementation and evaluation. Its emphasis is based in determining objectives, in particular as they relate to beneficiaries, and to facilitate participation and communication between stakeholders. It expresses goals, objectives, and expected outcomes and outputs for the project at a global level. It also cross-references these with indicators (both baseline and target), sources of verification, risks and assumptions. In summary, it threads the logic of a project with its strategy and expected results.

The CBA Programme’s Logical Framework<sup>5</sup> expresses three specific outcomes, and within each outcome, expected outputs are outlined. Objectively verifiable indicators are also specified in the Matrix. A simplified version is graphed below. The complete Logical Framework Matrix is in Annex 1.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcome 1: Enhanced adaptive capacity allows communities to reduce their vulnerability to adverse impacts of future climate hazards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1.1: A Country Programme Strategy.</li> <li>• Output 1.2 NGOs/CBOs with capacity to design and support implementation of CBA projects.</li> <li>• Output 1.3 A portfolio of CBA projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction to vulnerability to climate change including variability</li> <li>• Magnitude of global environmental benefits secured (using the SGP’s Impact Assessment System [IAS])</li> <li>• Number of strategies adopted to address drought and other categories of vulnerability</li> <li>• Approval of CPS documents</li> <li>• Number of CBA concepts submitted</li> <li>• Percentage of CBA concepts submitted that incorporate voluntary mechanisms</li> <li>• Number of approved CBA projects</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcome 2: National policies and programmes designed that include community adaptation priorities to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 2.1 Policy makers engaged in the CBA process.</li> <li>• Output 2.2 Lessons from community-based adaptation-related activities compiled and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of policies and programmes adopted or adapted on the basis of CBA experiences</li> <li>• Number of policy makers</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) are rated.

<sup>5</sup> As indicated in the Project’s Document.

<p>promote replication, up-scaling and mainstreaming of best practices derived from CBA projects.</p>	<p>disseminated</p>	<p>engaged in the CBA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of lessons compiled and disseminated</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcome 3: Cooperation among member countries promoted for innovation in the design and implementation of adaptation to climate change including variability projects and policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 3.1 CBA web-site</li> <li>• Output 3.2 Global database of CBA projects.</li> <li>• Output 3.3 Best practices and lessons learned exchanged among countries.</li> <li>• Output 3.4 Guidance documents for GEF and others on CBA programming and project support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption or adaptation of practices piloted through the CBA</li> <li>• Existence of CBA web-site</li> <li>• Value of web-site.</li> <li>• Existence of CBA global database</li> <li>• Value of CBA global database</li> <li>• Number of cases included in UNDP's Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM)</li> <li>• Documented CBA experiences guide future GEF interventions on adaptation to climate change including variability</li> </ul>

## **Assumptions and Risks**

The Programme's logical framework, as well as other project design and formulation instruments, contains a series of assumptions and risks<sup>6</sup>. These have been identified as follows:

- Communities are able to identify factors that contribute to their vulnerability to climate change including variability and can rank these objectively.
- Priority adaptation interventions can be identified that also contribute to securing global environmental benefits.
- In developing and implementing CBA project proposals, innovative solutions to increase adaptive capacity are generated.
- Expressed government commitment translates into early and prompt action to develop CBA CPS documents.
- NGO/CBO capacity building is effective in allowing communities to develop concepts for CBA funding.
- The NSC remains committed and active.
- Policy makers are effectively engaged in the CBA process and CBA projects generate policy-relevant experiences.
- Selection of policy maker to be engaged maximizes potential for lessons to be integrated into national policies and programmes.
- Engagement of senior policy makers increases the likelihood of lessons being adopted in non-CBA locations within each country.
- Projects are under implementation long enough for lessons to be transferred to other countries before the end of the programme.
- ALM becomes operational and effective in time to document best practices from the CBA.
- GEF continues to target adaptation to climate change including variability.

## **Planned stakeholder participation**

The CBA Programme had planned a strong participatory approach at the community level involving multiple stakeholders. The communities were the primary stakeholders and beneficiaries, as well as implementing entities of the CBA Programme.

In addition, other important participants in the Programme included:

- At the global level, a core CBA team that would include Programme team members, implementing agency members, and country representatives.

---

<sup>6</sup> As indicated in the Project Document.

- At the regional level, the involvement of UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination teams was planned to monitor progress and provide technical support to the national coordination committees.
- At the national level, participation was planned through a National Coordinator (NC) and National CBA Coordinating Committee (NCC), that would provide the necessary linkages between community-based and national-scale activities. In all countries but one (Bangladesh), it was planned that existing SGP National Coordinators and members of the National Steering Committee (NSC) would fulfill these roles.
- At the site levels, the communities themselves remained the most important group which realized the important gains the project achieved. It is also recognizable that the community institutions such as SHG's and local traditional outfits played important roles in brokering projects activities at site levels.

Stakeholder engagement was also embedded in the design of other processes such as information dissemination, production of knowledge management products, as well as in the promotion of volunteerism.

### **Replication approach**

A replication approach was rooted explicitly within the project design in Outcome 2 of the Logical Framework, where it states that the Programme would seek *“National policies and programmes designed that include community adaptation priorities to promote replication, up-scaling and mainstreaming of best practices derived from CBA projects”*. It was also considered that participation by key institutions and other partners would foster replication. The CBA Programme's ProDoc indicates that benefits derived from individual projects will, however, have little value unless results are disseminated and the national policy environment is modified so as to promote replication within countries. In addition, this process was sought through the Country CBA Programme Strategy (CCPSs) as guided by the National Coordination Committees.

### **UNDP comparative advantage**

UNDP's engagement in the project is due to strategic considerations, including UNDP's comparative advantage in the field of development and of climate change adaptation. However, the relationship between UNDP and fieldwork (including relations with UNDPs country offices) in this case was less intense than with other projects or programs. This limit was due to the fact that UNOPS was the CBA executing agency with responsibility for financial execution and operational oversight of the project. And also, due to the fact that, at the country level, UNV fulfilled some of the roles that UNDP through GEF SGP normally has in project administration.

### **UNV Comparative advantage**

The UNV brought on board human skills on community mobilization, as well as providing and testing methodologies through participatory research process. The community solidarity and all-inclusiveness skills and techniques were uniquely contributed by the UNV. In addition, developing methodology for tracking and valuing volunteerism was ably provided by UNV throughout the partnerships period. In

addition, management of small community projects participatory skills which was also the strength emerging out of UNV.

### **Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector**

At the global level, the CBA Programme was linked to other climate change adaptation programs and projects. For example, linkages included UNDP's Adaptation Learning Mechanism and units such as Low Emission Climate Resilience Development Strategy, UNDP Local Pillar, and the UNDP Gender Team.

At the national/local levels, linkages were established with other regional, national and local adaptation activities carried out by the involved agencies, other institutions and initiatives. To give an indicative examples, these activities were either those of GEF full sized projects, bilateral organizations work such as GTZ, CARE international and UNDP-based large adaptation programmes such as Africa Adaptation Programme, implemented by UNDP and supported by the Government of Japan.

### **Management arrangements**

At the global level, the CBA Programme had a Project Management Unit (PMU), headed by a Programme Coordinator based in UNDP Headquarters. This Unit is responsible for the Programme's managerial and operative management. The program had the guidance of a Steering Committee comprising of UNDP GEF, SGP, UNV, GEF and UNOPS, at the global level providing policy guidance and monitoring overall project progress.

Management arrangements at the local level, in nine out of the ten countries involved, used GEF SGP procedures and mechanisms. In Bangladesh where GEF SGP is not in place, similar mechanisms were established at the UNDP Country Office. In each of the pilot countries, a National CBA Coordination Committee (NCC) was established to support activities at the country level. These Committees involved several different stakeholders, such as UN representatives, government actors, civil society groups as well as technical climate change experts.

## 3.2 Project Implementation

### Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

There were no major changes to project design or project outputs throughout the life of the CBA Programme. However, the complexities of the project, the diverse number of regions and countries it operated in, funding constraints, as well as other similar issues, called for adaptation to circumstances throughout the duration of the intervention. Management responses were very adaptive especially in regards to ensuring that a retrofitted log frame was prepared after the needs were identified from the midterm reports. This evidently had to take place within operational constraints, but management adapted to particular circumstances and obstructions in the implementation process as they arose given that the UNV initial commitments to supporting PMU came to an end by December 2011, PMU was reduced to two staff who continued with all the administrative functions of backstopping all pilot countries. For example, the cost of the Project Coordinator was also shared with SGP so that management support could proceed unabated amidst scant administrative resources.

### Project Finance

	<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
GEF financing:	4.5	4.5
Government:	.965	.965
Other:	1.55 (UNV), 0.375 Ausaid 0.4 (GOJ), 0.19(GOS)	1.55 (UNV), 0.375 (Ausaid) 0.4 (GOJ), 0.19 (GOS)
Total co-financing:	2.2	2.2
<i>Total Project Cost:</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>6.7</i>

Although the above figures are the general project financial data, as stated in the rest of the evaluation, this Programme had an enormous amount of volunteering input, from a large number of sources. The communities as well as other actors volunteered their time and effort, providing in-kind contributions throughout the life of CBA. In addition to global financial resources, many of the local projects have received funding from other sources. These funding sources have been local authorities and corporate funding, among others. Therefore, the figures listed above only reflect global financial resources, not in-kind resources or cash contributions from other sources.

### Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

The monitoring and evaluation framework was designed at entry and implemented throughout the project's lifespan without perceivable major changes. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) at the global level is set as part of the logical framework matrix and it is articulated with related goals, outcomes and

outputs. This is replicated with an M&E framework at the country-level. Field visits to project sites are also added to monitoring practices.

An additional observational tool, not designed at the onset or at project formulation level, has been added. Namely, UNV carried out field visits to many of the countries involved in the program, providing a mission report to the Project Management upon each mission's completion.

However, the complexities faced by projects in order to report on each of the tools used, and because of non-harmonization of the multiple monitoring tools that were implemented in order to monitor all the aspects of the projects (resilience and volunteerism indicators) activities as captured in the annual reports from the fields, indicated that while the overall reporting provided good information, the quality of monitoring and evaluation could be rated as moderately satisfactory due to the shortcomings faced in the harmonization of all expected indicators to be monitored within the programme.

### **UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution: coordination, and operational issues**

Given the multiple partners involved as well as the multiple levels of intervention (from local to national and global level), governance and implementing structures of the CBA Programme are multi-layered. Firstly, the CBA Programme had the guidance of a Programme Steering Committee consisting of representatives from UNDP, GEF Secretariat, GEF SGP, and UNV. This Committee provided leadership on the Programme's strategy as well as followed project progress and work plans. For operational aspects, the CBA Programme has a Project Management Unit (PMU).

At the country-level, there were National CBA Coordination Committees (NCC), whose members have included national and local stakeholders, technical experts, and relevant UN staff members. The Programme sought co-operation of stakeholders at the national scale through the NCC or NSC, to develop capacity among NGOs and CBOs at the local level in designing and implementing CBA projects. In addition, the NCC/NSC provided all projects evaluation functions as provided for in the GEF SGP operational guidance found in this link: <http://sgp.undp.org/>

The participation of national stakeholders in the NCCs provided input that assured alignment between a country's CBA actions and interventions and its climate change vulnerabilities and adaptation needs, by attempting to link the Programme with other in-place processes such as the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) or the National Communications process, for example.

Also, SGP National Coordinators, assisted by national UN Volunteers, worked in managing and overseeing day-to-day project activities, conducted outreach activities, engaged with local communities and NGOs in capacity building activities, provided technical assistance to field-level community projects, ensured sharing of knowledge management products and related activities, as well as carried-out monitoring and evaluation of the individual projects.

CBA Programme activities at the national level and at the community levels have been sustained by the involvement of UN Volunteers, in seven out of the ten pilot countries.<sup>7</sup> UN Volunteers provided support to community projects, assisted in developing volunteerism activities and knowledge generation. UNV as an organization has also been involved in management support of the projects.

At the community level, CBA projects are implemented by community-based organizations and/or local NGOs. These organizations are the grant recipients. Their roles are many and included providing technical support, as recipients of the grants; they prepared the site level projects and implemented them as well as in participatory monitoring processes being the actual local level participatory researchers.

### **3.3 Project Results**

#### **Overall results (attainment of objectives)**

The overall results defined as the attainment of objectives, in this case *"to enhance the capacity of communities in the pilot countries to adapt to climate change including variability and to provide evidence based adaptation models at community levels"*, have been highly satisfactory. In the sections below, the subjects of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, country ownership, mainstreaming, sustainability, impact, and timeliness of the project's implementation that make-up the overall results, are expanded upon.

#### **Relevance**

The relevance of the CBA Programme is assessed based on the extent to which the Programme and its interventions and activities are suited to local and national development priorities and needs. Furthermore, relevance is also assessed by determining how the project relates to the main objectives of the GEF Adaptation Strategic Priority window.

The CBA Programme is of high relevance to GEF. As indicated in pertinent project documentation, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Secretariat proposed that up to ten percent of the resources under the Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA) be devoted to piloting community adaptation initiatives. This is a formal and resourced recognition that communities in developing countries are severely affected by climate change impacts, yet are not knowledgeable or equipped to cope and adapt and be resilient regarding these impacts. In outlining key elements of the Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA), the GEF indicated its intention to improve its own capacity and that of others to facilitate community-based adaptation.<sup>8</sup>

The CBA Programme's goal was to reduce vulnerability and to increase adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change in the focal areas in which the GEF works. Its overall arching and explicit objective was to enhance the capacity of communities in the pilot countries to adapt to climate change

---

<sup>7</sup> These are the seven countries where UNV has a national presence: Bolivia, Guatemala, Jamaica, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, and Viet Nam.

<sup>8</sup> (GEF/C.23/Inf.8/para 23).

including variability. It sought to enrich community capacities in the selected countries to adapt to climate change impacts.

This is expressively aligned with national as well as local priorities in the countries involved as well as with global priorities through the preparations of the CBA country programme strategies. Regarding the latter, the relevance can be gauged against GEF priorities, not only in climate change per se but also in the role, needs and priorities that communities in developing countries have vis-à-vis climate change adaptation. The CBA Programme, therefore, soundly integrated the needs of the participating countries national visions, climate change strategies and commitments to relevant conventions as well as the needs of beneficiary's local social, environmental and livelihoods needs.

The impacts of climate change are more and more evident throughout the world, especially in vulnerable communities in developing countries. This also adds to the increased acknowledgment that climate change is a serious threat to the global environment as well as to the development process. Local communities in developing countries are faced with impacts on multiple fronts. They are not only highly dependent upon the natural resources and sectors affected by climate change factors, but also lack the tools to generate resiliency and coping mechanisms to face these impacts and the risks associated with climate change.

However, the international community, including UNDP has, up to recent periods, emphasized other aspects and involved at other levels of climate change adaptation. Considerable work has been therefore realized at national levels, including assessments of vulnerabilities, adaptation plans, and policy frameworks prepared. Yet, the local action component which aims at participatory approaches to climate change adaptation that was adopted by the CBA Programme can be considered an original methodology for assessing vulnerability reduction and taking into recognition issues of volunteerism as crucial aspects of climate change adaptation needs. These types of activities remain still very new within the international community's work in the field of climate change adaptation.

Therefore, to implement this policy aim and to fulfill these objectives, the CBA Programme was formed as a pilot project to address community-based adaptation to climate change. The project components were deliberately designed as small-scale 'project/policy laboratories' for on the ground interventions and to generate knowledge on adaptation at the local level.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the CBA Programme is the

---

<sup>9</sup> For example, it should be noted that GEF Council paper GEF/C.23/Inf.8/Rev.1 (GEF Assistance to Address Adaptation) "Adaptation to climate change is increasingly recognized as significant to the attainment of sustainable development and as essential for the achievement of many global environmental objectives. While many scientific uncertainties exist, the scope and magnitude of the risks now known to be associated with climate change represent a challenge to environmental and economic goals that must be taken into account today ... the understanding of human response to climate change is still at an early stage, with much to be learned from historical experience. However, in general it is known that [among numerous factors] the capacity to adapt is determined by access to resources, information and technology, the skill and knowledge to use them, and the stability and effectiveness of cultural, economic, social, and governance institutions that facilitate or constrain how human systems respond. Those with the least resources have the least capacity to adapt and are the most vulnerable".

community-based component of the GEF Strategic Priority on Adaptation and is consistent with the 2003 GEF Piloting an Operational Approach to Adaptation, a strategic priority on adaptation within the climate change focal area. The project also aims at increasing capacity to adapt to climate change as well as to address the vulnerability of communities regarding this phenomenon. Moreover, project activities have been geared towards efforts to achieve global environmental benefits in other related GEF focal areas: biodiversity conservation and the prevention of land degradation. The project is also consistent with many other global convention policies such as those of the UNCCD and CBD given that it meets the needs for generating knowledge and lessons about how to achieve adaptation at the local level.

The CBA Programme has also been relevant because it has provided lessons and knowledge for other GEF funded projects, and other UNDP, UNV and other partners and institutions, on the approach, design, and implementation of participatory community based adaptation projects. The CBA has been very valuable in the sense that it has nourished other new projects and programs and maintains a strong potential to continue to do so in the future.

The CBA Programme's approach and work was pioneering and innovative by promoting and acknowledging local action. The community-based approach is, furthermore, a focus embraced by the United Nations Volunteers programme, and has been explicitly and implicitly acknowledged by their role and involvement as partners in this program. Local actions that reflects and support the needs, demands, perspectives and commitments of local actors in adaptation projects and strategies has been a new working method. This was not only done by recognizing the value of and needs of local action, but also by assuming a participatory approach, promoting the incorporation of local knowledge and the identification of priorities by local stakeholders.

Regarding the selection criteria for the countries and sites selected, it can be stated that it was highly relevant and remained so throughout the implementation process. The criteria used were a combination of factors. Among them:

- a) regional representation (for countries) and geographical representations (sites of projects),
- b) ecosystem representation,
- c) vulnerability to climate change,
- d) adaptive capacity or community resilience to climate change, including increased resilience of natural systems,
- e) community vulnerabilities,
- f) cross-scale policy potential, (including replication, up-scaling and integration of innovation), and,
- g) Global environmental benefits.

The CBA project has been relevant in applying these criteria. For example, the countries involved are either high risk or medium risk countries with regard to climate change impacts. The communities where the project was implemented were vulnerable to climate impacts. The ecosystem representation was also highly diverse, ranging from mangroves to mountainous highlands, for example. It also addressed a series of environmental issues as they relate to climate change impacts, such as land degradation and desertification, increased severity of droughts and floods, among others.

---

The individual projects have been found relevant since there was a strong emphasis on community aspects: community-drivenness, local design, addressing livelihood needs and relevant adaptation activities. This in turn has benefitted not only the implementation process and impact but has also developed ownership of the process and results. This helps substantially to generate sustainability of project results and replicability.

Although the Programme in its design stage did require the linkages from local-to-national levels relationships in view of the climate risks to be addressed, particularly, how these risk and problems related to policy, up scaling, and reliability of results, the linking of this process, was at time and in certain countries, not fully realizable because of the nature of demand driven bottom up approach of SGP.

Therefore, at conceptual stages of the project, attempts were made to align local to national priorities in order to have clear policy linkages. However, it must be pointed out that, first, there were no specific allocation of resources for this to happen proactively. While countries involved did have a national and a local-to-national link in the design stage (for instance, in elaborating country program strategies identifying vulnerabilities and priorities and in linking the on the ground projects to policies and strategies, among others) this was not –thus far–reflected nor contributed fully to the relevant up scaling and mainstreaming of some of the individual projects’ results. A lesson learned is that mainstreaming and scaling-up of these sorts of projects if sought, this should be incorporated in the design stage, including providing resources for this to happen. Furthermore, it has been pointed out that at the country-level, because of limited resources, there was no sufficient critical mass of projects that could have direct policy influence or results in up scaling the projects.

Although, the CBA Programme specifically recognized the need to have community-based approaches and projects enlighten national planning processes, this was not noticeable in many places with exception of only a few in some specific cases (e.g. in Jamaica and Namibia) where direct links to policy are evident. This can be traced to the lack of specific mechanisms for this to happen. That is to say, that the CBA Programme expected these results but its time span was too limited to start realizing these gains given that these community projects are only implemented within a two year span. In addition, it is prudent to also indicate that the project did not imbed specific mechanisms within countries for this to occur spontaneously. Although national-level policy makers did sit on the National Steering Committees (NSC), this itself cannot guarantee that up-scaling will necessarily take place. Given that this is a lesson learned, a recommendation for the future is that when up-scaling and mainstreaming of results is sought, there should be a specific objective in the design process which can ensure relevant implementation practices are followed.

As indicated in several documents<sup>10</sup>, there were several other deficiencies in the design that –later on– caused inadequacies or difficulties in the implementation process. For example, the highly complex architecture of some aspects of the program and how it reflects on the complexity inbred into the projects at the field level has been elaborated in this evaluation as one of the issues. The highly technical

---

<sup>10</sup> For example in the Mid-Term Review, workshop reports, etc., as well as, evidently, information specifically gathered for this evaluation through interviews and questionnaires.

and complex application process was not commensurate with the capacities of the local communities the Programme attempted to reach. This is also a lesson learned, and a recommendation is that the processes and projects aimed at the local level and at vulnerable communities should demand that capacities of communities, if not a huge capacity building process is offered, should at the very least, commensurate with a certain expectations of results. Capacities and the level of and quality of results are very much linked and investments in capacity are very useful.

This has been pointed out also in other sections on the issue of generation of global environmental benefits (GEB), and their indicators, will need to be much clearer so that monitoring and reporting can be easily done by communities. It has been noted that (although these environmental benefits can and do occur within the programme and in the projects as indicated in project documents), this was also a highly technical aspect and more often times it was difficult to make the communities to understand fully. For this to happen, the programme had to spent a lot of time in the area of capacity building in order to bring the communities to a level of understanding to be able to implement the project. , The PMU however, made important efforts in translating communities' actions into quantifiable global levels environmental benefits, more specifically in the area of sustainable land management and biodiversity.

The issue of indicators was noted to be complicated for communities as reflected in relevant stakeholder interviews and documents reviewed. This was not only in respect to the Global Environmental Benefits indicators, as previously noted, but also other livelihoods indicators sets within the projects outcome.

On the one hand, stakeholders noted that the program lacked adequate indicators at design stage that would allow a better measurement of impact, adaptive capacity, and similar aspects; while on the other hand, some corrective measures were undertaken during the midterm review where, these indicator sets were reviewed and appropriately used for reporting in the GEF project implementation reports (PIR). What remained a challenge for the communities was how to measure such things as changing lifestyles and changing attitudes without undertaking some sort of social questionnaire based surveys which required quantitative results. A methodology to do opinion surveys for example was a challenge to communities. The VRA indicators and measurements, however, assisted in providing some indicative figures on how the perceptions of communities were changing over time during the implementation of the projects.

However, on the other hand, and especially from the field level, several questionings and issues arose regarding indicators and reporting. Because of the many indicators sets to be followed by different participating partners (UNV and SGP), the reporting of the information was rather unclear, especially regarding field-level projects, given that for some stakeholders it was not clear to whom or to which institutions they must report to while the fact was that there were multiple tools (for vulnerability measurements and Volunteerism) used for monitoring and reporting on different aspects of the projects with expertise rested in different collaborating institutions.<sup>11</sup> A lesson learned in this respect is that the

---

<sup>11</sup> . As indicated in different collaborating institutions, and in the mid – term review, this aspect of the CBA could have benefited from retrofitting and strengthening. Stakeholders indicate that implementing and using VRA, volunteering manual, SGP's Impact Assessment System (IAS), as well as other tools where relevant (such as gender manual, planning tools, etc.) made the issue of reporting and monitoring complex and that consolidating the different tools used into one instrument would have

instruments and methodologies used at the community level should be developed in a simplified way (such as the “Almanario” used in Guatemala SGP programme) and with capability of being utilized by communities being the guiding factor. It should also be noted that building capacity is a time consuming exercise and to be able to build capacity that matches the technical expertise and knowledge that is needed at the local level for implementing projects does not only take time but requires huge resources do so.

### **Effectiveness and Efficiency**

The effectiveness of a project is defined as the extent to which its objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved. While the efficiency (or efficacy, or furthermore, cost-effectiveness) is defined as the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible, an evaluation, when looking at effectiveness and efficiency, basically assesses the quality of “the road taken” to get to the results achieved. Given the multi-layered approach to the CBA Programme, the following sections will look at effectiveness and efficiency of different program components, such as governance and management arrangements.

Regarding effectiveness at the local level, project activities in countries involved in the Programme are building resilience to climate change and creating local capacities to adapt to climate change’s impact. Notwithstanding issues identified regarding global management, incongruity between local capacities and what was expected of communities regarding project presentations and reporting, as well as financial constraints, all data gathered indicates that the projects themselves have been successful to a great degree.

Partnership arrangements, as stated before, for the CBA Programme were layered and complex. Not only were there arrangements set up and implemented at the global level, but these partnership arrangements were replicated at the field levels in each of the pilot countries. Furthermore, site level activities also resulted in local level partnerships, which all demanded careful operating. The project largely achieved this objective satisfactorily resulting in the needed sustainability of the programme in each individual country. The global-level partnership, involving UNDP, GEF SGP, UNV, and UNOPS, according to the stakeholder interviewed, was not an efficient arrangement because of different locations of decision making process, as well as differing agencies implementation modalities and roles. As described in the institutional arrangements sections, many actors were in different locations and more specifically, their roles were not fully described in the design project document and were not clear at times, and that the structure that could make this sort of multi-layered partnership work was not put in place in the implementation stages. Partners were acquired on the basis of comparative advantage in the field and from the fact that they could contribute monetary and human resources support. In future projects, this sort of partnerships should be carefully elaborated in the programme document with details of roles and functions.

Furthermore, there have been several criticisms to the lack of full partnership of the project at a global level. It was indicated that the visibility of all partners was not equal, and that the role of what partners

---

greatly benefited the Program and evidently the projects. Furthermore, stakeholders specifically indicated that they were not clear on who to report to or that in many instances they had to report to several different agencies within the Programme.

were supposed to play in the overall application of the CBA Programme was not clear, culminating in some partners assuming the tasks and roles of other partners, especially in key global events and in visibility documents, not all partners were all recognized at times. Nevertheless, the issues identified did not hinder partnerships in terms of effectiveness (given that the Programme's objectives have been achieved). Furthermore, at the local and project implementation levels, partnerships worked quite effectively.

At the local level, partnerships, as revealed by the functioning of National Steering Committees, have functioned well, and have adapted to local conditions in order to be fully functional. For example, it has been indicated by stakeholders, that in some countries, non-governmental organizations took the lead, indicating the sustainability of the programme but also showed that at the levels of institutions involved, local level adaptation needs for continuity at the local conditions was realized.

However, the linkages between the global level partnership/structure with the national level structures were unclear at times for local and national partners. This has caused a series of issues, for example in identifying who/or what institution the national and local levels report to and even in identifying which is the management organization the local projects respond to.

The project's logical framework and work plans have been used as management tools during implementation. However, due to changes and unforeseeable issues that arose out of a program with the complexity of this one, and coupled by many project activities in many countries, adaptive management was needed, not only to ensure efficient use of resources but also to guarantee implementation in different circumstances. For the CBA Programme, adaptive management practices took place throughout project implementation, demonstrating flexibility to adapt to prescribed routine and unforeseen circumstances for implementation especially in respect to the participating country's absorption capacity of the grants, as well as the established delivery mechanisms. It is noteworthy that 3 out of the 10 participating countries had no UNV's and one country did not have an SGP infrastructure in place to provide implementation support.

Effective partnership arrangements were established for implementation of the Programme with relevant stakeholders involved at the local level. Not only the National Steering Committees, which were multi-stakeholder groups that provided support, but also there is some evidence that the projects have managed to establish alliances with other stakeholders outside of the Programmes in several countries to help realize intended outcomes. A list of such partners is provided in the CBA website. This aided in leveraging support for further activities, as well as scaling up efforts.

Community based adaptation to climate change is (to a great degree) a pioneering strategy to handle climate change impact at local levels, and in the countries' programme reports that were prepared by all participating countries and which provided some of the basic information for this evaluation, indicated that –in most cases-- this is the first time local Climate Change adaptation issues were being dealt with methodologically at the national and, of course, at the community levels. Notwithstanding the innovative approaches which made it easy to be replicated by other actors at local levels, projects report that they have managed to link with other similar initiatives on an ongoing basis and influencing their practices as they implemented their programmes.

Although monitoring and evaluation activities have been in place (including for adaptive management and other such issues) several difficulties have been reported from the field level. Here, as also indicated above, there have been some difficulties given that the monitoring and evaluation systems are too complex for community level interventions. It has also been pointed out the indicators to be used in

monitoring and evaluations are not one set but an amalgamation of sets responding to the different partners needs involved at the global level.<sup>12</sup>

This has been, at the very least challenging and time consuming at the national and community levels. Not only have they proven too complex for local communities to report, but have also been time consuming and challenging for national level partners. For instance, the reporting of diagnostics and other monitoring instruments had to be absorbed by external consultants in some cases, given that they were too complex and outside the communities capacities to accurately complete them.

The Programme's effectiveness can also be illustrated by some indicators. The projects have reached 64 communities and an estimated 240,000 community members, working with over 100 community groups. These projects at the local level effectively faced issues of climate change adaptation with improving livelihoods. Furthermore, a series of knowledge management products were generated, either as specific project outcomes or as products created specifically for the CBA as a whole. These were videos, fact sheets, case studies, briefing notes, thematic papers, as well as articles and publications based on lessons learned from specific projects (see Annex 6 for a list of knowledge management products). Furthermore, CBA projects have influenced or contributed to shaping 33 local policies and about 60 national level discussions on climate change adaptation.<sup>13</sup> Key results as of December 2011 are summarized in Annex 2, which is extracted from the Annual Report for PIMS: 3508-Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change, (GEF SPA-Global FSP), Year 2011.

Moreover, since project activities have been geared towards efforts to achieve global environmental benefits in other related GEF focal areas - biodiversity conservation and the prevention of land degradation - these achievements can be illustrated by some indicators. For example, as part of the project's results, more than 9,662 hectares have been restored. Also, the projects have aided in the conservation and sustainable use of over 70 different flora and fauna species.<sup>14</sup>

Project implementation was as cost effective as originally proposed. UNOPS was chosen as the financial execution agency after presenting the lowest bidding through a competitive process to manage grants and projects implementation costs. In addition, although the normal management, accounting and other such systems have been in place and functioning, some logistical issues as well as organizational/administrative issues were identified. Several stakeholders have indicated that this has hindered Programme's smooth financial flow and added complexity to the implementation process. All data gathered and information provided indicates that financial resources were used in an efficient manner and were well targeted. Therefore, financial resources were utilized as efficiently as possible within the funding constraints.

---

<sup>12</sup> Namely, the UNDP Adaptation Indicators, the SGP's Impact Assessment System (IAS), the VRA, and volunteerism indicators.

<sup>13</sup> Key results as of December 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Indicators of achievements as of December 2011.

Unfortunately, fundraising for furthering the Programme and leveraging other funds was not as successful as expected at the global level, especially when considering the demand for increasing the number of field projects, expanding to other communities and countries. A UN Collaborative Programme on Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change in Developing Countries (UN-CBA) was established as a multi-partner trust fund in 2009 to allow donors to pool resources and provide funding to activities within the Programme. Regrettably, the association between UNDP, UNESCO and UNV created to raise funds for furthering the CBA Programme's activities was not successful. This is because, as noted by relevant stakeholders, the alliance between the partners was not strong enough to convince potential further donors that this mechanism which was attempted by collaborating partners could translate to a true and effective collaborative program. A lesson learned from this effort to set up a fund raising mechanism is that institutional partnerships should be firmly based on each of the institutions strengths and not on incidental association, with each partner bringing to the table their institutional strengths and capacities. Therefore, it is recommended that partnerships should be genuine and not only a circumstantial association.

### Country-level local interventions

The principal components of the CBA Programme are the local level interventions. A sizeable number and quality pioneering CBA interventions are needed for a energetic lesson learning process at the national and local levels. Overall, sixty three projects were implemented. The table below lists 60 projects out of the total number of programmed projects which were 63 in total.

Bangladesh	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Community-Based Wetland Project</li> <li>2.Coping with Climate Risks by Empowering Women in Coastal Areas</li> <li>3.Piloting Climate-Resilient Development Initiatives</li> <li>4.Strengthening Community Resilience in the Southwestern Coastal Area</li> <li>5.Promoting Diversified Agro-Based Activities in the Jamalpur District</li> </ol>
Bolivia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Water Source Protection and Soil Conservation through Reforestation in Batallas Municipality</li> <li>2.Participatory Adaptation Learning to Reduce Food Insecurity in Ancoraimes</li> <li>3.Sustainable Management of the Cherimoya Crop for Climate Change Adaptation in Saipina</li> <li>4.Knowledge and Tools for Sustainable Management of Water and Soils in Moro Moro</li> <li>5.Rural Water and Climate Risk Management in the Alto Seco Area</li> <li>6.Recovery of Tarwi Seeds for Adaptation in the Carabuco Municipality Near Lake Titicaca</li> </ol>
Guatemala	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Soil Recovery with Organic Crop and Soil Conservation Structures in Pin Pin Canton</li> <li>2.Adapting to Climate Change through the Application of Green Forest Borders</li> <li>3.Reforestation and Soil Conservation to Improve Tree Nurseries for Adaptation</li> <li>4.Tree Nursery Activities for Reforestation in the Taltimiche Plains</li> </ol>
Jamaica	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Land &amp; Preservation Measures to Combat Climate Change Pressures in Martha Brae Watershed</li> <li>2.Increasing Community Adaptation and Ecosystem Resilience to Climate Change in Portland Bight</li> <li>3.Glengoffe Climate Change Adaptation</li> <li>4.Watershed Conservation Programme for Awareness and Action in the Rio Grande Watershed</li> <li>5.Reducing Climate Change-Driven Erosion and Landslide Risk through Sustainable Agriculture</li> <li>6."Tell It": Disseminating Caribbean Climate Change Science and Stories</li> </ol>
Kazakhstan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Reducing Vulnerability to Declining Water Supplies in Burevestnik</li> <li>2.Forest Protection Belts to Combat Increasing Aridity in Shyrkyn Village</li> <li>3.Sustainable Water and Land Management in South Kazakhstan Under Increased Aridity</li> <li>4.Demonstrating Adaptive Land Management in Priozernoye</li> <li>5.Climate-Resilient Horse Production in Kargaly Village</li> <li>6.Climate-Resilient Pasture and Livestock Management in Zhangeldy Village</li> <li>7.Adaptation to Increased Aridity through Climate-Resilient Agro-Silvo-Pastoralism Using Sauxal</li> <li>8.Adapting Grazing Stock-Raising in Lepsy Village</li> </ol>

	9.Adapting Farming Practices to Increasing Temperatures and Aridity in Akmola Oblast 10.Autumn/Winter Irrigation as Adaptive Mechanism for Water Resources
Morocco	1.Land and Water Protection, Conservation Farming and Climate Risk Management in El Mouddaa 2.Natural Resource and Endemic Species Conservation in Laachoria Community 3.Vetiver Grass and Conservation Farming in Sidi Majbeur 4.Agroforestry and Soil/Water Conservation in the Boumaad Community 5.Resiliency through Sustainable Farming/Forestry Strategies in the Azilal Province 6.Strengthening Tarmguiste Ecosystem Resilience and Local Adaptive Capacities 7.Enhancing the Resilience of the Iguiwas Oasis Ecosystem to the Impacts of Climate Change
Namibia	1.Adjusting Agricultural Practices to Reduce Climate Change Risk in Omusati Region 2.Harnessing Coping Strategies via a Holistic Approach for Community Adaptation to Climate Change
Niger	1.Intensified Goat Breeding to Help Vulnerable Women Adapt to Climate Change Effects 2.Adapting to Climate Change in the Community of Tamalolo 3.Intensified Agroforestry Practices for Adaptation in Tânout 4.Hut Livestock to Reduce Household Vulnerability in Houtchi and Dan Djaoudi, Roubou 5.Developing Sustainable Agriculture Techniques for Adaptation in Roubou Municipality, Dakoro 6.Improving Agro-Forestry and Providing Better Seeds to the Community of Maigochi Saboua, Roubou 7.Adapting Pastoral and Agricultural Practices to the Realities of Climate Change
Samoa	1.Adaptation to Flooding and Sea Level Rise - Fagamolo 2.Adaptation to Flooding and Sea Level Rise - Safai Community 3.Adaptation in Lelepa Village 4.Protection and Conservation of Mangroves, Ecosystems, and Coral Reefs - Fasitootai 5.Adaptation in Sato'alepai 6.Adaptation to Flooding and Sea Level rise - Avao, Vaipouli, Salei'a
Vietnam	1.Addressing Drought and Saltwater Intrusion Issues for Agro-Development in the Ky Nam Community 2.Sustainable Agricultural Production and Food Security at Phuoc Hoa Commune 3.Adaptation through Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in Thua Thien Hue Province 4.Onion-Based Cultivation Crops to Adapt to Droughts and Saline Intrusion in Vinh Chau Commune 5.Minimizing Climate Change Impacts for Sustainable Aquaculture in Con Truong, Hoang Chau Commune 6.Conservation and Sustainable Use of Drought- and Salinity-Tolerant Rice Varieties in Phuoc Long Community 7.Applying Technologies to Address Flash Floods and Drought in Cam Tam Commune

By all analysis, evaluations, and monitoring thus far, the general assessment is that the outcomes of the local-level projects have been highly successful, achieving what the CBA Programme was set up to do. Namely, to provide the tools and capacity to local communities in order to adapt to the vast impacts they are observing and experiencing in relation to climate change.

Interventions in countries involved in the Programme are building resilience to climate change and creating local capacities to adapt to climate change's impact. Notwithstanding the problems identified regarding global management, incongruity between local capacities and what was expected of communities regarding project presentations and reporting, as well as financial constraints, all data gathered indicates that the projects themselves have been successful to a great degree.

The project can be overall rated as successful in contributing to the current global debates in climate change adaptation and creating awareness at national levels. This is attested to by noting a series of indicators of the projects' successes such as the praises and awards the projects received in international meetings such as COPS/MOPS, as well as the local visibility provided both in print and media in pilot countries. Specifically therefore, although there was no precise communication strategy for CBA Programme activities, the local projects have been featured in local and national media. They

have received awards, and have been featured in advocacy efforts and numerous publications. Furthermore, they have been presented in international forums, such as in Rio+20 and at the UNFCC Conference of Parties.

Interestingly, it has been detected that the projects themselves as well as local stakeholders have been successful in leveraging funding for the continuance of the projects or for other similar interventions, which is also an indicator of the Programme's success. The funding sources are varied, ranging from corporate funding to support from local authorities. It is also indicated that the projects as well as the approach to assess and plan for dealing with climate change (The UNDP APF Methodology and VRA process) at the community level is having a conceptual impact upon other areas of the international community. The approach is being incorporated in many climate change activities and programs and replicated by other cooperation agencies.

### **Cross-cutting Issues: Volunteering and Volunteerism**

Strong and innovative components of the CBA Programme have been the issues of volunteering and of volunteerism. This is not only so through the partnership with United Nations Volunteers as an agency, but also through the promotion of volunteerism as a practice, particularly in the decision making process of SGP through the NSC. The overall objective to include volunteerism practices was to mainstream and strengthen the capacity of community volunteering in order to enhance grassroots capacity to adapt to climate change. That is, not only to encourage volunteering but also to promote the *idea* of volunteerism. The other important aspect was to use the UN Volunteers as participatory researchers while working with community groups.

To a great degree this has occurred, either by design or because volunteerism is an intrinsic aspect to community actions. This is shown, first of all, by the fact that all CBA projects included significant in-kind contributions from the community.

A document named *Volunteers' Contributions to community-based adaptation (CBA) to climate change: A handbook, training guide and work plan to support, promote and measure volunteering in UNDP-GEF CBA projects* was produced by UN Volunteers. Although there is no assessment as to the application of this manual in the projects per se, it is undeniable that most of the projects were volunteer-based. It would be of interest in the future to assess what is the role of volunteering, in all its forms, in the different community-based climate adaptation approaches as well as to set a value on it in order to provide volunteerism with a thorough visibility.

Volunteering and volunteerism, in any form, were not specific nor overarching objectives set out in the project planning, as manifested in the project planning documents. Therefore, given this, the issue was not closely weaved into the development of the projects and of the programme itself and of course not a principal focus. Therefore there has been a gap in analyzing not only the implementation of the manual per se, but also how volunteering and volunteerism has or has not in some way affected the programme itself.

It is recommended that in the future, should volunteering and volunteerism be considered germane for further community based adaptation projects, interested parties should analyze this aspect. In order to produce accurate data and information, indicators should be drawn that are specific, measurable, achievable and attributable, realistic and relevant, as well as timely. Without losing sight that the analysis should above all have the overall impact of the project and the improvement of livelihoods in mind.

When or if this matter is analyzed, interested parties should determine what the nature and levels of volunteering are, what volunteerism implies and entails in terms of results achieved, effectiveness and efficiency, as well as ownership for consolidating achievements and results in the long run. Besides the above mentioned development of indicators to be able to measure volunteerism in its different forms, methodologies for this measurement should be applied throughout the life span of the project. Interested parties should also agree at early project planning stages of a programme on how to measure volunteerism (for example, time volunteered, monetizing or giving number values to volunteer work, mobilization aspects, administrative project management volunteering versus concrete beneficiary volunteering, etc.). It is only then that the true significance of volunteering and volunteerism can be acknowledge, tallied, and evaluated. And, as stated before, by keeping in mind the overall objective of the programme, which was to improve the lives of beneficiaries through fostering communities' resiliency and development in light of climate change-related vulnerabilities.

### **Cross-cutting Issues: Gender**

As indicated in several documents, gender considerations have also been mainstreamed at the project level within the community-adaptation activities as a cross-cutting issue incorporated from the early stages of project development. Specific knowledge management products on gender and climate change were developed and there was an effort to include gender as a cross-cutting issue to be mainstreamed in the country-level projects. Besides the incorporation of gender as a theme, data gathered for and within the projects was often disaggregated by sex and parity was sought in the participation of project activities.

The main product in this subject has been a *Gender, Climate Change and Community-Based Adaptation handbook*, in order to channel gender mainstreaming in CBA projects. This guidebook highlights the groundwork on this subject, integrating economic, social as well as strictly environmental issues. This KM product has been very well received and one of the top 10 most accessed products in UNDP as per an EEG survey. Furthermore, gender sensitive vulnerability assessments were developed.

Hand in hand with the attempt to mainstream gender considerations, some projects have targeted women specifically to improve their ability to reduce risk and manage climate change impacts. However, there is no conclusive data thus far on how or if gender issues were mainstreamed in the general projects themselves. Some field visit reports indicate that data disaggregated by sex was gathered, but there is no assessment yet how much of gender issues has been mainstreamed.

### **Instruments and Knowledge Management Products**

A series of knowledge management products were drawn up as part of the CBA Programme in addition to the ones mentioned above. They have been high quality products and there is evidence that they are being used within and outside the Programme. These included policy briefs, videos, manuals, and similar types of knowledge management products.

The project had dynamic website<sup>15</sup>, which aided in disseminating information on the projects as well as the knowledge managements products. Some of the products were the following:

- Sustainable Land and Watershed Management Experiences. Policy brief-issue 1.
- CBA "How-To: Inclusivity" Guidebook
- Gender and Community-Based Adaptation to climate change guide book
- Thematic Papers on CBA at portfolio levels within the UNDP-GEF Project
- Harnessing multiple coping strategies for a holistic approach towards community adaptation to climate change: the use of Conservation Agriculture (CA) in Namibia, Case Study
- Community-Based Adaptation for Lelepa Village (Samoa), Case Study
- A Toolkit for Designing Climate Change Adaptation Initiatives.

A more complete list is included in the Annex 6.

## **Country and local ownership**

The country ownership of programs and projects can be stated to be directly linked to the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements in a specific country. In this Programme, since the approach is community-based and driven, community level ownership is a factor that indicates the goals of local people, is indirectly reflected on national ownership and directly demonstrated in local level ownerships

The CBA Programme clearly fits with the different countries development priorities as well as local development and climate change adaptation priorities. The Programme, overall and of course with some differences from country to country, has shown a fair degree of national ownership as well as solid community-level ownership. First of all, regarding local level ownership, a contributing factor is the fact that the individual projects act upon community identified needs and identified vulnerabilities regarding climate change. Furthermore, local ownership is also in evidence when taking into account that many of the activities were volunteered and in-kind contributions were leveraged. That is, the fact that community members volunteer their time and add their own resources to projects, is a clear indicator that there is strong local ownership.

## **Mainstreaming**

The project considered vertical and horizontal mainstreaming which meant that project activities could influence other community groups, organizations and other local actors. At the same time, it was expected that the lessons learned and innovations coming out of the projects could permeate to national and even global levels in terms of contributing best practices.

As in all cases of GEF-financed projects within UNDP programming at the country level, the CBA Programme must be assessed regarding how successfully it has mainstreamed other UNDP priorities and

---

<sup>15</sup> The URL of the project's website is <http://www.undp-alm.org/projects/spa-community-based-adaptation-project>.

cross cutting issues. It can be stated that the CBA Programme has been very successful in this aspect given that it has worked jointly with others in UNDP priority areas such as poverty alleviation, resiliency regarding risks, and the incorporation of gender issues as part of the implementation process.

The CBA Programme, with of course variations according to each individual project and national/local circumstances in mind, has had positive effects on local populations concerning improved natural resource management, improved livelihoods, as well as enhanced resiliency regarding coping strategies in the face of climate change.

Some success has also been achieved in community-level and local level mainstreaming and scaling up into policy and planning. Furthermore, mainstreaming through fostering of inter-country exchange of experiences occurred through the global project, through knowledge management products, and through exchanges between the local level projects themselves. Increased capacity and awareness raising occurred at different levels and with varied stakeholders.

## **Sustainability**

Sustainability is the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after a project's completion. The sustainability of project activities is based on several factors. One of the main factors is the degree of ownership. Throughout the CBA Programme's implementation, a high level of local ownership has been identified, given, among other aspects, that the projects were based on local needs and built upon local capacities.

Since the individual projects have been highly relevant given that there was a strong emphasis on community aspects (drivenness, local design, addressing livelihood needs and pertinent adaptation), this contributed to a high possibility of sustainability given that the projects have fitted into local issues and needs. The replication and community-to-community reproduction of the projects' activities (also done on a volunteer basis and intuitively by the communities without direct intervention by the CBA Programme) is an indicator that in many circumstances the CBA is likely to be sustainable in many cases in mid to long term.

## **Impact**

At the community level in each of the countries where the individual projects took place, a series of positive impacts have been identified (such as, increased levels of awareness, local levels plans incorporating climate change adaptation issues, etc.) for the enhancement of local adaptive capacity to address climate change's impact. Although fully aware that long-term adaptation and resiliency are two factors difficult to measure within the short life span of the projects, individual country project reports indicate that they have certainly aided in the short term in reducing communities' vulnerability and strengthening the resilience of those ecosystems that communities depend upon for their livelihoods.

The positive impacts identified have taken different forms such as through several types of activities, namely, the promotion of sustainable agriculture adaptive to climate change (for example, with the introduction of agricultural practices or crops that are better suited for current climate conditions) or practices that aid in mitigating climate change's negative impacts (such as rehabilitation and reforestation of areas eroded by floods, soil conservation practices). In other communities, the renovation of infrastructure and other properties in order to improve their resiliency to extreme weather events was implemented, as well as through several different water management actions.

The activities and on-the-ground actions have had impacts through their combination of indigenous knowledge with advanced technologies.. Furthermore, adaptation measures have been flexible and appropriate for each specific community in order to adjust to local conditions, needs, and vulnerabilities. Nevertheless, all of the activities have generated local capacity and community resiliency. This impact is also attested to some degree by requests coming outside the project countries and even from non targeted communities within the pilot countriesreceived by project management, that manifest that recognizable impacts have occurred in project sites and are stimulating external demands. The generation of capacity, through a targeted capacity programme addressing capacity gaps and needs in climate change adaptation, is a key factor, not only for the CBA Programme's impact but also for its mainstreaming and scaling up.

A unique sort of impact has been the effect that the CBA *approach* has had in other programs and projects. That is, the field tested methodologies in which communities (bottom up approach) have been the driving force as opposed to top down approaches which are common of large adaptation projects funded by many development agencies. This Programme, being the only pioneer CBA project from the GEF, s has shown that working from bottom up is also an effective and important way of addressing adaptation for those who are impacted most, the poor and vulnerable communities. This realization and proven fact has continued to be shared as a desirable process for adaptation in international programs as well.

## 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

The CBA Programme has been a very successful project, not only with regard to pioneering approaches to deal with climate change adaptation for local vulnerable communities in developing countries, but also in terms of results and possible replication and with regard to scaling up. Following is a list of lessons learned and recommendations that can be drawn-up based on the information available.

### *Lessons learned*

- Much of the success of local activities was due to the fact that they built upon local needs, vulnerabilities, as well as perceptions and that a community approach to climate risks works when working jointly on measures leading to climate change adaptation while sustaining livelihoods.
- A lesson learned is that the approach of the CBA Programme and its projects (non-paternalistic, generating and building capacity and anchored in communities) has been a key positive factor for success and effectiveness.
- Civil society participation, community involvement, and volunteer work have been key inputs in the process of CBA projects and contributed to their successes.
- Project management and vulnerability assessment tools, instruments, knowledge products, and methodologies to be used for a specific project are successful when they help in mobilizing local groups and address local needs. The highly technical and complex application process should be commensurate with the capacities of the local communities attempting to reach.
- The incorporation of gender issues was a positive key aspect of the global to local activities, and of the knowledge management products.
- Gender mainstreaming gave visibility of climate change issues upon women and worked towards equitable adaptation issues.
- 
- Global partners' relations and interlinkages were stressed at times, straining working relationships among the global partners and at the same time confounding national and local components of the Programme. Global partners' relations and expectations should be clearly detailed in the cooperation agreement and clearly understood from the projects' onset, by defining working relationships, inputs by each partner, and providing for joint visibility.
- Monitoring processes were highly complex, multiple, and not commensurate with the sort of projects and the local capacities in project management.

### ***Recommendations for future actions***

- Local climate change adaptation successes should be firmly anchored not only on technical knowledge but also on approach.
- Local activities should continue to build upon local needs, vulnerabilities and perceptions, and continue to work jointly on adapting to climate change while sustaining livelihoods.
- Mainstreaming and scaling-up of the projects must be fully planned from the project design stages and properly resourced.
- The incorporation of gender, volunteerism, and other cross cutting issues should be integrated from the design stage for them to be truly woven into the Programme and its activities. If not done at the appropriate stage, these cross cutting issues remain disconnected to or cannot contribute to the overall outcome
- Application processes for local activities and projects should be commensurate with the aptitudes of communities a project or program is attempting to reach.
- Global partners' relations and expectations should be clearly marked and delineated from the projects' onset, defining working relationships, inputs by each partner, and joint visibility.
- Partners' global fund raising efforts should be based on strong partnership agreements between associates that bring to the table their institutional and technical strengths.
- Programme activities should continue to build up local capacities, creating awareness on the concept that climate change adaptation can be dealt with at the local level by communities, and that resiliency and adaptive solutions can be built-upon while improving livelihoods.
- It would be of interest in future projects and programmes to assess the role of volunteerism , in all its forms, in the different community-based climate adaptation approaches as well as to set a value to it in order to provide volunteerism with a thorough visibility.
- Volunteerism-specific data should be collected if future programmes and projects include this aspect of community – based adaptation.
- It would benefit future projects and programmes if all partners are involved at the design stage.

- It would be useful to organize events to highlight the CBA initiative, its successes, not only to communicate this, but also to encourage networking among country and site level actors involved in environmental and climate change adaptation.
- Monitoring processes need to be streamlined, to be commensurate with the type of the project being monitored and there is need to acknowledging and address local capacity gaps to effectively monitor Programme implementation.
- Instruments, methodologies, and knowledge management products could benefit communities by making them highly understandable, adapting and tailoring them to the different needs and abilities (for example, language, literacy rates, etc.).
- Monitoring and other related instruments should be structured to avoid the use of multiple instruments. The use of integrated methodologies for community based adaptation to climate change should be encouraged and whenever possible, the methods should include cross cutting themes to avoid the need for multiple use of methodologies.
- Future activities should attempt to build linkages among projects and between the community projects and local and national authorities where this do not occur, or reinforce this aspect when it does take place, in order to provide impulses to mainstream adaptation into policies.
- Building strong linkages with municipal authorities increase the chances of internalization of policy and sustainability. The support of local and national governmental authorities needs to continue to be built through a more targeted approach through outreach and communication of current results and achievements.
- Further community based climate change adaptation processes and projects should be adequately resourced in relation to the problems and levels of intervention they are attempting to deal with.
- It is important that future actions should address root causes (or continue to do so when it did) related to challenges in adaptation to climate change (livelihoods, poverty, vulnerabilities, community organization).
- It would be desirable that pilot programs such as CBA should in the future generate several projects in a particular local area to have a greater critical mass of projects in order to identify larger scale lessons learned, greater impact, and have more leverage regarding adaptation policies. The need for proper description of geographical focus at the time of preparing the CBA strategy document should help in formulating and fully describing this need. Landscape approach is therefore an important contribution that these community projects have shown is required, both as an effective planning, cost efficiency and for greater impacts.

All in all, CBA project, notwithstanding its limitations and problems, has been a very successful Programme. In order to reinforce initial benefits and build upon them, future directions should consider reinforcing the positive aspects demonstrated by this project in respect to the community-based approaches discussed in this document and build upon what has been field tested and proven as demonstrated by the achievement of the CBA programme and its local-level projects. Efforts should be made to sustain the community-based approach, building on and strengthening local capacities to deal with climate change adaptation. The CBA Programme has achieved increased awareness that community based approaches to climate change adaptation are feasible, and this is the strength it should build upon for future projects, scaling-up and mainstreaming.

Given the CBA Programme's positive results, a continuation would be highly recommended, not only attempting to replicate and upscale the activities already carried out, but also moving beyond. For example, expanding work in other countries and in other communities. Also, seeking to impulse the *approach* itself of communities working together to adapt to climate change while improving their livelihoods would be an asset.

## 5. Annexes

### Annex 1. Framework Matrix<sup>16</sup>

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
Goal	To reduce vulnerability and to increase adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change in the focal areas in which the GEF works				
	Indicator	<u>Baseline</u>	<u>Target</u>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective of the project: To enhance the capacity of communities in the pilot countries to adapt to climate change including variability	Reduction to vulnerability to climate change including variability	Each individual CBA project will undertake a quantitative assessment of its vulnerability (based on the VRA approach). The programme baseline is the average of individual project values	At any time after the completion of initial CBA projects, the average VRA value over all completed projects is at least 35%, and for no project is this value less than 10%	Individual project reports of participatory VRA assessments, compiled at country and global levels	Communities are able to identify factors that contribute to their vulnerability to climate change including variability and can rank these objectively.
	Magnitude of global environmental benefits secured (using the SGP's IAS)	Projects will apply the SGP IAS methodology in defining focal area-specific indicators of GEBs and measuring baseline values	At any time after the completion of initial CBA projects, 75% of projects will have met or surpassed their IAS targets.	Individual project reports of IAS assessments, compiled at country and global levels	Priority adaptation interventions can be identified that also contribute to securing global environmental benefits

<sup>16</sup> As indicated in the Project Document.

<b>Outcome 1: Enhanced adaptive capacity allows communities to reduce their vulnerability to adverse impacts of future climate hazards</b>	Number of strategies adopted to address drought and other categories of vulnerability	No strategies adopted other than pre-existing strategies	By the end of the programme, at least two new strategies in each category of vulnerability have been introduced at the community level in each participating country	Project reports, NC reports	In developing and implementing CBA project proposals, innovative solutions to increase adaptive capacity are generated
Output 1.1: A Country Programme Strategy.	Approval of CPS documents	No CPS documents	Within 4 months of the start of implementation, all 10 countries have an approved CPS	NC reports, and submissions of CPS documents to UNDP	Expressed government commitment translates into early and prompt action to develop CBA CPS documents
Output 1.2 NGOs/CBOs with capacity to design and support implementation of CBA projects.	Number of CBA concepts submitted  % of CBA concepts submitted that incorporate voluntary mechanisms	No CBA concepts  None	Within 8 months of the start of implementation, at least 30 CBA concepts have been received by the NC in each country	NC reports, and copies of concepts forwarded to UNDP	NGO/CBO capacity building is effective in allowing communities to develop concepts for CBA funding
Output 1.3 A portfolio of CBA projects.	Number of approved CBA projects	No approved CBA projects	Within 11 months of the start of implementation, at least 3 projects have been approved in each country	NC reports, and copies of approved proposals forwarded to UNDP	The NSC remains committed and active
<b>Outcome 2: National policies and programmes promote replication of best practices derived from CBA projects</b>	Number of policies and programmes adopted or adapted on the basis of CBA experiences	National policies and programmes rarely account for community based adaptation strategies	By the end of the programme, at least 8 national policies or programmes have been adopted, or existing policies and programmes adapted to take account of experiences generated through the CBA	NC reports, supported by surveys of policy makers in each country	Policy makers are effectively engaged in the CBA process and CBA projects generate policy-relevant experiences

Output 2.1 Policy makers engaged in the CBA process.	Number of policy makers engaged in the CBA	No CBA process initiated	Within 12 months of the start of CBA implementation in each country, at least one senior policy maker (at the level of Director General or above) in each of the identified sectors for CBA implementation is engaged in the CBA process through participation in the NCC or equivalent body.	NCC reports	Selection of policy maker to be engaged maximizes potential for lessons to be integrated into national policies and programmes
Output 2.2 Lessons from community-based adaptation-related activities compiled and disseminated	Number of lessons compiled and disseminated	No lessons generated	Within 12 months of the start of CBA implementation in each country, at least one lesson generated by CBA projects has been described and disseminated to national level stakeholders. By the end of the programme, this number is at least five in each country	NC reports	Engagement of senior policy makers increases the likelihood of lessons being adopted in non-CBA locations within each country
	<i>Dissemination and use of a methodology to measure communities' voluntary contributions to adaptation</i>	<i>No methodology available to measure value of communities' contribution to adaptation to climate change</i>	2009: Existence of draft methodology  2010: Methodology disseminated and implementation supported in all project countries; Data available on at least 75% of the implemented CBA projects with voluntary mechanisms due to implementation of methodology  2011: Finalized methodology disseminated globally; Data available on at least 90% of the implemented CBA projects with voluntary mechanisms due to implementation of methodology	Methodology user guide CBA project reports	

<b>Outcome 3: Cooperation among member countries promotes innovation in adaptation to climate change including variability</b>	Adoption or adaptation of practices piloted through the CBA	No cross-border learning	By the end of the programme, there is at least one example in each country of a strategy or practice that was introduced on the basis of experiences gained in other countries	Survey of NCs and CBA project teams	Projects are under implementation long enough for lessons to be transferred to other countries before the end of the programme
Output 3.1 CBA web-site	Existence of CBA web-site  Value of web-site	No web-site  No web site	Within 1 month of the start of implementation, a public programme web-site has been created  At the end of the programme, a survey of stakeholders in each country reveals that at least 60% used the CBA web-site regularly to learn about progress in the CBA	Project reports  Survey of stakeholders as part of the final evaluation	
Output 3.2 Global database of CBA projects.	Existence of CBA global database  Value of CBA global database	No database  No database	Within 11 months of the start of implementation, a public global database of CBA projects has been created  At the end of the programme, a survey of stakeholders in each country reveals that at least 60% referred to the global CBA database regularly	Project reports  Survey of stakeholders as part of the final evaluation	
Output 3.3 Best practices and lessons learned exchanged among countries.	Number of cases included in the ALM	No cases of best practice recorded	At the time of programme completion, at least 3 examples of best practice generated through the CBA are accessible through the ALM (12 months after programme completion, this figure is at least 10)	Programme reports, ALM reports	ALM becomes operational and effective in time to document best practices from the CBA
Output 3.4 Guidance documents for GEF and others on CBA programming and project support.	Documented CBA experiences guide future GEF interventions on adaptation to climate change	Initial GEF guidance developed without benefits of community experience in	At the time of programme completion, discussions have been initiated with the GEF Secretariat to ensure that experiences from the CBA guide future GEF	Programme reports, interviews with GEF Secretariat personnel	GEF continues to target adaptation to climate change including variability

	including variability	adaptation to climate change including variability	interventions on adaptation to climate change including variability		
--	-----------------------	--	---	--	--

## Annex 2: Key Results

As extracted from *Annual Report for PIMS: 3508-Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change, (GEF SPA-Global FSP), Year 2011*

<b>Outcome 1: Enhanced adaptive capacity allows communities to reduce their vulnerability to adverse impacts of future climate hazards.</b>	
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Results and recommendations</b>
1.1 Development of Country Programme Strategies.	Country strategies in all 10 participating countries were developed within 4 months of project implementation.
1.2 To select NGOs/CBOs with capacity to design and support implementation of CBA projects.	<p>From 2008 to 2011, all NGOs/CBOs, who had comparative advantage in terms of designing and supporting implementation of community-based adaptation-related activities, have been identified and selected in the 10 participating countries. The focus on the prior years, which will continue into 2012, is to train the NGOs/CBOs on how to build their own capacities to manage impacts of climate change as dictated in the GEF/SPA guidelines. In the 2011 APR, it was noted that the project’s capacity building and awareness-raising requires continued effort when working at the community and national levels and that many local NGOs and CBOs have limited technical and implementation capacity. Therefore, long-term capacity building is required for the sustainability of the project at the local level.</p> <p>Similarly, the project has developed tools that communities are trained on and continually use. These tools, processes and methods include: the CBA project-developed templates (conducting CCA, financial reporting, project monitoring and evaluation, Assessing economic and environmental outcomes, training requirements for adaptation and mitigation, undertaking adaptive land and water management practices, CBA project development processes, VRA and knowledge sharing strategies), CCA toolkit, CBA and Gender Guidebook and a case studies (Namibia conservation tillage documentary). Additionally, in 2011, a 4-page “How-to” Inclusivity document was developed and disseminated to highlight the importance of including everyone in the community including the elderly, children, people with disabilities, etc. The project also jointly published an article for an international audience on “Seeking Sustainable Financing Mechanisms for Up-Scaling Community-Based Adaptation”</p> <p>NGOs/CBOs were also trained on the design of GEF SPA eligible projects where the following components were taught: gender mainstreaming, climate change adaptation, policy influence, Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA), and support to communities in participatory methodologies including volunteerism and inclusive participation. Trainings were also conducted for journalists and NGO’s. UN Volunteers have also been very involved with the CBA concept/project development cycle. In 2011, 4 projects in Guatemala and</p>

	8 projects in Morocco were prepared with the support from UNVs and NCs.
1.3: A portfolio of CBA projects	In 2011, 17 full proposals were technically cleared by the NSC in 3 out of 10 countries. The three countries were the last to prepare projects, and these 17 projects are the last projects to be implemented under the pilot CBA project, which has stopped further project preparations this year. With regard to project closures, 5 of the 64 projects were completed in 2011. 59 projects will close on or before December 31, 2012, when the pilot CBA project is planned to operationally close.
<b>Outcome 2: National policies and programmes include community adaptation priorities to promote replication, up-scaling and integration of best practices derived from CBA projects.</b>	
Output 2.1 Policy makers engaged in the CBA process	<p>In all CBA countries, project results are reported to the SGP National Steering Committee, some of whom are government officials and work in line Ministries (such as Ministry of Agriculture and Planning Institute in Jamaica). This is an important consideration in influencing policy. On the other hand, CBA continues to work closely with regional councils, local and traditional authorities, farmers, organizations, national and international institutions of higher learning, and vocational centres.</p> <p>Some examples of policy-influencing activities at the local level are: i) In Morocco, CBA contributed to the Climate Change matrix strategy as solicited by the Ministry of Environment. The inputs on the policy at national level aimed at reinforcement of CBA approaches, community mobilization, capacity building and gender mainstreaming; ii) In Kazakhstan, round tables were conducted with government officials, NGO representatives, and academics on climate change adaptation problems. The CBA approaches were discussed as forming possible solutions to the identified problems. Additionally, demonstration plots and trainings were used to share information and to involve community leaders and policy makers (local and regional).</p> <p>Collaboration with policy makers ensured information is disseminated through the official channels; iii) In Namibia, in an effort to formulate policy and to influence already existing policies at the local and national levels, the CBA team participated in a conference held in Namibia by both Governments of Tanzania and Namibia, which was hosted by the World Bank. On the cross-country information exchange, the CBA team shared their CBA experiences and approaches on community participation, volunteerism and resource management practices applied in the projects in various venues such as CBA5 and in bilateral meetings in Africa; and iv) In Samoa, CBA projects are aligned with the Samoan Government' Coastal Infrastructure Management Plans and are concretely mainstreamed in another large stand alone CBA programme (MAP CBA).</p>
Output 2.2 Lessons from community-based adaptation-related activities compiled and disseminated	The progress of each CBA project was reported in four quarterly reports and project-based reports prepared by PMU, based on information from the field. The CBA and Gender guidebook, "How-to" Inclusivity publication and an Issue Brief on "CBA and Gender" were disseminated at UNFCCC COP17. Success stories of CBA projects were highlighted in the UNDP Quarterly CCA newsletter and in the GEF website. In August 2011, two UNVs attended the

	<p>Adaptation Learning Programme for Africa: Gender and Community-Based Adaptation Workshop in Ghana and shared experiences on the CBA on gender mainstreaming and successful adaptation methods to CC. In March 2011, the project shared lessons learned in the international CBA conference in Bangladesh and continues to contribute to the Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM). Overall, all KM products are disseminated globally or locally, and are available in the CBA website. During this period of reporting many KM products were in the process of preparations by consultants. Most of these will move into 2012 to be completed.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3: Cooperation among member countries promotes innovation in the design and implementation of adaptation to climate change, including variability, projects/policies</b></p>	
<p>Output 3.1 CBA website</p>	<p>A CBA Web-site was designed and is operational (<a href="http://www.undp-adaptation.org/projects/cba">http://www.undp-adaptation.org/projects/cba</a>). This website is maintained and up-to-date with current information. On the homepage, all articles written about CBA by external parties (newspapers, NGO partners) and by internal CBA staff are available. It also holds all conferences in which the CBA staffs were involved as well as all KM products (videos and publications) created by CBA. Each country page has an overview of climate challenges in the country, the CBA country programme strategy, and the various projects under implementation with photos from the project sites. A Knowledge Management page also exists, which is organized by type of product and the date that the product was made available. Besides regular up-keep, the website is modified on a quarterly basis based on analysis of visitor profiles and assessed needs through the use of Google Analytics tool.</p>
<p>Output 3.2 Global database of CBA projects</p>	<p>The CBA database is anchored within the SGP database in which all monitorable VRA and IAS data are stored. In addition, non quantitative narrative data are also included for all projects. The data inputs are continually done by all countries CBA personnel. Other countries, except Namibia, Niger and Vietnam, have 100% data inputs and information is up to date. All official documents are also stored in the UNDP filing system as well as the UNDP-GEF database (PIMS).</p>
<p>Output 3.3 Best practices and lessons learned exchanged among countries</p>	<p>This activity is handled at two levels. One is the sharing of KM products by all interested parties and in international seminars, workshops and conferences. The other way is sharing information and lessons in-country and between countries. For example, a round table meeting between Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan to discuss current CC challenges in Central Asia and to share CBA practices in KAZ was held. The key partners discussed the regional aspects of adaptation and developed a complex set of primary measures to be taken at the local level, in governmental led efforts and also by inter-governmental and inter-country initiatives. Similarly, cross-country exchanges between Namibia and Tanzania occurred as stated in output 2.1. Knowledge sharing was also disseminated via participatory videos. For this purpose, Bolivia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Samoa, Niger and Morocco have developed PVs for national/global dissemination. The CBA PMU provided an update on the progress to the board members in May 2011.</p>

<p>Output 3.4 Guidance documents for GEF and others on CBA programming and project support</p>	<p>A CBA Practitioners' Guidebook is under development and aimed to be finalized in the last quarter of 2012. Additionally, the following publications are being developed in 2012: 1) A Comparative Studies publication is being prepared for KAZ, Samoa and Jamaica; 2) A Policy brief on "Sustainable Land and Watershed Management Activities of the UNDP GEF CBA Project"; 3) Document on VRA experiences in the project; and 4) A Lessons Learned publication based on the technical report prepared for and at the time of the midterm review of the project.</p>
--	--

### ***Annex 3. Terms of Reference***

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE

(Individual Contractor Agreement)

Title: Terminal Evaluator of the Community-based Adaptation Project

Project: CBA UNDP / 59738

Duty station: Home based

Section/Unit: EMO IWC

Contract/Level: Local - Support ICA, Level SB-4

Duration: 15/10/2012 through 07/12/2012

Supervisor: Senior Portfolio Manager, Ms. Katrin Lichtenberg

#### 1. General Background

(Brief description of the national, sector-specific or other relevant context in which the individual contractor will operate)

#### Objective and Scope

The project was designed to implement community-based projects that seek to enhance the resiliency of communities, and/or the ecosystems on which they rely, to climate change impacts. It essentially created small-scale 'project/policy laboratories' and generated knowledge about how to achieve adaptation at the local level. Ten participating countries (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Samoa, and Vietnam) each developed planned and implemented a portfolio of community-level adaptation projects. Lessons learned from community projects would then be leveraged to promote replication of successful community practices, and integration of lessons learned into policies that promote increased community adaptive capacity. This project would assist in responding to GEF's internal needs for concrete experience with local-scale climate change adaptation, as well as the growing needs of countries for ground-level experience and clear policy lessons. The TE covers the entire programme, including the components supported by UNV and the Governments of Japan and Switzerland. The overall aim of the UNV support to this project is to mainstream and strengthen the capacity of community volunteering and enhance grassroots capacity to adapt to climate change. UNV support is aimed at adding value to the project, by focusing on the assets of communities and by bringing the strength of volunteerism to development, voluntary action, and the mobilization of national and international volunteers.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP and UNV programming. Page 2 of 4

## 2. Purpose and Scope of Assignment

(Concise and detailed description of activities, tasks and responsibilities to be undertaken, including expected travel, if applicable)

### Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with local stakeholders, in particular the GEF operational focal point, GEF SGP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in New York and other key stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNV Headquarters, GEF SGP and line Ministries in the 10 pilot countries.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, project files, CBA country programme strategies, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

#### Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the retrofitted Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

#### Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table.

#### Mainstreaming

UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact Page 3 of 4

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in community livelihoods, b) verifiable reductions in vulnerability of ecological systems and communities, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

#### Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

#### Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Global Office in New York, USA. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Governments and national Stakeholders in the pilot countries.

#### Evaluation time frame

The total duration of the evaluation will be 15 working days according to the following plan:

#### Activity Timing Completion Date

- Preparation 3 days 15 October 2012
- Draft Evaluation Report 10 days 29 October 2012
- Final Report 2 days 31 October 2012

#### Evaluation deliverables

The consultant is expected to deliver the following:

- Inception Report Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method; No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation is finalized; Evaluator submits report to UNDP PMU, NY
- Draft Final Report, (per template) with annexes; within 2 weeks of the end of the consultancy; sent to pilot countries, reviewed by STA, PMU.
- Final Revised Report; within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft; sent to GEF EO for uploading to relevant sites and PIMS.

#### Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'

#### 3. Monitoring and Progress Controls

(Clear description of measurable outputs, milestones, key performance indicators and/or reporting requirements which will enable performance monitoring)

#### Payment modalities and specifications

This payment schedule is indicative and can be varied based on the consultants needs.

- 10% upon the provision of a simple work plan on how the consultancy will proceed
- 40% Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
- 50% Following submission and approval (PMU, UNV Hqts and UNDP GEF STA) of the final terminal evaluation report

#### 4. Qualifications and Experience

(List the required education, work experience, expertise and competencies of the individual contractor. The listed education and experience should correspond with the level at which the contract is offered.)

##### a. Education (Level and area of required and/or preferred education)

- MSc or equivalent in a related biological or natural resources management field

##### b. Work Experience

(List number of years and area of required work experience. Clearly distinguish between required experience and experience which could be an asset.)

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience,

##### c. Key Competencies

(Technical knowledge, skills, managerial competencies or other personal competencies relevant to the performance of the assignment. Clearly distinguish between required and desired competencies)

- Previous experience with results-based monitoring, PRA evaluation methodologies and working with poor vulnerable communities a strong advantage
- Technical knowledge in climate change adaptation and management of projects at the community level
- Knowledge of UNDP, GEF and excellent analytical and writing skills. Previous demonstrated experience in evaluating community based adaptation projects is an added advantage.

• Excellent English writing and communication skills and demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw well supported conclusions

Project Authority (Name/Title):  
Signature Date

Contract holder (Name/Title):

Signature

Date

**Annex 4**      **List of persons contacted and interviewed**

---

<b>Nick Remple</b>	Senior Technical Adviser, Community Resilience and Sustainability (CRS)
<b>Alan Fox</b>	Evaluation, Advisor, UNDP
<b>Lucy Wanjiru</b>	Environmental Focal Point in Gender Team, UNDP
<b>Diana Salvemini</b>	Consultant, MTR 2010
<b>Oliver Wittershagen</b>	Portfolio Manager, UNV
<b>Ghulam Isaczai</b>	Chief, Development, UNV
<b>Jennifer Laughlin</b>	Environment & Energy Group, UNDP
<b>Mari Matsumoto</b>	Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office
<b>Charles MacNeill</b>	Senior Manager, Environment & Energy Group, UNDP
<b>Charles Nyandiga</b>	Programme Coordinator
<b>Anna Lisa Jose</b>	Programme Associate
<b>Ruben Salas</b>	National Coordinator, GEF SGP Bolivia
<b>Liseth Martinez</b>	National Coordinator, GEF SGP Guatemala
<b>Fredy Soto</b>	National UNV, CBA Guatemala
<b>Hyacinth Douglas</b>	National Coordinator, GEF SGP Jamaica
<b>Michelle Curling-Ludford</b>	National UNV, CBA Jamaica
<b>Katerina Yushenko</b>	National Coordinator, GEF SGP Kazakhstan
<b>Sion Shifa</b>	National UNV, CBA Namibia
<b>Abdou Gaidama</b>	National UNV, CBA Niger
<b>Anne-France Wittmann</b>	International UNV Officer, CBA Morocco
<b>Kim Anh Nguyen</b>	National Coordinator, GEF SGP Vietnam

---

## ***Annex 5 List of documents reviewed***

### *Project's Documents*

- UNDP Project Document Community-based Adaptation, PIMS 3508.
- Annual Report for PIMS: 3508-Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change (GEF SPA-Global FSP), Year 2011.

### *Final Country Program Reports*

- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT BANGLADESH
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT BOLIVIA
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT GUATEMALA
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT JAMAICA
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT KAZAKHSTAN
  
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT MOROCCO
- 
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT NAMIBIA
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT NIGER
- GEF SPA CBA COUNTRY PROGRAMME REPORT VIETNAM

### *Final Workshop Presentations*

- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA) and Impact Assessment System (IAS) Rabat, Morocco; November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA Overview, Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Bangladesh), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Bolivia), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012. (DVD)
  
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Jamaica), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Kazakhstan), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Morocco), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Namibia), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Niger), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.

- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Samoa), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.
- Community-Based Adaptation Programme Final Workshop, CBA (Viet Nam), Rabat, Morocco, November 2012.

#### *Evaluation and Monitoring Guidelines and Manuals*

- Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Evaluation Office, 2009.
- UNDP EVALUATION GUIDANCE FOR GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS VERSION FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATORS, (FINAL DRAFT, MARCH 17TH 2011)
- Outcome-level evaluation: A companion guide to the handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators. December 2011. UNEG.

#### *CBA Programme's Monitoring, Evaluation, and Observation Reports*

- Mid Term Review, UNDP-GEF Community Based Adaptation Programme (CBA), Project PIMS 3508, 2010
- UNV Official Mission to Bolivia, Back to the Office Report
- UNV Official Mission to Guatemala, Back to the Office Report
- UNV Official Mission to Jamaica, Back to the Office Report
- UNV Official Mission to Morocco, Back to the Office Report
- UNV Official Mission to Namibia, Back to the Office Report
- UNV Official Mission to Niger, Back to the Office Report
- UNV Official Mission to Viet Nam, Back to the Office Report

#### *Other Bibliography and Resources Consulted*

- The Local Capacity Strategy Enabling Action for the Environment and Sustainable Development UNDP Environment and Energy Group
- The Power of Local Action Learning from Communities on the Frontline of Sustainable Development UNDP Environment and Energy Group
- Enabling Local Success A primer on Mainstreaming Local Ecosystem-Based Solutions to Poverty-Environment Challenges UNDP – UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative
- Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change UNDP
- Gender, Climate Change and Community-Based Adaptation, Guidebook.
- Methodology to measure volunteers' contribution to CBA, UNV.
- "Tarwi: the Seeds of the Future" Video

**Annex 6      *List of Knowledge Management Products<sup>17</sup>***

<b>Product Title</b>
Gender, Climate Change and Community-Based Adaptation
CBA "How-To: Inclusivity"
CBA Success Stories - For GEF
Gender and Community-Based Adaptation to climate change
Community-Based to CC: Equator Prize Award-winning project in Morocco
Thematic papers on CBA at portfolio levels within the UNDP-GEF Project
Methodology to measure volunteers' contribution to CBA
Harnessing multiple coping strategies for a holistic approach towards community adaptation to climate change: the use of Conservation Agriculture (CA) in Namibia
Community-Based Adaptation for Lelepa Village (Samoa)
A Toolkit for Designing Climate Change Adaptation Initiatives
UNFCCC- The Nairobi Work Programme: On Impacts, Vulnerability, and Adaptation to Climate Change. The project contributed a chapter in the book.
Community-Based Adaptation in Niger
Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia
Community-Based Adaptation in Kazakhstan and Central Asia
"Tarwi: the Seeds of the Future" Participatory Video

---

<sup>17</sup> As indicated in Annual Report for PIMS: 3508-Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change, (GEF SPA-Global FSP), Year 2011.

Tiwizi: Community unites for adaptation to climate change
Tofiga o Pili A'au: Community-Based Climate Change Adaptation in Samoa
Video on Community-Based Adaptation
Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change Brochure
Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change: Supporting Climate Resilience and Grassroots Actions to Policy Change
Community-based adaptation to flooding in Avao village
Community-based adaptation to flooding and sea level rise in Fagamalo village
Reduce impacts of climate change-driven erosion through protection and conservation of mangrove and coral reef ecosystems in Fasitootai village
Community-based adaptation to flooding and sea level rise in Safa'i village
Intensifying goat herding to help women adapt to climate change in Tamalolo
Reconstitution of hut livestock to reduce household vulnerability to climate change in the communities of Houtchi and Dan Djaoudi, Roubou
Project in support for adjustment to Climate change in the community of Tamalolo
Expansion of agro-forestry practices in five country villages in Tamalolo
Contributing to improving agro-forestry and using improved seeds in the community of Maigochi Saboua, Roubou
Climate-resilient horse production in Kargaly village
Reducing vulnerability to declining water supplies in Burevestnik rural community
Autumn/Winter irrigation as an adaptive mechanism for efficient use of water resources in Sady Shakirov
Demonstration of Adaptive Land Management under Climate Change Conditions in Priozernoye
Harnessing multiple coping strategies enhanced via a holistic approach to community adaptation to climate change
Increasing community adaptation and ecosystem resilience to climate change in Portland Bight
Glengoffe climate change adaptation
Adaptive agroforestry in the Saipina municipality
Community water resource management as an adaptation strategy in Vallegrande

Adjusting community agricultural practices to reduce climate change risk in Omusati region.
Strengthening the TARMGUISTE oasis ecosystem's resiliency to the impacts of climate change and improving the local community's capacity to adapt to reduced water resources and soil degradation
Building the forest ecosystem's resiliency and improving two communities' capacities to adapt to the effects of climate change, particularly the increase and intensification of drought periods, through a sustainable and integrated farming and forestry strategy in the Province of Azilal – High Atlas.
Project Agroforestry and soil and water conservation as strategies to build the Boumaad mountain ecosystem's resiliency and the local community's adaptive capacities
Strengthening the resiliency of the IGUIWAZ oasis ecosystem to the impacts of climate change and improving the local community's capacity to adapt to reduced water resources and soil degradation
Strengthening the resilience of the Sidi Majbeur mountain ecosystem and reinforcing the community's adaptive capacities to increasingly erratic rainstorms and diminishing overall rainfall, through erosion control, conservation farming and income diversification, based on pilot vetiver application
Enhancing the resiliency of the oasis agrobiodiversity and strengthening the Laachoria community's capacities to adapt to growing climatic variability and intensified droughts, through a strategy of natural resource and endemic species conservation.
Promoting agro-based diversified activities for improving food and household livelihood security of vulnerable Adibashi Community in hilly areas of Bakshiganj Upzila under Jamalpur District
Strengthening Resilience of Climate Change-Affected Communities in South-western Coastal Areas of Bangladesh
Community-Based Wetland Management Project
Reducing Climate Change-Driven Erosion and Landslide Risks through Sustainable Agriculture for Safer Slopes
Land & Preservation Measures to Combat Climate Change Pressures in Cockpit Country's Martha Brae Watershed
Cockpit Country Adaptation to Climate Change Variability
Guatemala CBA Projects DVD
Life on Salty Soil Strengthening Resilience of Climate Change-affected Communities in South-western Coastal Area of Bangladesh CD

## **Annex 7 Evaluation Question Matrix**

### *Evaluation Matrix and Preliminary Questionnaire*

#### **Criteria**

#### *General questions operationalized in questionnaire*

<p>1. Relevance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Adaptation Strategic Priority window, and to the environment and development priorities at the local and national levels?</li> <li>• How does the project relate to countries development strategies and objectives (UNDAFs, etc.)?</li> <li>• How does the project link with other similar projects in the field, if at all?</li> <li>• How has the project dealt with monitoring throughout its development (indicators?)?</li> <li>• Lessons learnt and future recommendations?</li> </ul>
<p>2. Effectiveness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</li> <li>• To what extent has the project delivered environmental benefits?</li> <li>• How effective has the project been in delivering adaptation capacities for the communities?</li> <li>• How effective have been the Project's governance structures?</li> <li>• Lessons learnt and future recommendations?</li> </ul>
<p>3. Efficiency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</li> <li>• Has the Project implementation process been efficient in terms of how the activities have been delivered in the field? Were changes made necessary to the work plans during implementation?</li> <li>• What have been the problems/issues/challenges identified regarding efficient implementations?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have the administrative processes worked out (accounting, disbursement, hiring etc.)?</li> <li>• Lessons learnt and future recommendations?</li> </ul>
4. Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</li> <li>• What are the prospects of sustainability in the mid to long term?</li> <li>• What are the prospects of sustaining the program’s effects and benefits in the near future?</li> <li>• Was country-ownership of the projects generated? Does this help sustainability prospects?</li> <li>• What are the prospects of partners sustaining activities beyond project termination?</li> <li>• Was capacity building attended to in order to promote sustainability? What sorts of capacity building practices took place that can help with sustainability (generation of policy, training, etc.)?</li> <li>• What are the prospects of replication or scaling up of the projects?</li> <li>• Lessons learnt and future recommendations?</li> </ul>
5. Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced community and ecosystems vulnerability and/or improved ecological status of ecosystems and livelihoods status of communities?</li> <li>• What has been the overall impact of the interventions?</li> <li>• What impact indicators have been used in order to evaluate the effect of the interventions?</li> <li>• How do these indicators relate to the projects monitoring and evaluation process?</li> <li>• Lessons learnt and future recommendations?</li> </ul>