

Mid-term review Report

Binational project “Building adaptive capacity through food and nutritional security actions in vulnerable Afro-descendent and Indigenous communities in the Colombian-Ecuadorian border area”



World Food
Programme

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

i. Basic project information

Project: Building adaptive capacity through food and nutritional security actions in vulnerable Afro-descendant and Indigenous communities in the Colombian-Ecuadorian border area.

Implementing Entity: World Food Programme

Executing Entities:

Colombia

- Association of Cabildo Mayor Awá del Putumayo (Acipap)
- Indigenous Unit of the Awá People (UNIPA)
- Resguardo Indígena Nulpe Medio Alto Río San Juan (NULPE)
- Alto Mira y Frontera Community Council (Ccamyf)
- Bajo Mira y Frontera Community Council (Ccbmyf)

Ecuador

- Federation of Awá Centers of Ecuador (FCAE)
- Afro-Ecuadorian Confederation of Northern Esmeraldas (CANE)

Designated Authorities:

- Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia
- Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition of Ecuador

Review consultant: Dr. Isabel Guerrero Ochoa (isabel.guerrero@wfp.com)

Execution period and MTR delivery date: November 09, 2022, to February 08, 2023.

ii. Acknowledgments

This mid-term review was prepared for WFP by Isabel Guerrero Ochoa, Independent Consultant. I would first like to thank Laura Cadilhac for her relevant support to the work, going many times beyond the call of duty to ensure the success of this review.

The consultant is grateful to all those who provided information and shared their time and knowledge with me, providing a solid basis for the findings included in this report, including: Alfonso Maya, Amílcar Chapuez, Angélica Camacho, Angélica Mosquera, Anisorc Brito Ramírez, Carmen Galarza, Cesar Quiñones, Chiara Pili, Claudia Carrión, Damián Pachón, Diana Tamayo, Edison Marcial, Freddy Cubillos, Guillermo Prieto, Helber Gómez, Helmer Guzmán, Hugo Mideros, Inés Morales, Ítalo Quintero, Javier León, Javier Rojas, Jihye Shin, Johana Murillo, José Nastacuaz, Karla Solís, Luis Cumba, Luis Fernández, Marco Burbano, Maritza Landázuri, Marlon Acosta, Nadine Grimmampe, Pablo Aguirre, Pablo Caza, Ricaurte Ocampo, Rider Pai, Roberto Montesdeoca, Sofía Ayala, Tatiana Paredes, Verónica Lora, Viviana Carabali, Willington Guerrero, y Yolanda González. Without exception, I felt that all stakeholders contributed wholeheartedly to this assessment, and I am therefore deeply grateful for their support.

Finally, I thank Nataly Paredes for her unconditional support in the production of this report. Her high professional competence and her commitment were essential to deliver this report on time.

Contents

	Page
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
2. INTRODUCTION	9
2.1. Overview of the MTR	9
2.2. Context	9
3. REVIEW OF FINDINGS	12
3.1. Findings about project design	12
3.2. Achievement results and review criteria	19
3.3. Challenges and progress towards impact	24
3.4. Evaluation of the processes that influence the achievement of project results	25
3.5. M&E strategy evaluation (discussion)	33
4. LESSONS LEARNED, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	37
4.1. Lessons learned	38
4.2. Recommendations	41
4.3. Conclusions	43
5. References	44
6. Acronyms	45
7. Annexes	47

List of annexes

Annex 1. Review of methodology and its limitations	47
Annex 2. Documents reviewed (Guides and documents).....	51
Annex 3. Recommendations category 2 - Specifics to improve M&E.....	51
Annex 4. Proposal for adjustment to the safeguard indicators within the framework of the ESMP	52
Annex 5. Terms of reference	56
Annex 6. Interviewed stakeholders	63
Annex 7. Matrix of evaluation/review questions	69
Annex 8. Interview protocols	78

[Mid-term review report of the Binational Adaptation project Colombia – Ecuador]

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

1. The binational project, called "Building adaptive capacity through food and nutrition security actions in vulnerable Afro-descendant and Indigenous communities in the Colombian-Ecuadorian border area" (hereinafter, "the project" or "Colombia-Ecuador Binational Adaptation Project"), was designed to strengthen food security and nutrition through the implementation of climate change adaptation measures in the binational watersheds of Mira-Mataje and Guáitara-Carchi along the Colombia-Ecuador border. The project seeks to reduce the climate vulnerabilities of local Afro-descendant and Indigenous communities and the ecosystems on which they depend, promoting food security and nutrition, gender equality and contributing to peace building; and strengthen the adaptive capacities of Afro and Indigenous communities in the transboundary region, and strengthen regional institutions to address the threats posed by climate change.
2. The Project start date was May 03, 2018, with the Project Inception Workshop. On April 07, 2017, the Project Document (Prodoc) was already signed by all the parties involved, the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia (Minambiente), the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition of Ecuador (MAATE) and the Implementing Entity (WFP) of Colombia and Ecuador. The Adaptation Fund was requested to extend the project once for 18 months at no additional cost, and it was approved through Decision B.38-39/7, establishing the project completion date as November 3, 2024.
3. The total initial cash budget for the project was USD 14,000,000, of which USD 12,903,200 was earmarked for the total project cost (USD 1,781,500 for Component 1 outcomes and outputs, USD 1,681,800 was budgeted for Component 2 outcomes and outputs, USD 8,320,500 for Component 3, USD 1,119,400 to cover project implementation costs (9.5 percent) and USD 1,096,800 for the management fees (8.5 percent) of the Implementing Entity (IE)).
4. In the framework of the M&E Strategy a consultancy was hired to conduct a mid-term review (MTR) and this report presents the findings (see [Annex 1. Review of methodology and its limitations](#) and [Annex 2. Documents reviewed \(Guides and documents\)](#)), whose main purpose is to support learning (lessons learned) and make recommendations and corrective actions to the IE, Executing Entities, Designated Authorities, technical team, partners, and other interested parties to facilitate the achievement of the expected results of the Project.

Summary of Findings

5. The project has contributed to strengthening the capacities of the EE of Colombia and Ecuador for the implementation of adaptation measures (AM) to climate change. One of the main contributions of the project is the generation of knowledge for the EEs and the prioritized Awá and Afro communities of both countries. However, it would be important to reinforce the synergy between the national governments and technicians and specialists of the two countries to strengthen the relationship and collaborative work.
6. The project is of great relevance for the Awá and Afro-descendant populations, since they inhabit historically marginalized areas that are difficult to access for government entities in Colombia and Ecuador. The project was designed and is implemented in accordance with the priorities in terms of climate change,

environmental management, and sustainable development at the local, national and binational levels along the Colombia and Ecuador border area.

7. Agreed upon by the Parties during the project design phase, strategic management and implementation are carried out by WFP, MAATE and Minambiente within the framework of the Binational Steering Committee (BSC). The technical operational management and implementation of the project is carried out within the framework of an approved annual operational plan (AOP), and other agreements reached with the parties that make up the governance spaces at the national level (NSCC, NSCE, NTACC, NTACE). The delegates of the Afro-descendant and Awá indigenous Executing Entities participate in these committees, as well as national and subnational government and decentralized entities, among other key actors for local management depending on the country. The activities that are part of the daily management of the project are carried out through the WFP Country Offices in Colombia and Ecuador, in permanent coordination with the Designated Authorities (Minambiente, MAATE), considering applicable guidelines of the WFP, the Adaptation Fund, and depending on national contexts. Additionally, WFP as a multilateral implementation entity, has three spaces for strategic and operational articulation that internally promote a coordinated execution of the project.
8. There were delays in the implementation stage of the project, which to some extent is due to the fact that some risks were not identified at the design stage, which impacted the completeness of the Risk Mitigation Plan. In 2020 (Year 2), activity and budget execution levels remained low due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, in 2020 there was a significant increase in risks associated with armed groups in the project intervention area and which limited WFP's execution of activities in the field, including with the installation of anti-personnel mines and attacks on leaders of some Awá organizations. In 2021 (Year 3), the level of execution of planned activities was low due to the limited understanding of the EE of their role as established in the FLAs, this includes understanding the guidelines for the execution of the funds, the extensive consultation processes, the agreement with the communities and EE on the adaptation measures, as well as due to the non-compliance with certain clauses established in the FLA in relation to the gender approach (Awá organizations).
9. Adaptation measures design is consistent with the communities needs and was developed in the context of outputs 3.1.1. "Development of participatory approaches interconnecting scientific and traditional knowledge" and 3.1.2. "Design and implementation of effective adaptation measures incorporating participatory approaches, traditional and local knowledge and proven techniques to recover degraded ecosystems in 120 communities, promoting equal opportunities in access to resources". As a first step, 5 SLP were conducted with the participation of 133 people (33% women), each generating one SLP report (2 Afro, 3 Awá); and 12 prioritized EbA measures (6 in each country). Then, the community-based participatory planning (CBPP) took place, for which a group of facilitators was trained, with whom the planning process through local teams organized by ethnic group in each country. The local diagnosis and identification of priority adaptation interventions was developed during the COVID-19 lock-down. This allowed the appropriation of adaptation measures from the local level.
10. The project makes a limited but relevant contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment. Two outcome indicators on gender have been included but are not linked to the impact indicator. Within the scope of the Prodoc a first rapid assessment was conducted on the gender situation of the Awá and Afro-descendant populations in the intervention area. In addition, as part of the results framework, gender gap evaluations were carried out in each country under different working mechanisms and methodologies. This has allowed to encourage and promote the participation of women from the Awá communities in all activities. UN Women contributed with the development of a strategy for gender mainstreaming in the project, through which a guide for capacity building has been developed for the project technical team, the partners staff and community facilitators. WFP experience, policies, guides and/or guidelines, added to those shared by MAATE (it has created a technical team named "Gender and Climate Change Commission")

and Minambiente, have allowed the project activities to be implemented with this approach. The MTR also recognized the good practices for compliance with the gender clauses established in the Agreements with EE (FLAs).

11. The Prodoc contains a brief Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and a results framework with objective and outcome indicators for project implementation. Four M&E activities are indicated in the Prodoc: i) a project initiation workshop; ii) annual progress reports (PPR), iii) a mid-term evaluation (or review) (MTR), and iv) a final external evaluation. Each Country Office defines the monitoring budget based on the specific national context, in accordance with binationally established monitoring priorities. In that way, the execution of monitoring activities has been guaranteed from 2018 to the present date (e.g.: for the baseline, teams of local surveyors were formed, and companies hired for tabulation, analysis, and the preparation of reports, among others). Thus, with the leadership of the M&E areas of each Country Office, the monitoring teams are formed based on the project requirements. Due to national contexts, progress in monitoring is heterogeneous between the two countries.
12. The methodologies defined for measuring the results indicators are, to a certain extent, complex and intensive in the use of resources, since they imply the development of various semi-structured interviews with different target audiences of organizations/communities and institutions. The large number of monitoring interventions required is associated with a substantial logistical effort. The project team has worked on a review of scope, definitions and methodologies, whose recommendations are found in the section [Indicators and project basis \(discussion\)](#) of this report.
13. This document (MTR) highlights the efforts and dedication of the Binational Steering Committee and the Implementing Entity (IE) for the design and implementation of the activities and adaptation measures with the participation of the EE.

Synthesis of key lessons learned

14. The lessons learned are presented in six categories of analysis that highlight strengths and/or weaknesses in the project design and implementation (go to section [Lessons learned](#)): **(1) Participation and engagement** that considers: *the identification of implementation arrangements of highly complex projects, which requires a balance between community organizations and cooperating partners, for the creation and strengthening of locally led adaptation but also considering capacity assessments; *the relevance of having an engagement strategy for key stakeholders; and *the inclusion of cooperating partners to bridge capacity gaps among community-based organizations.
15. Regarding **(2) Capacity building**, *the development of the Edefami web learning platform, this binational tool that allowed community members to gain technical knowledge at any time, even during the pandemic.
16. In terms of **(3) Intervention methodologies**, five lessons were raised: *building capacities and local leaderships for adaptation to climate change, is possible through a continuous joint work with the communities and key local institutions, *the use of WFP methodologies, adequate to the project context, to standardize the consultation phase along in the 135 targeted communities at the binational level facilitated the process, *the internal governance mechanisms of the Executing Entities, specific to their worldview, are characterized by requiring extensive consultation processes and must be considered as part of the planning process, *the need of a balance between participatory approaches, with "top-down" methodologies derived from the analysis of climatic rationality for an area with certain biophysical characteristics, and *Good practices for gender mainstreaming and the empowerment of women.
17. Lessons associated to **(4) Operational management** emphasize on the *scope of a cross-border work, which is linked to the project implementation arrangements and local contexts, *the Importance of adopting processes, agreements, methodologies, and strategies to strengthen the operational management of the project, and the *relevance of the governance spaces for the implementation of a binational project.

18. In terms of **(5) Project monitoring** two lessons emerged from the extensive analysis on project indicators: the design factors that led to **the configuration of the array of indicators*, and **the consistency between the monitoring challenges and budget allocation*.
19. Finally, regarding the **(6) Design of future ACC projects with indigenous peoples** the report highlight **the Importance of the theory of change as an input to define the operational management model since the beginning, and better integrate the worldview within the planning phase*.

Summary of recommendations

20. The recommendations have been grouped into three categories, which in turn are subdivided into a set of actions that were prioritized based on their relevance, feasibility, considering the current stage of the project, and ensuring consistency with the findings of the mid-term review.
21. **(A) Key management aspects to complete the project successfully.** (A.1) *Strengthen project governance and coordination, both at the binational and national level* through the following actions: **maintain spaces for binational articulation, internally at the level of the coordination team (binational/ national) for sharing experiences according to the implementation needs, and externally with the Executing Entities to follow up on progress made, agreements, and other issues. Also, about the governance space, it is recommended *to guarantee compliance with the guidelines of the operational manual at each level, and *to simplify the approval process that involve national bodies, to avoid duplication. Three actions are considered to (A.2) Accelerate the execution of the project, by *reinforcing training and supporting activities for EE to strengthen their financial execution rates, based on the weaknesses identified to date, *preparing quarterly binational operational and financial progress reports and identify the necessary alerts; and *prioritizing the hiring of additional personnel, based on the hiring decisions made at each country level. A third group relates to (A.3) Strengthen project visibility through the *establishment of a roadmap for the development of national and binational communication products within the framework of the AOP 2023.*
22. The second category of recommendations correspond to **(B) Key aspects to strengthen project monitoring.** (B.1) *Strengthen the implementation of the M&E Strategy* through the **updating of the binational monitoring schedule according to national monitoring plans; *ensure data collection for the indicators considering the reporting priorities for PPR5, PPR6, and annual operational planning; *generate the necessary alerts and/or recommendations during the construction of the PPRs, on whether the indicators (output, outcome, and impact) are achievable by the project, considering the progress in the implementation of adaptation measures, as the key actions. Additionally, it is considered an (A.2) Adjustment of the array of indicators, considering the Adaptation Fund's guidelines that apply to each case, by means of: *a proposal to eliminate some indicators or make methodological adjustments at the level of project results framework, Adaptation Fund strategic framework (Annex 3. Recommendations category 2 - Specifics to improve M&E) and ESMP (Annex 4. Proposal for adjustment to the safeguard indicators within the framework of the ESMP).*
23. Finally, the third category on **(C) Key aspects that point to the sustainability of the project**, aims to (C.1) *Prioritize sustainability actions of adaptation measures giving special attention to *the articulation and identification of synergies with key actors for the design and implementation of adaptation interventions in each country, and *managing sustainability actions of the prioritized adaptation measures.*

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Overview of the MTR

24. A first stage of the MTR was carried out from March 1 to August 14, 2022, which presented some initial findings based on internal interviews (WFP), which were used as input to generate this final report. Subsequently, a second mid-term review stage was carried out (see [Annex 5. Terms of reference](#)), from November 9, 2022, and ended on February 8, 2023, with two key objectives: (i) make the interviews to external stakeholders (see [Annex 6. Interviewed stakeholders](#), [Annex 7. Matrix of evaluation/review questions](#)), and (ii) prepare the MTR report in accordance with the structure established for the document, using first consultancy findings to obtain a final report with an overall perspective that provides recommendations for decision-making.

Aims and objectives of the MTR

25. The Binational Project mid-term review (MTR) report is prepared taking into consideration all products, documents and reports developed up to May 31, 2022, that is, up to the Fourth Annual Progress Report (PPR4). MTR is aligned with the guidelines and directives established by the WFP and the AF. In this sense, the present Colombia-Ecuador Binational Adaptation Project is evaluated as a contribution rather than an attribution to a result since there are many other actors and events that influence the implementation of the project.
26. The objective of the MTR is to provide the Implementing Entity, Executing Entities, Designated Authorities, technical team, partners and other interested parties with recommendations for decision making in order to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency in the implementation of the binational project, as well as to provide key inputs that allow immediate corrective actions to be taken.

Structure of the MTR report

27. At the beginning of the MTR report, the reader can find basic information about the Project. The body of the report is structured in five chapters: Executive Summary, Introduction (current section), Review of findings, Section 3. Findings, is composed of five subsections divided into five sections, as follows: 3.1. Findings on project design; 3.2. Achievement of results and evaluation criteria; 3.3. Risks and process towards impact, 3.4. Evaluation of processes influencing the achievement of project results, and 3.5. Evaluation of the M&E Strategy. The last section of the report presents conclusions, proposed corrective actions, best practices and actions to reinforce the initial project benefits. The report also has three annexes that complement the report.

2.2. Context

Environmental context

28. The Mira-Mataje and Guátara-Carchi binational watersheds are located along the border of Colombia and Ecuador and are shared by the Awá and Afro-descendant populations. These watersheds show a diverse array of ecosystems, such as Pacific coastal mangroves, dry forests, and tropical rainforests. The effects of climate change, including increased frequency and

intensity of extreme events, sea level rise and ocean acidification, combined with environmental degradation, increase food insecurity and malnutrition by reducing access to productive assets and livelihoods.

Socioeconomic context

29. The Afrodescendant economy is centered on small livestock production (pigs and goats) and subsistence agriculture, which includes the cultivation of beans, corn, sugar cane, avocado, fruit, and pepper. Both agriculture, fisheries and livelihoods are vulnerable to climate change, particularly sea level rise affecting mangrove ecosystems and subsistence agricultural lands, putting populations at risk of food insecurity. The border region has been heavily impacted by deforestation and illegal activities such as coca cultivation. In Colombia and Ecuador, palm oil production has led to the clearing of forests and the expansion of the agricultural frontier.
30. Awá population have a cosmivision that defines the relationships between them, the spiritual world, and the environment. In the Awá tradition, the economy is based on reciprocity and solidarity rather than accumulation or monetary remuneration. It is also centered on traditional and local knowledge (environmental, ecological and cultural knowledge), which has allowed for a sustainable use of available natural resources. Subsistence activities, agriculture, hunting and fishing are mainly carried out at the individual, family or collective level, and livelihoods have traditionally not depended on wage labor. In the past, traditional knowledge was passed down orally from generation to generation by women in Awapit, the local language. However, the use of Awapit by armed forces is now prohibited in some areas, which has directly threatened intergenerational knowledge transmission and reduced livelihood opportunities. The advance of extractive activities, especially logging, oil palm plantations, mining and illicit crops, as well as external factors such as climate change, have affected crop productivity and the loss of animals, the main source of income for the Awá and Afro-descendant population.
31. The Prodoc highlights that the Awá and Afro-descendant populations have been historically marginalized and affected by the prolonged armed conflict in Colombia despite the signing of the Peace Agreement with the Revolutionary Forces of Colombia (FARC), and are particularly affected by environmental degradation, which is aggravated by short and long-term climate threats. The Awá population suffers a higher risk of food insecurity, especially those in Ecuador. There is also a high risk of malnutrition, to a greater extent in the Awá population (mainly in Ecuador), than in the Afro-descendant population due to the low diversity of their diet.

Institutional context

32. WFP is the Implementing Entity (IE) accredited to the Adaptation Fund.
33. The Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition of Ecuador (MAATE) and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia (Minambiente) are the Designated Authorities responsible for supporting project implementation with technical advice, ensuring that activities are aligned and contribute to the policies and programs around their competence, taking into account the leadership assigned in each country.
34. At the binational level, project execution is carried out in close collaboration and coordination with the Executing Entities (EE). The base that represents the beneficiary communities identified

in the project, the Great Binational Awá Family (GFAB), participates through the organizations of each country that comprise it. In Colombia, the Association of Indigenous Councils of the Awá People of Putumayo (Acipap), the Resguardo Nulpe Medio Alto del rio San Juan (NULPE) as part of the Cabildo Mayor Awá of Ricaurte Organization (Camawari) and the Indigenous Unit of the Awá People (UNIPA), while for Ecuador it is the Federation of Awá Centers of Ecuador (FCAE). The EE of the Afrodescendant people is legally represented by the South Pacific Community Councils Network (Recompas) of Colombia and the Afro-Ecuadorian Confederation of Northern Esmeraldas (CANE).

35. The *Binational Steering Committee* (BSC) is the project's highest decision-making body. It is chaired by WFP as IM, and is made up of Ecuador's MAATE, Colombia's Minambiente, WFP Focal Points in Colombia and Ecuador, who are each one of them accompanied by a technical advisor.
36. The *Binational Articulation Board* (BAB) is an instance whose main function is to establish an articulation space for the sharing of results and interaction under a binational watershed approach. As part of its functions is to create a space for dialogue, awareness, coordination, socialization of results, information, and reporting at the binational level. The WFP is the presiding organization. The MAB is made up of delegates from WFP of Colombia and Ecuador, MAATE, Minambiente and legitimate representatives of the EEs. As of the cut-off date of the MTR, the activation of the BAB has not been reported, which is due to the following: (i) the negotiations with the Executing Entities extended in time and complexity, completing the subscription of the FLA by March 2020 (see paragraph 40); (ii) at that moment, the restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic impeded in-person attendance; and more recently, (iii) it was decided to operationalize this board under a more practical approach, in common agreement with the Executing Entities. In this sense, articulation board will be organized depending on the needs (a first one took place with the GFAB in February 2023, and a follow up meeting was agreed to be organized three months after), as well as binational events for experience sharing, which will involve other key actors.
37. *Colombia's National Steering Committee* (CNSC) is the highest national decision-making body in the country for project implementation. It is chaired by WFP and is made up of one official delegate from each of the following entities: Recompas (accompanied by two representatives designated by the community councils of Alto Mira and Bajo Mira), Acipap, Camawari, UNIPA (accompanied by the respective local coordination of each organization), Minambiente, the WFP, the Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM), the Government of Nariño, the Regional Autonomous Corporation of Nariño (Corponariño), the Corporation for the Sustainable Development of the Southern Amazon (Corpoamazonía) and the Government of Putumayo. The *National Technical Advisory Committee of Colombia* (NTACC) is made up of Recompas (community councils of Alto Mira and Bajo Mira), Acipap, Camawari/NULPE, UNIPA, Minambiente, WFP Colombia, Colombia's National Planning Department (DNP), Corponariño, Corpoamazonía, IDEAM, the Departmental Climate Change Board, the Government of Nariño, and the Government of Putumayo.
38. The *Ecuador National Steering Committee* (NSCE) is the national decision-making body for activities and strategies to be implemented. The NSCE is made up of the following organizations and institutions: FCAE, CANE, MAATE and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG) of Ecuador.

The *National Technical Advisory Committee of Ecuador* (NTACE) is made up of the following organizations and institutions: FCAE, CANE, MAATE, MAG, WFP, Autonomous Decentralized Provincial Government (GAD) of Carchi, Provincial GAD of Esmeraldas, Provincial GAD of Imbabura, and Provincial GAD of Sucumbíos. The WFP is the presiding institution. In addition, other entities or organizations may be invited. The delegates will provide technical assistance to the NTACE, so that it may issue recommendations and provide specific advice to the NSCE.

3. REVIEW OF FINDINGS

3.1. Findings about project design

Risks found in the design for the achievement of results

39. In the Prodoc, implementation arrangements were approved that establish the GFAB as executing entity (EE) for the Awá populations of both countries; and Recompas and CANE for the Afro-descendant populations of Colombia and Ecuador, respectively. According to what was reported in the PPR1, from the start of the project, the articulation with the GFAB was complicated, because it did not have legal status (it was not possible to sign a Field Level Agreements (FLA) with this binational organization), this led to a fragmentation of agreements, since it was necessary to identify organizations in each country with the legal basis to assume this role. Given the situation, instead of signing a single agreement with the GFAB, during the project start-up workshop it was agreed that the following four Awá indigenous peoples' rights organizations from each country will assume the role of EE: in Colombia 1) Acipap; 2) Camawari, of which the NULPE Reservation (which ultimately signed the agreement) is a part; 3) UNIPA; and in Ecuador 4) FCAE.
40. The negotiations for the signing of agreements with the four Awá organizations were carried out after the Inception workshop on May 3, 2018, and they were able to sign, both with the Awá and Afro-descendant organizations in the months from June 2019 to March 2020 (Acipap, Camawari/NULPE, UNIPA, FCAE, CANE, Ccamyf and Ccbmyf). In addition, agreements were also established with cooperating partners (Academia) that have technical strengths to support the implementation of some activities of Component 1 (Pontificia Universidad Católica of Esmeraldas (Pucese) and Universidad Politécnica Estatal del Carchi (UPEC). The signing with stakeholders for the execution of the agreements was established through annual operational plans (AOP) prepared jointly.
41. The Prodoc identified 7 key risks of the project. In the low-medium level rating the lack of coordination between the different entities (regional, territorial, and national governments) was identified. In addition, six low category risks were analyzed: 1) the revaluation of the Colombian peso, 2) the lack of local capacities for the implementation of activities, 3) insufficient scientific and technical information on climate change in the region, 4) spills from the Trasandino pipeline. and its effects on water and soil pollution, 5) changes in governments and stakeholders; and 6) the possibility of communities continuing to grow crops not supported by the project. A classification by type of risk (financial, institutional, social and political) was not identified. Mitigation measures were developed for each of the seven identified risks. Regarding the management of environmental and social risks, it was indicated that the activities of Components

1 and 2 were of low risk. In the case of the activities of Component 3, the environmental and social risks were not identified in the design phase because, in the latter case, the identification of the adaptation measures would be carried out later. For these cases of interventions not identified during the design of the project, the procedure established in the Prodoc consists of applying a risk assessment during the design stage of the adaptation measures before the implementation of the activities (reported in the PPR3 and PPR4) starts. In addition, risk mitigation is part of the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP).

42. Although risk identification was an integral part of the project design, the operational risk of WFP staff turnover was not identified, which also impacted the project execution deadlines. The Prodoc identified the risk of lack of local capacities for the implementation of activities, but it did not evaluate risks related to: i) possible cultural resistance from the EE and Afro-descendant and/or Awá communities in relation to the execution model; ii) the reality of the territory (high-risk area with constant threats and impacts due to the existence of irregular groups); iii) remote communities, difficult to access (more than 6 hours of walking), and/or with limited access to network and internet coverage; iv) the high turnover (even annual) of representatives in the EE; v) external shocks, such as international economic crises, outbreaks of tropical diseases or others. Since these risks were not identified in the ProDoc, mitigation measures regarding the worldview of the Awá communities, and/or their territorial autonomy were not considered to reach a mutual understanding to sign agreements (FLA).
43. In the Prodoc, five social and environmental risks and impacts were identified, and mitigation measures developed, considering the 15 principles of the Social and Environmental Policy of the Adaptation Fund. The risks were related to: (i) the possibility that traditional knowledge and practices could be appropriated by third parties; (ii) the reluctance of the Awá community to accept actions based on Western science or technology; (iii) lack of support for women's empowerment due to predominantly male leadership; (iv) that some activities may have negative environmental impacts; and (v) that degraded soils are not the most appropriate to benefit from adaptation measures. Regarding this last risk, it was not defined which potential impacts the adaptation measures could generate on the conservation of land and soil. However, as part of the design of measures, the risk assessments ("Screening tool") have been carried out, according to which none of these interventions are expected to directly affect principle 15. With the Peace Agreement signed in December 2016 between the Colombian government and the FARC, it was expected that the violence would cease. In fact, however, there has been an increase in violent acts that has resulted in displacement, confinement, and restrictions on the mobility of communities.
44. In relation to the project results framework in the Prodoc, general assumptions and risks per product and results for components 1, 2 and 3 were formulated; however, most of the risks and assumptions are general, and were identified taking into consideration optimistic expectations regarding the context of the project. This affected the exhaustiveness of the risk mitigation plan, in order to anticipate and respond to complex situations in the intervention area.
45. In Component 1, no mitigation measures were identified with respect to risks related to the environment of violence generated by armed groups and illegal activities (drug trafficking, illegal mining, illegal trafficking of timber and non-timber products, among others), which affect the Awá

and Afro-descendant populations. The impossibility of entering certain communities due to the restrictions imposed by the presence of armed groups, was also not identified. In addition, at the designing stage of the project, the official statistics and information on the intervention area were limited, so no mitigation actions were identified on: (i) lack of availability or limited access to communication media for interaction, especially with the most remote populations; (ii) low educational levels among Afro-descendant and indigenous populations; (iii) remoteness or difficulties to access to some communities, among others. With respect to the products and results of Component 2, the risks were not exhaustively identified, which were similar to what was already mentioned for Component 1. For the outputs and outcomes of Component 3, the project design stage did not consider mitigation measures related to the possible conversion of illicit productive activities (planting of illicit crops) to alternative production activities, considering the socio-economic context and climate variability.

Indicators and project basis (discussion)

46. The Prodoc includes the project results framework, which presents the general objective of the project, three specific objectives and six results that contribute to the specific objectives and the general objective. The Prodoc considered four indicators to measure the progress of the general objective in the results framework. Two impact indicators measure progress towards the project objective: the vulnerability indicator (VI) and the dietary diversity score. The two remaining indicators correspond to the strengthening of the binational capacity and the percentage of women with physical, political, and economic empowerment. These two indicators are transversal in nature, that is, they are not associated with any particular result or objective.
47. The monitoring of the project indicators is consistent with the implementation arrangement of the project at the technical-operational level, as well as with the intercultural approach of the project. In the first case, this implies that the monitoring plan is executed by country, depending on the national contexts, in which is why for most of the indicators the figures are disaggregated by country (Colombia | Ecuador). Regarding the second aspect, it means that the approach applied per ethnic group (Afro-descendants | Awá) since their different worldviews, territories, Unsatisfied Basic Needs, etc. are recognized, as demonstrated by the baseline of each country.

Indicators of the project results framework

48. *Regarding impacts indicators.* The vulnerability index (AI01) and the dietary diversity score (AI02), allow to measure the achievement of the general objective of the project. Both are specific to the proposed objective (S), measurable using the methodology developed for each indicator (M), relevant to achieve the project objective (R), and possible to measure at the end of the project (T). However, as to whether they are achievable (A) within the time of the project, both indicators depend on whether the adaptation measures have been implemented and on their implementation time. For example, changes (decrease/increase) in dietary diversity (which is input to the vulnerability indicator, AI01), depend on the time of implementation of adaptation measures that contribute to the production and consumption of the seven food groups, thus affecting whether the indicator is achievable within the timeframe of the project.
49. *Regarding the cross-cutting indicators of the project,* the indicator of binational capacity building (AI03) and the percentage of women with physical, political, and economic empowerment (AI04).

These indicators are not SMART because the goal is not clearly defined (in both cases the increase is mentioned, but not in per cent or a specific metric), and the measurement depends on household and EE surveys, as well as semi-structured interviews.

50. *Regarding the indicators of components.* The three specific objectives of the project (components) do not have specific indicators attached, so their progress is measured at the results level. Each component consists of two results for which eight indicators were defined. Regarding the outcome indicators of component 1, indicators AOC11 (Ancestral knowledge and practices are recovered in support of adaptation and food security) and AOC12 (Percentage of women participating in dialogue processes and advocacy) depend on the perception of the interviewees on the recovery of traditional knowledge and its inclusion in community dialogues and decision making. The measurement of these two indicators is not based on the product indicators. Regarding the outcome indicators of component 2, both AOC21 (Scientific studies tailored to binational contexts, considering traditional knowledge and community priorities), AOC22 (Disaster Preparedness Score, disaggregated by institutions and community members by gender) are SMART. In the last case there is a difference in scope between the result, which focuses on communities and local institutions, versus the indicator sheet where it is mentioned that the measurement will be based on a focus group with local authorities, among other key actors, so the sheet requires adjustment. Regarding the result indicators of component 3, the AOC31a (Percentage of households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets) indicator is not SMART: the measurement depends on household surveys when the result is "Access to livelihoods improved, resilience increased and risks from climate shocks reduced in food insecure communities and households". In this sense, the indicator is neither specific nor measurable for the proposed result.
51. In relation to the twelve indicators (four of general objective and eight of results) it is observed that for eight of them the information gathering methodology corresponds to semi-structured interviews with organizations and/or institutions, depending on the nature / characteristics of the information required per the indicator. The application of these tools could generate many monitoring interventions with stakeholders, associated with a substantial logistical effort due to the complexities of the field. Regarding the target for the achievement of the objectives and results, in the case of the AIO4 indicator ("Percentage of women with physical, political and economic empowerment"), no specific metric has been defined for the achievement of the indicator. Additionally, two outcome indicators on gender have been included: AOC12b (Percentage of women participating in dialogue processes and advocacy) and AOC31b (Percentage of households where women, men, or both (women and men) make decisions on the use of incomes), which are not linked to the impact indicator AIO4, even though if the impact on gender depends on the inclusion of the perspective in each result.
52. *Regarding outputs indicators.* In the results framework, 17 products were defined that allow the achievement of the six results. For these 17 products, 43 product indicators have been established, more than double the number of project products. From these, at least five indicators are disaggregated by gender and leaders. This shows that outputs encompass several sub-outputs or that the defined indicators go beyond the defined outputs. For example, in the case of output 113 (Workshops, dialogues and cultural events (including fairs) organized to

disseminate the results of the study to 120 Afro and Awá communities, leaders and decision makers, in local languages. Equal participation of men and women will be promoted) there are three output indicators (AOP113): [a] Number of events to disseminate information on the studies, [b] Number of communities attending, and [c] Number of people trained according to sex (men, women)", the three indicators are obtained from the report of each of the events so there is no greater complexity in their monitoring.

53. In the case of output 315 (Reintroduction of native species to diversify production and consumption and for commercialization, including the introduction of organic, agroecological and marine species crop production practices) there are the indicators: [a] Number of communities that reintroduced climate resilient native species, [b] Types of income sources for households generated under climate change scenarios (disaggregated by Head of Household), and [c] Percentage increase in household income from ecosystem services and agricultural systems. In this case output indicators are completely different among them. Specifically, the second indicator is not relevant to the output, while the third indicator is not achievable within the timeframe of the project because it is assumed that in addition to the implementation of the adaptation measure, the necessary time has elapsed to consolidate a productive process that has allowed the reintroduced species to be marketed. A SMART indicator adjusted to the scope of the project would have been to have a business plan for the reintroduced species, or to consider the avoided food expenses as a result of the implementation of family/resilient gardens.
54. In the case of output 313 (Introduction of community water use, storage and management measures), the indicators are: [a] Number of communities with improved access to water for agricultural and drinking purposes and [b] Number of people with improved access to and control of water for agricultural and drinking purposes". Both indicators are duplicated to obtain four, since each one must be measured for agricultural and drinking water. In this case, not only is the amount of information to be collected increased, but also none of the indicators are SMART, as they are not specific or relevant to the output and the measurement depends on household surveys, instead of using measurement units associated with adaptation measures.
55. For each of the indicators defined in the results framework (impact, outcome, output) a profile was prepared with general information to assist in data collection, calculation of their components, aggregation of scales, description of the method adopted to define the baseline, establish targets, and references to scientific literature. However, the methodological considerations are rather general, so that even though each indicator has an indicator sheet, it requires additional information to guide its monitoring. To date, there are some indicators for which measurement difficulties have occurred, for two of which a baseline has yet to be established (AI04, AOC22).

Indicators from the strategic results framework of the Adaptation Fund

56. The Prodoc also presents the alignment of the project with the Adaptation Fund's strategic results framework. The Adaptation Fund outcome indicators were aligned with the outcomes for each specific project objective; and the Adaptation Fund output indicators were aligned with the outputs. These indicators are reported in the PPRs - "Results tracker" tab. The results framework of the Adaptation Fund is structured by one impact indicator corresponding to the number of

beneficiaries (ARCI1), nine outcome indicators, and ten output indicators. Of these twenty indicators, five are considered “Core” for the Adaptation Fund: Number of beneficiaries [ARCI1], Number of Early Warning Systems [ARCI2], Assets produced, developed, improved, or strengthened [ARCI3], Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated [ARCI4], Increased income, or avoided decrease in income [ARCI5]. Some of those Core indicators, are on Outcome and others are on Output level.

57. The definitions of the above-mentioned indicators are found in the "Results Tracker Guidance Document", the latest version of this guide is from 2019. The indicators are SMART. The indicators are SMART, except for those corresponding to the Outcome 4 that are not directly related to the objectives of the project since the interventions are not oriented to the service sector or large-scale infrastructure (4.1. Increased responsiveness of development sector services to evolving needs from changing and variable climate [AROC41]; 4.2. Assets produced, developed, improved, or strengthened [ARCI3], with its corresponding associated Output indicator 4.1.1. No. and type of development sector services to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change [AROP411]). On the other hand, six of the Adaptation Fund indicators have a similar scope to that of the project results framework indicators (duplication).
58. The measurement of all the "core" indicators can be obtained using information from the output matrix and indicators from the project results framework, excepting for two indicators: Outcome 6 (6.2. Increase in targeted population's sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods and 6.1.2. Increased income or avoided decrease in income (end line) and are aligned with the Output indicators 315, which are not SMART (see Table 1). On the other hand, the Output indicator AROP72 (7.2. Number of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced) is not achievable considering that the scope of action and incidence of the project is focused on the subnational level.

Table 1. Duplicated indicators or with a similar scope

AF Indicators	Results framework Indicators
<p>[ARCI2] 1.2. Number of early warning systems (EWS) (drought, wind)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [a] Number of adopted early warning systems - [b] Número de municipalidades con SAT 	<p>[AOP221a] Number of early warning systems (EWS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of early warning systems adopted - Number of communities covered by early warning systems - Number of SAT community nodes <p>[AOP211b] Number of climate information products/services provided for decision making, conformed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of climate information products/services designed - Number of communities using climate products/services - Number of climate information products/services used

<p>[ARCI4] 5.1. Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total number of natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated - Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation 	<p>[AOP312a] Number of natural resource assets created, maintained, or improved to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability</p>
<p>[ARCI5] 6.1.2. Increased income, or avoided decrease in income</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of households (<i>total number in the project area</i>) - Income level (USD) 	<p>[AOP315c] Percentage increase in household incomes from ecosystem services and agricultural systems (disaggregated by sex of the head of household) (Not a SMART indicator)</p>
<p>[AROP11] 1.1. Number of projects/ programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments - Status 	<p>[AOP211] <i>Number of scientific studies:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [a] Number of technical studies on water supply considering the climate threats generated - [b] Number of studies on the vulnerability of ecosystems to climate change and variability and extreme events generated - [c] Number of studies on food security and nutrition in vulnerable communities generated
<p>[AROC6a] 6.1. Increase in households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of targeted households - Percentage of female headed households - Improvement level 	<p>[AOC31a] Percentage of households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets</p>

Source: Prodoc and PPR

59. The measurement instruments for six of these correspond to semi-structured interviews and household surveys. This methodology is suggested by the Adaptation Fund in the "Results Tracker Guidance Document" for "outcome" indicators (see Table 2), but considering the definition of the indicators, the remaining time of the project and the funds available for M&E, it should be considered using monitoring information from the project's outcome framework indicators and output matrices.

Table 2. Adaptation Fund outcome indicators

Project code	Adaptation Fund Indicator
AROC1	Indicator 1: Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis
AROC2	Indicator 2: Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased
AROC31	Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses
AROC5	Indicator 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress
AROC6	Indicator 6.1: Increase in households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets [a] Indicator 6.2: Increase in targeted population's sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods [b]
AROC7	Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy.

Source: Prodoc and PPR

3.2. Achievement results and review criteria

Relevance

60. The local responses for adaptation to climate change contemplated in the project are aligned with the national climate change and food security policies of Colombia and Ecuador, and with the priorities and Social and Environmental Policy of the Adaptation Fund. The project is implemented under a participatory approach involving more than 20 binational, national and/or local public institutions, as well as seven Afro-descendant and Awá organizations, to promote the reduction of climatic vulnerabilities of the communities they represent and of the ecosystems that they depend on, while promoting food security and nutrition, gender equality, and contributing to the construction of peace. The project also supported to strengthen community and institutional capacities for adaptation in the cross-border region is to increase resilience to threats posed by climate change. The community-based adaptation plans (CBAP) were also prepared with the participation of the targeted communities and in line with the policies and regulatory framework on climate change at the binational and national levels.
61. The project proves to be relevant to both countries. Through seasonal consultations on livelihoods (SLP), community-based participatory planning (CBPP), the preparation of the CBAP and the prioritization of adaptation measures in a participatory manner, it is ensured that the interventions contribute to the priorities of the beneficiary communities and their base organizations.
62. The project promotes political commitment, involvement of government institutions that do not have easy access to border territories, increased shared vision, as well as the institutional capacity for the design and management of AM that contribute to reduce the effects of climate change on food security and nutrition. The project is also aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2 (Zero Hunger), 5 (Gender Equality), 13 (Climate Action) and 17 (Partnerships for the goals).

Efficiency

63. Agreed upon by the Parties during the project design phase, strategic management and implementation are carried out by WFP, MAATE and Minambiente within the framework of the Binational Steering Committee (BSC). This committee meets twice a year, although to date, the committee has met once a year on average (seven meetings in almost five years of the project), due to the rotation of personnel in the binational coordination team at the beginning of the project. However, as of January 2020, two annual committees have been held, as established in the Operating Manual. The technical operational management and implementation of the project is carried out within the framework of an approved annual operational plan (AOP), and other agreements reached with the parties that make up the governance spaces at the national level (NSCC, NSCE, NTACC, NTACE). The delegates of the Afro-descendant and Awá indigenous Executing Entities participate in these committees, as well as national and subnational government entities, decentralized entities, among other key actors for local management depending on the country. The activities that are part of the daily management of the project are carried out through the WFP Country Offices in Colombia and Ecuador, in permanent

coordination with the Designated Authorities (Minambiente, MAATE), considering applicable guidelines of the WFP, the Adaptation Fund, and depending on national contexts.

64. On the other hand, the manual also establishes a Binational Articulation Table (BAT) which has been recently operationalized under a practical approach, in common agreement with the EE. Additionally, WFP as a multilateral implementation entity, has three spaces for strategic and operational articulation that internally promote a coordinated execution of the project. Within this framework, it must be understood that the project promotes a joint work at the cross-border level, that takes advantage of learning opportunities considering the common challenges posed by climate change. The activities, processes, work mechanisms, products, results, and impact of each country are conditioned by the differences in context.
65. The planning and execution of the project activities has occurred in a sequential/linear manner, in accordance with the project design. This implies that a large amount of time has been invested in planning, studies, training (Components 1 and 2), participatory consultations, and even the technical design of measures (Component 3), versus measures implementation. Although the first measures of ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) approach (Component 3) were approved in July 2020, the implementation of these measures gained strength from the fourth year of execution. This sequential implementation does not consider the worldview of the beneficiary communities, mainly the Awá population.
66. As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, both Ecuador and Colombia adopted restrictive measures with the declaration of a state of health emergency as of March 2020, including the mandatory preventive isolation of the population, which paralyzed activities of land in both countries. Given this new scenario, WFP designed and implemented a Business Continuity Plan both globally and, in each Country Office, following strict biosafety protocols, in which mitigation actions were identified, such as the identification of activities that could be carried out remotely. New responsibilities were agreed upon to the local community teams of the EEs in the formulation of the CBPPs, and the use of the EDUFAMI web platform was implemented for training purposes. For their part, the four Awá indigenous organizations issued an official statement restricting access to their territories, considering their high vulnerability to imported infectious diseases, and likewise issued statements suspending all project activities to avoid contagion. In this context, WFP Country Offices channeled donations to the communities, both at the level of biosafety supplies and food assistance, through the requesting Executing Entities: Afro-descendant community councils (Colombia), CANE, FCAE and Acipap. and in the same way they issued statements suspending all project activities to avoid contagion.
67. According to the evidence, the level of impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the implementation of the project was medium to high because the confinement was prolonged for approximately 12 consecutive months (March - April 2020 to March - April 2021), and 20 months of border closure. However, some activities could be developed within the communities themselves. For example, online training was provided to the CBPP facilitator delegations and permanent virtual support was provided so that they could develop CBPP consultations and reports. This empowered the EEs that committed to the process, such as CANE, which, in addition to the CBPPs, led the virtual SLP, experiences that were presented at COP26 at the invitation of the Adaptation

Fund in the third capacity building hub under the title "Enhancing climate finance access for adaptation in the context of COVID-19: Lessons from the Adaptation Fund portfolio".

68. During the preparation of the MTR, there was a high level of dedication by the WFP to support the EEs through training to achieve the implementation of the activities established in the FLAs. However, there are delays in the execution of the activities due to the low technical capacity of the Awá organizations, despite the mitigation measures carried out, such as the formation of local teams to operationalize the implementation of the AMs. It should be noted that the actors interviewed (IE, EE, Designated Authorities, subnational governments, universities, among others) showed their commitment to meet the deadlines established for the remaining of the project.
69. WFP Colombia held a workshop to develop a strategy for accelerating the implementation of the project (in which it was agreed to carry out a performance evaluation of the EEs), due to the low level of financial execution. This strategy seeks to strengthen and/or improve the coordination with the government through the Minambiente; Expand the technical assistance staff for the implementation of measures, communication and visibility of the project, follow-up, and monitoring, among others.
70. One factor that affects the efficiency of the project is the small project team, both at the binational and national level in both countries (compared to the results that the project needs to deliver in its last 2 years of operation). In this regard, at the closing date of the MTR there will be expansion of WFP national teams this year, but there are no known agreements on the expansion of the binational team.

Effectiveness

71. The high-level objectives of the project are "1) Reduce the climatic vulnerabilities of local Afro-descendant and indigenous communities and the ecosystems on which they depend, promoting food security and nutrition, gender equality and contributing to the construction of the peace; and 2) Strengthen the adaptation capacities of Afro-descendant and indigenous communities in the cross-border region and strengthen regional institutions to deal with the threats posed by climate change".
72. As of August 2022, the operational progress of the project was 45%, it involved 17 AMs, of which four were completed (100%), two were in the execution stage (75%), and the remaining eleven had different levels of progress in their design and implementation phases, together representing 28%. Likewise, in relation to the execution achieved by the seven EEs with which WFP signed the FLAs, US\$ 308,649 (16%) had been executed of the global amount subscribed in the last FLAs. The gaps in the capacity of the EEs to comply with what was agreed in the FLA and with their role as executors were reported in the PPR4, which is due to the lack of experience and knowledge in the execution of highly complex projects, in technical, administrative, and financial aspects.
73. The Adaptation Fund binational project seeks to generate local adaptation responses to climate change with two approaches: community-based adaptation (CbA) and ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) to promote food security and nutrition. In this sense, one of the expected results of the project is the community and institutional strengthening of the Afro-descendant and indigenous Awá populations considering a gender approach and, an intercultural and conflict

sensitive vision. The results 1.2., 2.2. and 3.1. and products 1.1.3., 1.2.1., 1.2.2., 2.2.2., 3.1.2. and 3.1.5., promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls, through the participation of women in spaces for community consultation/diagnosis, decision-making, workshops, training, specialized courses/diplomas dialogues for the transmission of knowledge and AMs that seek equal opportunities for women and men.

74. Within the framework of the execution of result 3.2., the adaptive capacity of Afro-descendant communities has been strengthened through the implementation of AMs for the reduction of climate-related risks with the ancestral recovery of the planting of soil-retaining species (Strip) to prevent flooding, and at the Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) level with the strengthening of agroforestry systems. These mechanisms also allow them to preserve flora and fauna by planting retainer species.
75. Strengthening the capacities of both leaders and delegates of the communities, progress has been oriented towards the construction / strengthening of adaptive capacities through the following results and products: communities with natural assets created, maintained or improved for strengthen adaptation to climate change (Outcome 3.2); people trained through the tools and learning mechanisms of the result 1.2. (Output 1.2.1: 234 community leaders/members graduated from specialization courses (Ecuador) / diplomas (Colombia); and in Output 1.2.3: 628 people completed courses from the EDUFAMI platform; communities that have a CCCAP (Output 3.1.2: 68 CCCAP covering 88 communities) Participation of women in decision-making and/or productive spaces 44% women); people have participated in community planning spaces for the adaptation and/or prioritization/validation of the measures that must be implemented by the project. Likewise, delegations from the seven EE of the project representing the 135 targeted communities comprising 460 people (men: 57%; women: 43%) participated in 12 workshops for the socialization / prioritization / validation of adaptation measures (EbA, CbA), resulting from the SLP, CBPP, CCCAP, as well as the local/national adaptation priorities that were developed in the cities of San Andrés de Tumaco, Chachagüí and Mocoa in Colombia, and San Lorenzo and Ibarra in Ecuador. The vulnerability index of the communities will be measured for the end of the project, not for this review.
76. The vulnerability indicator is a project essential indicator because the objective of the project is not to modify the sensitivity of the ecosystems or of the Awá and Afro-descendant communities in the intervention area, but to strengthen the adaptive capacity of the Afro-descendant and indigenous communities, which requires more time and investment.
77. Under outcome 2.1.1. "Studies produced at the level of binational basins on (1) water supply considering climatic threats; (2) vulnerability of the ecosystem to climate change, variability and extreme events; (3) food security and nutrition in risk-prone communities; and (4) gender evaluation", 9 hydrometeorological studies were prepared that have supported the design of adaptation measures to climate change. The studies do not focus on binational watersheds, but rather by country, due to the difference in the meteorological and hydrological information available for the project area. In PPR4 it was reported that the second stage of the hydrometeorological studies, in charge of Ecuador, is finished (the results corresponding to the Colombian basin were already reported in PPR2, PPR3). This captured information has served as input to design the Binational early warning system (EWS) (Product 2.2.1.).

78. The output 3.1.1. "Development of participatory approaches interconnecting scientific and traditional knowledge" and Output 3.1.2. "Design and implementation of effective adaptation measures incorporating participatory approaches, traditional and local knowledge and proven techniques to recover degraded ecosystems in 120 communities, promoting equal opportunities in access to resources", contribute to achieving Result 3.1., through participatory approaches that integrate traditional knowledge with scientific knowledge, and thus, design and implement adaptation measures to climate change. To date, the following methodologies have been developed for output 3.1.1: a binational SLP Guide; four CBPP Guides, of which two for Colombia (1 Afro, 1 Awá) and two for Ecuador (1 Afro, 1 Awá); Conceptual framework on climate change linked to food security and nutrition; Methodology for building inventory about native species and floors; Methodology for the recovery of ancestral knowledge. While in relation to output 3.1.2., actions have been developed that contribute to the adaptation to climate change of the Awá and Afro-descendant communities, being the assets created to date: 1) family gardens, 2) forest nurseries, and 3) eco-efficient stoves that contribute to the use efficiency of wood, among others that will be added as the implementation of the measures progresses.
79. At least two mechanisms have been identified through which the integration of scientific knowledge with traditional knowledge has been promoted: (1) guaranteeing the direct participation of the communities in the data and information gathering processes for the development of technical studies, consultation, analysis, prioritization and implementation of measures, among others. This has allowed ancestral/traditional knowledge to be manifested and integrated into the products associated with these processes, through training, mediation-adjustment of contents/ surveys/ methodologies/ formats, joint planning/coordination of activities, etc.; and (2) using the results of the studies as inputs for the pre-design and technical design of the adaptation measures.
80. In relation to Component 1, the real progress in relation to the traditional knowledge recovered and incorporated into decision-making, beyond the activities carried out (results of consultancies), is low (baseline) to medium (mid-term follow-up), according to the monitoring of the two result indicators (AOC11, AOC12). Regarding Component 2, there is no evidence on the progress in the implementation of the EWS in coordination with the competent institutions, especially after the closing of the Agreement between WFP and IDEAM due to circumstances of major cause. To date, activities related to EWS in Colombia have mainly involved training, while in Ecuador progress has been made in the acquisition of technological equipment for the installation of agroclimatic tables. There is no evidence of progress in the methodology and implementation of the EWS to make it a binational system. Finally, in relation to Component 3, a programmatic progress report was prepared, through which binational monitoring is carried out, not in detail, of the progress of the design and implementation stage of the adaptation measures, based on those that were approved. However, there is no mechanism for monitoring AMs that allows to provide detailed information and record key data on them.

3.3. Challenges and progress towards impact

81. The activities carried out in the prioritized communities in Colombia and Ecuador contribute to the adoption of the adaptation measures. In this regard, the Executing Entities through their authorities and/or community delegates have participated in the consultation phase (SLP, CBPP), planning, coordination and development of activities and adaptation measures to ensure that the actions respond to local realities and interests. The results and products related to institutional capacity building led to generation of knowledge for the prioritized Afrodescendant and Awá communities. Likewise, it is a commitment of the members participating in the BSC, NSCC, NTACC, NSCE and NTACE to take advantage of this knowledge, strengthen local and inter-institutional articulation, promote synergies, and manage resources and engagement to give sustainability to the activities implemented. It should be noted that although the Designated Authorities (Minambiente and MAATE), subnational governments, etc., did not have (or do not have) a direct channel of articulation with the Afro-descendant and indigenous communities living in the border area, the execution of the project has allowed this approach, through the Implementing Entity, which constitutes an opportunity.
82. The operational and governance structure of the project presents duplicity of spaces between the Steering Committee and the Technical Committee for the review and (recommendation of) approval of products since the focal points participate in both spaces either as principal and/or alternate members.
83. To a certain extent, the project is having an impact on the cosmovision of the Awá and Afrodescendant populations because the knowledge shared is based on western science. Community leaders have been trained to act as surveyors, facilitators of WFP corporate methodologies for local consultations (SLP, CBPP), data collection, among others. Likewise, the project's focus on intercultural dialogue has facilitated actions among leaders to promote gender equality within the communities.
84. The Prodoc identified seven key project risks. In the low-medium level rating was one risk: lack of coordination between different entities (regional, territorial and national governments). In the low category there were six risks: i) the revaluation of the Colombian peso; ii) lack of local capacities to implement activities; iii) insufficient scientific and technical information on climate change in the region; iv) spills from the Trasandino pipeline and their effects on water and soil contamination; v) changes in governments and stakeholders; and vi) the possibility of communities continuing with crops not supported by the project. In the implementation stage, adjustments have been made to the rating of six risks to medium high, and the low-risk rating was maintained on items 3 and 4.
85. In the Prodoc, "the revaluation of the Colombian peso" was identified as a low financial risk, however, in the PPR4 the rating was changed to medium risk, due to (i) the increase in inflation both nationally and internationally, and (ii) the increase in interest rates by the Bank of the Republic of Colombia, which has generated an acceleration in the devaluation of the Colombian peso. In addition, medium/high risk was identified for low financial execution, which on average among the seven organizations (five in Colombia and two in Ecuador) reached 11% based on the three disbursements received. The following mitigation measures were proposed: (i) Capacity

building in the EEs for technical/financial execution through the following actions; (ii) creation of local teams within the framework of the Agreements; (iii) constant reminders and training on administrative and/or financial guidelines; (iv) permanent monitoring by the WFP to ensure the preparation of financial reports and compliance with delivery times for settlements; (v) transfer of funds in smaller amounts, and direct implementation from the WFP (especially for larger purchases or those requiring specialized technical specifications).

86. During the project implementation stage, the socio-political risk rating associated with "Increased conflict and escalation of violence in the project implementation area" increased from medium to high, due to multiple events, including a massacre that occurred on 3 July 2022 in one of the Awá communities that are part of the EE UNIPA (Inda Sabaleta in the municipality of Tumaco/Nariño). In this regard, mitigation measures were implemented, however, it is very likely that some of the 135 targeted communities will not be accessible.
87. In Ecuador, MAATE designed the CCCAPs, and the process of pre-design, design, review, and final approval of adaptation measures was carried out in coordination with MAATE and MAG. However, some public entities in Ecuador (MAATE, MAG) and Colombia (Governorate of Nariño) perceive that they are not yet actively participating in the implementation of these measures in the field.
88. In the project execution stage, institutional and governance risks were identified associated with (i) difficulties in coordinating with the EEs as implementing partners; (ii) weaknesses of the EEs in fulfilling their role as established in the FLAs; and (iii) changes/rotation of personnel from the focal points of the Designated Authorities and/or other entities participating in the Committees, WFP, and/or the EEs. In this regard, the EEs have weaknesses for the execution of funds because they do not have experience or knowledge in the execution of projects of high technical complexity, nor in administrative or financial processes such as carrying out competitive and transparent processes for the purchase of materials and supplies or the hiring of personnel. Appropriate mitigation actions have been proposed. However, in the interview process, additional risks were identified in Colombia related to the annual election of authorities of the base organizations of the Awá population (EE), which generates delays, limiting the progress in the execution of activities.
89. Finally, the identified risk related to the limited access to internet, mainly of the Awá communities, and the lack of interest of the beneficiary population to participate in virtual training processes, has been rated as low, because it has been mitigated with the suspension of COVID-19 restrictions.

3.4. Evaluation of the processes that influence the achievement of project results

Country ownership (discussion)

90. The project objectives and results framework are aligned with and contribute to national priorities and policies on climate change and food security and nutrition in Colombia and Ecuador. Relevant national and binational policies and plans are detailed in the Prodoc. Likewise,

national, regional and local government authorities participated in the design and implementation stage, which are detailed in Annex 2 of the Prodoc. In 2020, the SLP were carried out, which were the first consultative and participatory processes to identify and prioritize Ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) interventions, with a gender and intercultural approach in which communities, government, Academia and other local partners participated. Subsequently, CBPPs were carried out at the community level for the development of the CCCAPs, in which national and/or subnational governments were involved. This participatory process of at least two years has made it possible to build a path of community ownership of planning for local adaptation to climate change, the implementation of the adaptation measures and thus contribute to their sustainability. In accordance with the work done in Output 3.1.1, the development of the CBPPs was divided into stages. In the first phase, a group of facilitators was trained, with whom the CBPP community planning teams were formed. With these teams organized by ethnic group in each country, the CBPP workshops/consultations were coordinated in the 135 target communities during the first stage of restrictions by COVID-19. Finally, the local coordinators generated the CBPP reports/sheets that were sent to the project technical team. With respect to the SLP, 5 SLP were conducted with the participation of 133 people (33% women), each generating one SLP report (2 Afro, 3 Awá); and 12 prioritized EbA measures (6 in each country).

91. Under Outputs 3.1.1. and 3.1.2., the local Afro and Awá communities participated and led the CBPP methodology consultations. In this regard, once the interventions suggested by the communities were prioritized, portfolios of measures were generated, reviewed, analyzed, and adjusted by the project's technical team, based on the policy and regulatory framework of each country. They were then shared for review by the stakeholders that make up the Committees in each country.

Stakeholders participation (discussion)

92. Section 3.1. of this report describes the process of signing the first set of FLAs with the EEs and implementing partners. The second set of FLAs were signed in 2021 as addenda with the same EE, while the third set of FLAs were signed with all entities throughout 2022. However, in the case of FCAE, the Agreement was closed in December 2022 due to low financial execution (less than 3% versus 21% by CANE during the same period) and non-compliance with gender clauses. Also, in 2022, the first FLA was signed with the Ecuadorian Populorum Progressio Fund (FEPP) and the Association for Peasant Development (ADC) (Colombia), in order to support the EE with the implementation of more specialized measures. It should be noted that the Afro-descendant EE complied better with the FLA implementation deadlines.
93. The degree of stakeholder participation varies according to each country, the time and interest that the Ministries and other counterparts dedicate and involve themselves in the follow-up and development of project activities. Likewise, WFP has been a catalyst to facilitate this participation, since it has made an important effort to build trust in the field, with the communities and institutions, and at the same time among these stakeholders. The activities that have been developed jointly between WFP and the Designated Authorities depend on the above. For example: (j) at COP 26, Minambiente (Colombia) had a pavilion where a side-event was held with the participation of WFP, MAATE and the Adaptation Fund to share the progress of the project;

and (ii) in December 2022 an awareness campaign on mangrove conservation was launched by WFP, CANE, MAATE and other local partners.

94. The activity managers of Colombia and Ecuador are decision-makers in the project management framework, together with the National Coordinators. Besides, most of the personnel hiring decisions are agreed with the Designated Authorities within the framework of the AOP. In the case of Ecuador, MAATE is part of the selection/evaluation committees that are formed to hire personnel. On the other hand, the participation and commitment of key stakeholders (DA, EE, others) depends to a large extent on the processes for information sharing, consultation and decision making in national bodies (NSCE, NSCC, NTACE, NTACC), following the guidelines of the Operational Manual of the Binational Project. This has helped avoid non-compliance through the steps established in the Manual, mainly with respect to access to information generated in the project.
95. The project has generated spaces for discussion at the technical level through the National Technical Advisory Committee of each country. These committees develop and share methodologies, adaptation plans, predesigns of measures, technical designs of measures, and are given a deadline for review, feedback, and discussion, which guarantees the use of local capacities. One result of this process is the synergy between WFP Ecuador and the Provincial Government of Imbabura, which contributed with the donation/delivery of fuel-efficient stoves that promote the sustainable use of forest resources. In this regard, since 2021 the EbA measure "Community Forest Guard" has been implemented with 22 Awá communities, whose main results are: the formation of community guards, for which a minimum structure of ten guards per community was established; nine zoned workshops (Chical, Lita, San Lorenzo, Lago Agrio) in three phases (third phase in July 2021), for which support was provided by the National Risk Management Service of Ecuador (SNGR); the attendance of 106 people (men: 65, women: 41) who were also trained as facilitators; the generation of capacities to identify climate risks, threats, as well community resources available to reduce such impacts and that are important for the communities.
96. Some cooperating partners and Designated Authorities that were interviewed indicated that they have participated in the design of the adaptation measures but respected the process of consultation and engagement of the communities for their design. For example, they do not impose new technology, but take into consideration the climate rationale and cost-benefits of the adaptation measures. However, other stakeholders mentioned that they have not been involved in the project design and implementation process. This may also stem from a weak relationship between the DAGs and the national entities, as well as with the EEs located in the territory under their jurisdiction (Ecuador). For example, the Provincial Government of Imbabura does not have a relationship with CANE or FCAE, while the Provincial Government of Carchi does have a stable relationship with these organizations.
97. All stakeholders were involved through highly participatory processes, based on WFP methodologies (SLP, CBPP), which vary according to each country: central government, subnational governments (DAG Esmeraldas, Sucumbíos, Carchi and Imbabura), community representatives (majority participation) among others. Likewise, the EE have participated in the

prioritization of the communities, and these in turn have participated in the prioritization and technical design of the adaptation measures.

98. The coordination and organization of project activities (including stakeholder mapping) were carried out jointly with the ES within the framework of the jointly agreed AOP. Differentiated methodologies have been implemented for the Afro-descendant and Awá population to encourage and promote the participation of women from the Awá communities in all activities. UN Women contributed with the development of a strategy for gender mainstreaming in the project, through which a guide for capacity building has been developed for the project technical team, the partners' staff and community facilitators. Notably Afro-descendant women are empowered and have a high degree of participation in their communities while Awá women tend to remain more silent. In general, the involvement of women in consultation and decision-making processes has been challenging, but the methodologies implemented have improved their participation, such as creating separate groups of men and women in workshops so that each can express themselves freely and learn about their different needs. Despite the context, six out of eight communities in Acipap have women governors; in addition, there is more participation of women than men in the workshops. There is also participation of young people (in Acipap, the Youth Governance School was created) and older people (the latter sharing their ancestral knowledge / cosmovision).
99. The Prodoc conducted a first rapid assessment of the gender situation of the Awá and Afro-descendant population in the intervention area. In addition, as part of the results framework, gender gap evaluations were carried out in each country under different working mechanisms. In Ecuador, several gender studies associated with Output 2.1.1 were prepared. An agreement was signed with UN Women to prepare a survey of knowledge, attitudes and practices on gender gaps and analysis of common and differential aspects of the Project's target groups. In the case of Colombia, a gender analysis was carried out using information gathered from focus groups within the framework of the FLAs. In addition, the FLAs include a clause on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.

Financial management (discussion)

100. WFP has a global financial and budgetary control system called WINGS. Based on the reports generated by this system, the units and/or administrative/financial assistants generate financial reports for each country to compile the binational financial report. The system reflects WFP categories of expenditure, with the report then having to be recategorized via Excel spreadsheets to reflect the categories of reporting (components/outputs) as required by the Adaptation Fund. This generates additional work for the staff in charge of monitoring financial execution. Using the Adaptation Fund Expenditure Tracking Tool (Colombia and Ecuador), a binational validation process is then carried out before sending the PPR report for review and approval.
101. Budget planning is carried out at the beginning of each year (within the framework of the AOP), and execution is monitored on a monthly and quarterly basis, which allows for the monitoring of balances and the flow of funds (required disbursements).
102. The total financing requested from the Adaptation Fund for the project was US\$ 14,000,000, of which US\$ 12,903,200 was allocated for the total project cost (US\$ 1,781,500 for Component 1;

US\$ 1,681,800 was budgeted for Component 2; US\$ 8,320,500 for Component 3; and, US\$ 1,119,400 to cover project execution costs 9.5%); and US\$ 1,096,800 for MIE's management fees (see [Table 3](#)).

103. The project budget is also divided by component, results, and outputs for the 5 years of the project and a disbursement matrix for 4 years (see [Table 4](#)). According to the evidence, the budget execution up to 31 May 2021 was US\$1,964,832 and up to 31 May 2022 was US\$2,970,988 (35%), which shows a low financial execution.
104. The project adopted a set of financial management tools that are constantly updated (AOP), from which financial reports are generated. These inputs have enabled the focal points in both countries to make informed decisions regarding the updated budget.

Table 3. Budget by component, outcome and outputs

Result	Output	Countries	TOTAL U.S. dollar
Component 1			1,781,500
1.1.	1.1.1.	Colombia/Ecuador	169,200
	1.1.2.	Colombia/Ecuador	56,400
	1.1.3.	Colombia/Ecuador	430,200
1.2.	1.2.1.	Colombia/Ecuador	200,200
	1.2.2.	Colombia/Ecuador	150,000
	1.2.3.	Colombia/Ecuador	150,000
	1.2.4.	Colombia/Ecuador	625,500
Component 2			1,681,800
2.1.	2.1.1.	Colombia/Ecuador	761,300
2.2	2.2.1.	Colombia/Ecuador	700,500
	2.2.2.	Colombia/Ecuador	220,000
Component 3			8,320,500
3.1	3.1.1.	Colombia/Ecuador	40,000
	3.1.2.	Colombia/Ecuador	3,800,000
	3.1.3.	Colombia/Ecuador	1,300,000
	3.1.4.	Colombia/Ecuador	220,000

	3.1.5.	Colombia/Ecuador	1,280,500
3.2.	3.2.1.	Colombia/Ecuador	780,000
	3.2.2.	Colombia/Ecuador	900,000
Project components			11,783,800
Project execution 9.5%			1,119,400
Total project cost			12,903,200
MIE management fees 8.5%			1,096,800
Total financing requested			14,000,000

Source: Prodoc

Table 4. Disbursement matrix approved in the Prodoc

	Upon Contract Signature	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Schedule Date	01.06. 2017	01.06. 2018	01.06. 2019	01.06.2020	01.06.2022	--
Project Funds	1,445,200	2,226,500	4,217,000	2,843,100	2,171,400	12,903,200
MIE Fees	122,842	189,252	358,445	241,692	184,569	1,096,800
Total	1,568,042	2,415,752	4,575,445	3,084,792	2,355,969	14,000,000

Source: Prodoc

105. Subsequently, in July 2022, at the request of WFP, the Adaptation Fund approved the modification of the disbursement schedule to align it with the extension of the project (6 years) for an additional 18 months, at no cost, to finalize the implementation of field activities and ensure project closure (see Table 5). This decision was based on the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the insecurity situation in the territory, as well as the capacity gaps of the Executing Entities.

Table 5. Updated project disbursement schedule

Year	Original disbursement schedule (US\$)	Modified disbursement schedule (US\$)
1	1,568,042	1,568,042
2	2,415,752	2,415,752
3	4,575,445	4,575,445
4	3,084,792	601,358

5	2,355,969	2,483,434
6	-	2,355,969
Total disbursement	14,000,000	14,000,000

Source: Letter from WFP to the AF "Request to amend the disbursement schedule of the Binational Project".

106. The minutes of the Seventh BSC of October 2022 present information on the financial execution of the project as of August 2022. In this regard, it was indicated that the disbursement for the development of the project components was US\$ 7,278,100, of which US\$ 3,166,492 was executed, representing 44% (including commitments). For Component 3, US\$1,281,636 was executed, which represents 41%. Execution by country was US\$ 1,933,345 (61%) in Ecuador and US\$ 1,233,147 (39%) in Colombia. However, no document was found to support these figures, since the financial execution information presented in the PPR4 is current as of 31 May 2022.

Oversight and support of the Implementing Entity (discussion)

107. WFP's capacities include infrastructure, technology, experience in humanitarian assistance, as well as access to remote areas or communities where the same government institutions do not reach. WFP, with financing from the Adaptation Fund, implemented the project Strengthening the resilience of communities to the adverse effects of climate change with emphasis on food security (Foreccsa) from 2012 to 2018, in the Province of Pichincha and the Jubones River basin in Ecuador. This has allowed it to generate experience in the monitoring of outcome indicators, in the implementation of adaptation measures, operational planning in adaptation, financial control, food security and gender approaches. It is important to operationalize the lessons learned from the Foreccsa project in the binational project, although it is recognized that this is the first WFP project in this border area with this level of intervention.
108. The Prodoc identified challenges and difficulties related to project implementation, which have been comprehensively explained in the risk management section of PPR4 and previous PPRs. This section has described the risk mitigation actions taken by WFP to achieve the expected results. The financial execution of the first CANE and FCAE FLAs were 100%, although it is important to note that the first agreements were signed for amounts up to US\$140,000; while the financial execution with respect to the amount signed was 13% for Ccamyf and Ccbmyf, 5% UNIPA, 2% Acipap and 9% NULPE.
109. Due to the complex situation of weak capacities of the Colombian EE, and because all the FLAs expired in July 2022, it was agreed to restructure the agreements with the EE. Several scenarios were generated, which take as a starting point the proven capacities of the EE. In the case of Afrodescendant organizations (Ccbmyf, Ccamyf), the current scenario is to continue with the agreements based on an adjusted work plan, supported with partners that strengthen them technically and who are selected based on an internal qualification process. In the case of the Awá organizations (Acipap, NULPE, UNIPA), the agreement as of today is to continue with the organizations based on a reduced work plan adjusted to their implementation capacities, plus the inclusion of new partner(s) selected through an internal qualification process, who work in the communities where they can have access and are accepted by the Awá organizations to

guarantee their entry into the territory. Likewise, new implementing partners are being incorporated to support the EE to improve their execution rates, however, there have been difficulties of access to the territory, insecurity, and high costs due to the factors already explained.

110. The availability of staff and/or team size is determined by the Adaptation Fund guidelines, as well as by the budgetary constraints that exist mainly under the heading of project execution costs and for measure investment. It should also be mentioned that resources for M&E were not originally explicitly contemplated. There is a perception among the EEs and public entities (MAG) that, although there is proactive coordination, additional personnel (technical and communications) with decision-making power should be hired so that there is fluid communication and decisions can be made on concrete timely actions.
111. There are three levels of internal coordination within WFP at the binational level, which, although they have not yet been reported in the project reports, are documented by means of memoirs or other internal work documents. First, there are monthly coordination meetings, where WFP Headquarter, the Regional Bureau of Panamá and the two WFP Country Offices meet to follow up and identify opportunities for work, training, advice, and/or visibility for the project. Second, the two WFP Country Offices through the Project Management, with the Binational Coordination, meet on a regular basis (once a month or more as required) to review strategic issues, follow up, provide technical guidance, and/or establish guidelines for the national teams, as needed. Finally, the space for technical articulation between the national coordinators and the binational coordinator is an operational space for the exchange of experiences and review of progress.

Skills and abilities of the Executing Entities (discussion)

112. The capacities of the EE have not been sufficient to make timely progress in project implementation. During the project design phase, priority was given to the involvement of these organizations to strengthen them, which is why they were not subjected to due diligence with respect to their capacity to implement highly complex projects. Administrative, financial and management capacities are complementary, and in some cases are the basis for developing technical skills that allow them to lead climate change adaptation activities. In this regard, there is not known training strategy for the EEs that is based on the capacity assessments carried out. In Colombia, a training plan was developed for the EEs, however the level of implementation of this plan is not known.
113. The budget for hiring the EE team is established in agreement with WFP at the time of designing the FLAs, and the number of contracts is based on the requirements of the activities defined in each AOP. In the case of Ccamyf and Ccbmyf, a team of technicians/professionals (liaison coordinator, accountant, assistants, technicians) was hired. Despite this, the entities have lacked sufficient knowledge and experience for the implementation of procurement processes.
114. National, regional and local government entities do not have constant, fluid communication or articulation with the communities due to geographical conditions (conflict zone, distance, access). Such communication is achieved through the WFP technical team. On the other hand,

the Ecuadorian Academia considers that decision making, information management procedures and signature collection should be more agile to improve operational and financial management.

Delays in project start-up (discussion)

115. During the first year, the project planning activities were prolonged with the Afrodescendant and Awá indigenous EE (with the latter for more than 1 year), due to the complexity of the negotiations with these organizations for the subscription of the FLAs. These articulation difficulties are because they were assigned a double role in the implementation arrangements: to be beneficiaries, and at the same time Executing Entities. This has led them to assume the role of being the only channel through which access to the territory can be gained, to enable dialogue with the communities, and to implement the project. In addition, indigenous organizations in Colombia take advantage of their administrative autonomy granted by Decree 1088 of 1993 to request additional support, often outside the scope of the project and/or the provisions of the FLA.
116. The EE also do not have experience working in the implementation of highly complex projects that involve compliance with the guidelines of multilateral implementation entities. In the case of Acipap, they did not allow the WFP team to enter their territory as the previous legal representative did not agree with conducting studies to gather information related to their medicinal flora. Likewise, the study development phase was extended due to the particularities of working with the communities, the complexities of the territory, restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic, among other factors already mentioned.
117. In year 3, there were numerous delays in the execution process due to some reasons: first, restrictions of the pandemic that affected the work in the field and therefore the progress in the achievement of the outputs; continuing weaknesses of the organizations for the execution of the funds; limited access to internet in the most remote communities; rotation of personnel among authorities and/or members of the Boards of Directors of the ES; weaknesses in the information channels/flows from the ES to the communities. In addition, there was rotation of WFP staff with changes in the binational coordinator, manager in Colombia, national coordinator in Ecuador, among other key technical personnel.

3.5. M&E strategy evaluation (discussion)

M&E Plan

118. The Prodoc contains a brief Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and a results framework with objective and outcome indicators for project implementation. Four M&E activities are indicated in the Prodoc: i) a project initiation workshop (IW), ii) annual progress reports (PPRs), iii) a mid-term evaluation (or review) (MTR), and iv) a final external evaluation.
119. Monitoring activities date back to the initial stage of the project: from 2018 to 2019 baselines were developed at the country level; from 2019 an indicator of progress & gaps was established at the programmatic level; from 2020 quarterly monitoring of outputs was incorporated through a matrix collecting information; in 2020 the binational baseline was presented based on the national results; from 2020 to 2021 the M&E Strategy was designed with the technical team of

the project and the M&E country office units, to define in consensus the methodologies, parameters and scope of the indicators, and a timeline which was approved in September 2021 by the BSC; in 2021 the monitoring process of indicators of component 3 (mainly adaptation measures) started with the implementation of six EbA measures. Due to national dynamics, progress in monitoring is heterogeneous between the two countries.

120. Subsequently, in 2022, as part of the mid-term review, an analysis of the M&E Strategy was requested to identify required changes, both at the level of design of the results framework and implementation, based on its contribution to the monitoring of expected results and impacts. Within this framework, the M&E units, together with the project's technical team, worked on an internal review of the binational project's indicator matrix, due to the large number of project indicators (102 indicators) as the matrix included outputs and/or outcomes more than one indicator, duplicated indicators, and indicators that did not meet any of the SMART criteria. In this review, adjustments to the definition and application of some measurement methodologies were proposed as well as the number of indicators was reduced.

Implementation, budgeting and financing of M&E activities

121. In the Prodoc, a M&E budget was presented that does not include the cost of personnel to carry out the activities. Thus, the budget allocated for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the project was US\$213,700, distributed as follows: launching workshop (US\$20,000), annual progress reports (US\$40,000) and project monitoring (US\$28,700). The remainder of the budget was allocated for the mid-term evaluation (US\$15,000), final external evaluation (US\$60,000) and final audit (US\$50,000) (see [Table 6](#)). In addition, the budget by components and execution costs includes a budget line for monitoring assistants (2) for a total of US\$91,000, while the cost line for WFP Country Offices includes monitoring which amounts to US\$12,400. The detailed M&E budget specified in the monitoring and evaluation arrangements section does not fully match the breakdown and values contemplated in the project management costs section, according to the project document.

Table 6. Project budget for M&E commitments

M&E Activity	US\$
Launching workshop	20,000
Mid-term evaluation	15,000
Final external evaluation	60,000
Final audit	50,000
Annual progress reports (annual)	40,000
Project monitoring (four per year)	28,700
Total	213,700

Source: Prodoc

122. The M&E Strategy does not include an M&E budget for the M&E activities defined in the Prodoc. At the binational budget planning level, approved by the Adaptation Fund under the

extension request, the following cost structure is presented: US\$ 43,800 for monitoring activities, US\$ 23,000 for the mid-term review, US\$ 130,000 for the final external evaluation. At the monitoring plan level, each WFP Country Office defines the budget required for the activities prioritized in the binationally defined schedule; within this framework, the necessary adjustments have been agreed upon to guarantee the availability of funds, since the implementation of activities is managed according to national circumstances (validity/situation of the Agreements with the Executing Entities, progress in the implementation of measures, security conditions for accessing the communities, etc.). Therefore, it is not possible to identify changes in the costs of M&E activities with respect to what was established in the Prodoc, to understand the level of execution and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation, in addition to the costs associated with baseline and endline measurement. The absence of binational budget tracking at the monitoring activities level does not allow determining if these activities have had sufficient resources during their implementation, versus what was planned, especially considering that some items were underestimated or omitted during project design (e.g., the actual cost of a final external evaluation for a regional project is estimated at US\$130,000 instead of US\$60,000; the baseline cost was omitted in the M&E plan).

123. Prodoc mentioned that WFP is in charge of the financial supervision of the project; within this framework, it provides monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual information, according to reporting requirements at the national and/or binational level (PPR, BSC, national committees and monthly progress reports). Regarding project progress reports, WFP Ecuador submits monthly progress reports on the project by component, outcomes and outputs according to agreements established with the members of the national committees (from July 2019 to February 2023). For its part, WFP Colombia submitted monthly reports detailing the progress of project activities in the period August 2021 to March 2022.
124. As of the date of submission of the MTR report, four PPRs have been prepared, in which the annual progress of the project is evaluated using the M&E indicators. Up to PPR3, the information requirements were met in all sections (except for some gender indicators). However, in PPR4 there were difficulties in responding to all monitoring requirements due to: (i) the adaptation measures to which the measurement corresponded were not yet in the implementation phase or were barely begun; (ii) impossibility of the technical team and/or local partners to access the communities for insecurity reasons; linked to the above (iii) technical capacity gaps of Executing Entities.
125. A work plan was drawn up to provide key data and information to guide decision-making on the progress of project implementation. WFP Colombia and Ecuador teams have implemented information management mechanisms, which include the traceability of outputs and/or progress of results, determining the personnel responsible, the time of delivery, as well as the means of verification. The follow-up mechanisms are implemented by each country office with the support of the M&E areas, depending on the monitoring requirements of the project. The allocation of resources (technical staff, technical assistance and/or accompaniment time, etc.) is based on the intensity of the information gathering, analysis, systematization, activities etc. The progress and gaps matrix, as well as the product follow-up matrix, are tools that provide information on project performance, in accordance with the AOP approved at both the national and binational levels.

This information allows decisions to be made on the direction of the project and the implementation of activities.

126. As part of the process of implementing the monitoring plans, workshops have been held with the EE to adjust the tools, facilitate the technical language, apply a differential approach, etc., to make monitoring viable in the Project's territory. CANE's monitoring is carried out by the local coordinator with the support of project technicians, who prepare monthly plans and generate a monthly report on the visit and monitoring process. WFP makes random visits to verify the work carried out.
127. A large part of the M&E activities consists of methodological definition, information gathering, monitoring the indicators of the project results framework, the Adaptation Fund results framework, and compliance with the Environmental and Social and Gender Policies. There are 55 indicators distributed into four impact indicators, eight outcome indicators (one for each outcome, including two gender indicators in two outcomes), and 43 output indicators. As mentioned in paragraphs 46 to 59, several of these indicators are not SMART, so tracking them is challenging. Due to the nature of the information covered by some of the indicators, they must be constructed from household surveys or semi-structured interviews, which makes information gathering a labor-intensive process in terms of hours of work, as well as travel costs to reach the beneficiary communities (indicators AI03, AI04, AOC21, AOC12, AOC22, AOC31, AOC32). In other cases, the assumptions and risks identified in the Prodoc have changed. The risk analysis presented in the last PPR shows that it is complex, in some cases impossible, to enter the communities to implement the activities.
128. As for the Adaptation Fund's outcome indicators, there are 20 indicators, omitting the indicators belonging to Outcome 4, which are proposed to be eliminated because they do not correspond to the scope of the project's intervention. Following the revision of the Adaptation Fund's guidelines¹ it is identified that the definition of the outcome and output indicators, presents a high level of complexity since some methodologies require an evaluation or perception on effectiveness, quality, or level, by targeted population groups or communities, which goes far beyond a record of outputs. This varies depending on the type of adaptation measure that corresponds to the indicator. It also explains the main difference in the scope of indicators among the results frameworks. For example, indicators AROC31, AROC5, AROC6 can be reported using indicators from the results framework, instead of developing or applying other methodologies for their measurement (without the need to eliminate the indicator), or using household survey data, linked to livelihood benefits; indicator ARCI5 does not meet the conditions of being achievable or relevant, because the project does not contemplate activities that could generate income effects; indicators AROC2 and AROC7 can be estimated with information from the intermediate products developed in the project. Monitoring these 19 indicators increases the burden on the team (see [Table 1](#)).
129. *Regarding the indicators of compliance with the Environmental and Social and Gender policies*, there are 27 indicators of which only 15 should be measured. Regarding the indicators of Principle

¹ <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/AF-FinalDraftGuidance-wimpactproposal-10March11.pdf>

5 "Gender equality and empowerment of women", some of these indicators are process indicators, and in the case of this project, where the gender issue has been worked on in a cross-cutting manner and is part of the project's outcome indicators, it should be considered to align these indicators with those of the results framework (ESP55 - sub-indicators). Some are indicators that had to be measured in the baseline, or their measurement is very complex, or they are not relevant to the project (some sub-indicators of ESP55 and indicators ESP71, ESP93). Regarding principle 15 "Land and soil conservation", information in PPR4 shows why project activities are not at risk of violating this principle due to having carried out the process of prioritization and design of the adaptation measures; on the contrary, they can contribute to soil conservation.

130. In summary, M&E and project technical teams must monitor together a total of 102 indicators, of which 55 are in the project results framework, 20 are from the Adaptation Fund's strategic results framework and 27 are for environmental, social and gender policy compliance. As part of the design of the M&E Strategy, the M&E and project teams conducted an internal review of indicators that allowed: (i) reclassification of the types of indicators to facilitate operational monitoring; (ii) propose the elimination of some indicators because they are not relevant to the project or because they are duplicated. Regarding the reclassification of indicators, it is important to mention that it is internal and for operational purposes, as the type of indicator is reported according to the results frameworks of the project and the Adaptation Fund. Regarding the elimination of indicators, it is important to differentiate between measurement and reporting, i.e., the indicator must be measured once, but can be reported more than once. Thus, indicators that are measured for the project results framework can also be reported as part of the Adaptation Fund results framework. To close the review of the indicators to be monitored, specific recommendations have been included in the following section (Recommendations).
131. Finally, monitoring at the binational level is constructed by aggregating the activities, products, results, and impact of each country, considering both the differences in national contexts (by country) and the intercultural approach (Afro-descendants, Awá). In the case of indicator AI03 (binational capacity building score), it is measured at the country level, and then aggregated to provide a binational value, since it does not work with a binational institution or with an EE such as the Great Binational Awá Family, as defined in the Prodoc (since it does not have legal status).

4. LESSONS LEARNED, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

132. This section presents the lessons learned, recommendations, and conclusions from the MTR. These are broken down into six categories of analysis that highlight the strengths and/or weaknesses in the design and implementation of the project up to PPR4 (May 2022), which has affected the performance and fulfillment of the project results. The information has been extracted from the project documents, internal meetings, and interviews with external actors. Based on the lessons learned, the recommendations are divided into categories for implementation. Finally, the main conclusions of the project are described.

4.1. Lessons learned

The lessons learned are presented in six categories of analysis that highlight strengths and/or weaknesses in the project design and implementation:

(1) Participation and engagement

133. *(i) Identification of implementation arrangements of highly complex projects:* during the project design stage, the creation/strengthening for locally led adaptation to climate change was established as a priority. For this reason, it was agreed that the Afro-descendant and indigenous Awá organizations be the Executing Entities of the project (in addition to their role of representing the beneficiary communities). The capacity gaps evidenced to date, at the technical, administrative, financial, internal governance levels, among others, have made project implementation more extensive and complex than expected, with the consequent repercussions on low execution rates. Thus, to establish implementation arrangements appropriate to the local context and to the timeline also, it is important to agree and balance the setting among community organizations and cooperating partners, considering capacity assessments (“due diligence”), as an input for the definition of the arrangement.
134. *(ii) Relevance of having a strategy for key stakeholders engagement:* developing and implementing a stakeholder engagement strategy from the initial phase of the project would help optimize the time to carry out activities, especially the design and implementation of adaptation measures (Component 3). The strategy should consider the role of each stakeholder defined in the project implementation arrangements (e.g., executing entity, cooperating partner) and their time frame so that the project team could anticipate and mitigate possible delays due to capacity gaps.
135. *(iii) Incorporation of cooperating partners to bridge the capacity gaps:* the expansion of the project implementation team through alliances with local actors equipped with the technical expertise in this type of projects in the field has added local capacities to improve the financial execution rate of the project. Starting from the fourth year, two more partners that supported the EEs in the design and implementation of certain adaptation measures joined to support the technical capacity strengthening of the EEs.

(2) Capacity building

136. *(iv) Development of the Edefami web learning platform (Component 1):* this binational tool for the creation of capacities at the local level, in addition to the specialization courses/diplomas, enabled the members of the beneficiary communities to gain the necessary fundamental technical knowledge. This made it possible to create local teams of facilitators, interviewers and/or community parabiologists, which are needed to work on the three components of the project. Especially, during the COVID-19 pandemic, it allowed the organizations, mainly Afro-descendant, to encourage leaderships in their territories.

(3) Intervention methodologies

137. *(v) Building capacities and local leaderships for adaptation to climate change,* through joint work with the communities and key institutions of the territory was possible thanks to the use of highly participatory methodologies. These were applied by facilitators of the communities themselves

for local climate change adaptation planning and allowed that prioritized interventions reflect local needs and community interests. This has also contributed to the ownership of both knowledge and adaptation measures (mainly in the case of Afro-descendant communities), helping communities to build adaptation.

138. *(vi) Use of standard WFP methodologies appropriate to the project context (climate change, communities, COVID-19 context):* the use of WFP resilience program methodologies in the 135 targeted communities at the binational level made it possible to standardize the consultation phase, facilitating the processing of results, the classification of interventions, among other advantages (this is considered one of the lessons learned from the Foreccsa project).
139. *(vii) Planning of community consultation/prioritization processes considering the local worldview:* the internal governance mechanisms of the Executing Entities Afro-descendants and Awá (decision-making, information flow, community engagement, etc.), resulting from their worldview, are characterized by requiring extensive consultation processes. This particularity affected the achievement of the community-based adaptation plans (CBAP), which in turn generated expectations about the start of measures' implementation, mainly among the Awá.
140. *(viii) Analysis of climate rationality for the identification of adaptation measures:* considering the previous lessons, a balance must be guaranteed between participatory approaches —necessary to contribute to the ownership, sustainability, and local engagement of an intervention—, and the development of a "top-down" approach derived from the analysis of climatic rationality for an area with certain biophysical characteristics.
141. *(ix) Good practices for gender mainstreaming and the empowerment of women:* developing the gender mainstreaming strategy from the start-up stage of the project allowed for a timely approach, depending on the nature of the project.

(4) Operational management

142. *(x) Scope of cross-border work:* the project implementation arrangement, agreed upon by the Parties during project design, both at the level of strategic management and implementation (Binational Steering Committee) and technical-operational (national committees), facilitates the execution of project activities in each country. Likewise, it enhances and foster learning opportunities considering the common challenges posed by climate change along the river basins. This is also highly determined by the particularities of local contexts (legal / regulatory aspects, differences in currency / price system, security conditions, characteristics of meteorological and hydrological information, among others).
143. *(xi) Importance of adopting processes, agreements, methodologies, and strategies to strengthen the operational management of the project:* at the operational level, follow-up mechanisms have been implemented for project management, at the level of the technical team, of the Executing Entities, as well as the implementation team (consultants, cooperating partners), supported by the Annual Operation Plan with division of responsibilities. As of the date of the MTR, the level of operational (58%) and financial (51%) execution remains low. Therefore, it is necessary to implement and follow up on the previously defined acceleration strategies (WFP Ecuador / NSCE, September 2021; WFP Colombia/ Acceleration Workshop, May 2022; Binacional/ BSC, October 2022), based

on results-focused management, which will allow them to allocate resources (human, financial) to achieve the results and impacts defined in the result framework as well as to accelerate the financial execution.

144. *(xii) Relevance of the governance spaces for the implementation of a binational project:* the project governance spaces (BSC, NSCC, NSCE, NTACC and NTACE) have allowed the entities that are part of it (IGD, EE, Governors / Prefectures, other local actors depending on the country), both at a technical and strategic level, are consulted, participate in decision-making, and involve their focal points on a permanent basis. However, compliance with the guidelines of the operating manual regarding the flow of documentation must be guaranteed, to ensure a documented and open process. At the binational level, it is possible to strengthen the articulation in the framework of the activation of the MAB.

(5) Project monitoring

145. *(xiii) Configuration of the array of indicators:* the incorporation of more than one indicator for each Outcome and/or Output, the duplication of some indicators, as well as the inclusion of others that, after prioritizing the adaptation interventions with the communities, did not turn out to be relevant to the scope of the interventions, implies an extensive array of indicators (consisting of a total of 102).
146. *(xiv) Importance of the consistency between the monitoring challenges and the budget allocation:* the implementation of the M&E Strategy has generated important challenges because the budget required for the development of monitoring activities reflects limitations with the planning budget of the project document. This is explained given that: (a) some items were not considered during the design; and (b) the measurement methodologies of some indicators, mainly outcome, require efforts and challenges to reach the beneficiary communities. Especially, it should be considered that the circumstances are changing over time, since they are conditioned to the local context of complex areas.

(6) Design of future ACC projects with indigenous peoples

147. *(xv) Importance of the theory of change:* developing the project theory of change as part of the project design phase or as part of the inception workshop provides clarity on the causality and interactions of the components, which gives greater clarity on the operational management model to be applied to the project. In the case of the binational project, the “Climate Resilience Network for Zero Hunger” sought to describe the complex results chain that characterizes this project. This becomes more relevant when working with Afro-descendant and indigenous communities, because it is necessary for the interactions between products and results for the implementation of the actions to be more in line with their worldview. This will allow greater congruence between the costs (investment of time by the communities in studies, workshops, training, consultations, etc.) and the benefits (implementation of adaptation measures).

4.2. Recommendations

#	Recommendations	Responsible entities	Temporal horizon
A	Category 1: Key management aspects to complete the project successfully	WFP, BSC, NSCC, NSCE	2023
A.1	<p><i>Strengthen project governance and coordination, both at the binational and national level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Maintain spaces for binational articulation with the Executing Entities of the project if required (e.g., articulation table with the Great binational Awá family). ii. Maintain technical spaces at the binational level of the coordination team (binational/ national) for sharing experience on the implementation of the activities at least once every six months (e.g., measures execution mechanisms, methodologies, binational reports). iii. Guarantee compliance with the guidelines of the operational manual for each governance space (i.e., BSC, CDNC, NSCE, NTACC, and NTACE), ensuring the traceability of the procedure (Colombia). iv. Simplify the approval process in the project governance spaces at the national level (CDNC and NTACC) to expedite the project execution (Colombia). v. Reference the coordination, monitoring and decision-making spaces in PPR5 established at the operational level as part of the WFP's internal mechanisms. 		
A.2	<p><i>Accelerate the technical and financial execution of the project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reinforce training and support activities for Executing Entities to strengthen their financial execution, based on the weaknesses identified to date. ii. Prepare quarterly binational operational and financial progress reports and identify the necessary alerts to strengthen the project monitoring. iii. Prioritize the hiring of additional personnel to provide a timely response to the multiple demands for execution based on the hiring decisions made in each country. 		
A.3	<p><i>Strengthen project visibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Establish a roadmap for the development of national and binational communication products within the framework of the POA 2023, which is aligned with the visibility priorities of the project, in agreement with the Designated Authorities and other interested parties. 		
B	Category 2: Key aspects to strengthen project monitoring	WFP	2023

<p>B.1</p>	<p><i>Strengthen the implementation of the M&E Strategy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Update the binational monitoring schedule (built from the updated action plans / implementation of the M&E Strategy of each country), tending to the standardization of activities. ii. Ensure data collection for the indicators, considering the reporting priorities for PPR5, PPR6, and annual operational planning, in order to respond to the measurement of results and impacts; the recommendations on the individual indicators are detailed in Annex 3. iii. Generate the necessary alerts and/or recommendations during the construction of the PPRs, on whether the indicators (output, outcome, and impact) are achievable by the project, considering the progress in the implementation of adaptation measures. iv. Update the M&E Strategy based on the latest adjustments made to the monitoring tools/formats, roles, responsibilities of the EEs, knowledge management procedures (documentation and archiving), among other sections, as necessary, to maintain the process documented. 		
<p>B.2</p>	<p><i>Adjust battery of indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Formalize the specific recommendations for the indicators before the Adaptation Fund based on the guidelines that apply to each case: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Specific recommendations for the elimination of indicators or methodological adjustment in indicators of the project results framework and the Adaptation Fund, as detailed in Annex 3. Recommendations category 2 - Specifics to improve M&E. b. Proposal of adjustment to the safeguards indicators to go from 26 to 13 that are SMART; see Annex 4. Proposal for adjustment to the safeguard indicators within the framework of the ESMP. 		
<p>C</p>	<p>Category 3: Key aspects that point to the sustainability of the project</p>	<p>BSC, NSCC, NSCE, NTACE, NTACC</p>	<p>2023 - 2024</p>
<p>C.1</p>	<p><i>Prioritize sustainability actions of adaptation measures</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Prioritize the articulation and identification of synergies with key actors for the design and implementation of adaptation interventions in each country, to increase efficiency in the use of resources. Report the results in future PPRs, both in terms of the inter-institutional articulations achieved, and in terms of the respective co-financing value. ii. Manage sustainability actions of the prioritized adaptation measures, with the participation of the different key stakeholders in project governance, identifying commitments of each party based on their competencies. Consider the following dimensions: economic, financial, social, environmental, and institutional aspects, risk analysis, and other criteria as per defined in the “Final evaluation guide” of the AF. 		

C.2	<p><i>Develop a project closure plan</i></p> <p>ii. Establish and disseminate a roadmap for the closure of the project in a participatory manner with key stakeholders; include persons in charge, commitments, budgets (if applicable), times, asset delivery formats, and knowledge management products.</p>
-----	--

4.3. Conclusions

148. MTR report recognizes WFP presence and intervention in the areas that have been historically marginalized and difficult to access for government entities, as well as the effort and dedication of the WFP, the national institutions, cooperating partners, and the EEs, among others, that have been involved in the design and implementation of this project. The participation of the Afro-descendant and Awá communities should be recognized as well in the consultations, identification, and prioritization of the adaptation measures.
149. While the project went through some delays in its implementation, it has been making progress in carrying out the activities and achieving the intended results. The M&E tools have been useful to follow up on the processes and results. The results framework shows important interrelations between its indicators that contribute to the objective of the project. During the first half of the project, the main activities were studies, community-based participatory planning (CBPP) and training; in the second half (as of June 2020), the activities are heavily focused on the implementation of adaptation measures.
150. The project promotes cooperation and capacity building as well as builds trust with Afro-descendant and indigenous populations and the government entities involved. In addition, it has created space for collaboration with academia at the regional level. In this context, to achieve the expected outcomes and maintain them over time, it is necessary to promote the ownership over the EEs and local key institutions of the results of the project, so that they can take concrete actions to maintain the adaptation measures implemented through the project. Therefore, the project team must work on a sustainability plan for the project results, especially for the release/delivery of the early warning systems and adaptation measures.
151. The project implementation is characterized by being highly participatory with the EEs and targeted communities, through trainings contribute to their capacity strengthening and generate knowledge on risk management and for the design and implementation of the adaptation measures. In this sense, it should continue working on strengthening the capacities of the EEs for the funds execution, continuous monitoring of compliance with the FLA, which includes obtaining the intended results in the remaining time of the project. The capacities for planning, execution, and active involvement in territorial management will allow the EEs to improve their internal processes, leadership, and representation of the beneficiary communities, beyond the project.
152. This project is also a first step for operational binational coordination between governments on climate change. The Binational Steering Committee (BSC) is the first space for articulation between the multilateral implementation entity and the Designated Authorities in the areas, which generates opportunities for binational collaboration in complex areas that are difficult to

access, which undoubtedly requires increasing the institutional presence. This space can grow and generate greater cooperation if other actors that have competencies for cross-border cooperation are included, such as the foreign affairs ministries of each country. In this sense, the Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) projects financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) can be taken as a reference for future interventions in this border area, which have developed implementation arrangements that promote spaces for effective binational governance and cooperation.

5. References

- Guidance notes on Mid-term Reviews (WFP)
- Reviews Step by Step Process Guide (WFP)
- Guidelines for project/programme Final Evaluations (Adaptation Fund)
- Results tracker guidance document (Adaptation Fund)

6. Acronyms

Acipap	Association of Indigenous Councils of the Awá People of Putumayo
ADC	Association for Peasant Development
AOP	Annual operational plan
BSC	Binational Steering Committee
Camawari	Organization of the Cabildo Mayor Awá of Ricaurte
CANE	Afro-Ecuadorian Confederation of Northern Esmeraldas
CbA	Community-based adaptation
CBAP	Community-based adaptation plans
CBPP	Community-based participatory planning
Ccamyf	Alto Mira and Border Community Council
Ccbmyf	Bajo Mira and Border Community Council
Corpoamazonía	Corporation for the Sustainable Development of Southern Amazonia
Corponariño	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Nariño
DNP	National Planning Department
EbA	Ecosystem-based adaptation
EE	Executing Entities
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
EWS	Early warning system
FARC	Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia
FCAE	Federation of Awá Centers of Ecuador
FEPP	Ecuadorian Populorum Progressio Fund
Foreccsa	Project “Enhancing resilience of communities to the adverse effects of climate change on food security, in the province of Pichincha and the Jubones river basin”
GAD	Decentralized Autonomous Provincial Governments
GFAB	Great Binational Awá Family
IDEAM	Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies
IE	Implementing Entity
Inamhi	National Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MAATE	Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition of Ecuador
MAG	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
Minambiente	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia
MTR	Mid-term review

NSCC	National Steering Committee of Colombia
NSEC	National Steering Committee of Ecuador
NTACC	National Technical Advisory Committee of Colombia
NTACE	National Technical Advisory Committee of Ecuador
NULPE	Resguardo indígena Nulpe Medio Alto del Rio San Juan
PEC	Project execution costs
PPR	Project performance reports
Prodoc	Project document
Pucese	Pontifical Catholic University of Esmeraldas
Recompas	South Pacific Community Councils Network
SLP	Seasonal Livelihood Programming
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of reference
UNIPA	Indigenous Unit of the Awá People
UPEC	Carchi State Polytechnic University
WFP	World Food Programme

7. Annexes

Annex 1. Review of methodology and its limitations

153. The MTR provides information based on triangulated, credible, reliable, useful and relevant evidence. The MTR adopted a participatory and consultative approach promoting close collaboration with the ES and government counterparts and implementing partners. The review was conducted based on sound principles of integrity, honesty, confidentiality and cultural sensitivity.
154. The MTR involves a series of stages with primary and secondary data collection. The proposed phases of the review process are:
- A. Initial stage: Initial documentary review, coordination with the project team, elaboration of the Work Plan including the matrix of evaluation criteria/questions and agreements of the introductory meetings with the project staff.
 - B. Elaboration of Theory of Change (ToC): Exploratory review of the information used for the development of the first stage of the mid-term internal review (MTR1) and coordinate technical feedback with the WFP technical team for the elaboration and assembly of the ToC diagram.
 - C. First version of the mid-term review report: Data collection (interviews), data analysis, triangulation and drafting of the report containing main conclusions and recommendations.
 - D. Final version of the mid-term review Report: Includes executive summary, and final revision of the first version taking into consideration the 'audit trail' of comments.

Phase A - Initial stage

Initial revision

155. All relevant sources of information contained in the "100 MTR Bibliography" folder were reviewed, mainly the WFP mid-term review Guide and the Adaptation Fund Final Evaluations Guide; the regional project proposal, the MTR1, the final report structure document shared by the MTR Focal Point, and other materials useful for this evidence-based review.

Initial meetings with project team

156. The kick-off meetings, through teleconferences, were held with the participation of key stakeholders, including the MTR Focal Point, the M&E team of both countries, among others. During the initial phase, the project Focal Point added the consultant to the Teams group "MTR Binational Project Repository", so that she could access all the folders contained in the repository. Likewise, the consultant exchanged messages (email, messages on the TEAMS platform; and eventually the instant messaging application, specifically WhatsApp) with the MTR Focal Point of both countries.

Review Framework

157. The original set of questions presented in the "Review Questions" section of the ToR was modified and completed in order to answer relevant questions on all criteria, including relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. In this regard, the consultant aligned the criteria developed in the ToR with those of the AF Guide on final evaluations. The consultant also reviewed whether the 2021 LDC Mid-Term Review Guide has questions not considered in the ToR, so that they can be included (See [Annex 7. Matrix of evaluation/review questions](#)).
158. The Consultant shared the matrix of review criteria/questions for the document, which was fed back online to the MTR Focal Points, the M&E team and program officers, as well as the WFP regional and central headquarters.

Elaboration of a Work Plan

159. The consultant prepared the Work Plan, a document that contained the methodology, the project schedule, the stakeholder matrix, the evaluation criteria matrix, and the structure of the final version of the MTR (table of contents). These documents were shared via e-mail by the Consultant to the MTR Focal Points and the M&E team to receive feedback.
160. In this regard, the consultant facilitated the development of the project structure and evaluation matrix for the climate change adaptation project, which included the WFP Guidelines, the AF Guidelines and the consultant's experience with Global Environment Facility (GEF) projects.
161. The consultant also provided the matrix of actors to the project focal points in both countries, the national coordinators, and contacts with the organizations so that it could be completed; and in this way, the interviews (27 interviewees from 24 institutions) could be prioritized and carried out within the defined timeframe (until 28/12/2022) (see [Annex 6. Interviewed stakeholders](#)).

Phase B - Elaboration of the Theory of Change (ToC)

162. The consultant facilitated the feedback of the ToC for the Binational Project, considering the logical framework of the project, and taking into account the conceptualization of the operational management model "Climate Resilience Network for Zero Hunger". To this end, the consultant reviewed the annotated version of the first version of the ToC contained in the MTR1. Subsequently, the Consultant: a) indicated what should be adjusted in the first version of the ToC, taking into consideration the WFP MTR Guide; b) proposed feedback sessions with the MTR Focal Point, M&E team and other stakeholders to answer questions and solicit information; and c) generated a final version of the ToC (Deliverable 2).

PHASE C - First version of the mid-term review report

Data collection (interviews with project stakeholders)

163. Twenty-six interviews were conducted with 24 organizations and authorities and technicians from the U.S. and Mexico. The consultant provided an Excel matrix of stakeholders to be

completed by the MTR Focal Point (see [Annex 7. Matrix of evaluation/review questions](#)) and defined and carried out a final prioritization of stakeholders together with the WFP team. All responses from interviewees were treated confidentially and anonymity was maintained. In this regard, the information from the interviews was processed directly in the evaluation matrix, which was decoded to safeguard the confidentiality of the interviewee.

164. *Individual and group interviews* were conducted by teleconference with country representatives from the project executing agencies, the project implementing agency, as well as key stakeholders related to the Binational Project. The interview protocols, questionnaires and selection of interviewees were prepared using the review matrix.
165. *Semi-structured protocols and questionnaires* were designed for each interview and used as an initial orientation. An adaptive approach was developed during the meetings. The interviewer attempted to build trust and make the interviewee feel as comfortable as possible in providing the information/evidence needed for the assessment. All interviews began with an opening question intended to make the interviewee relaxed and willing to cooperate. There was a limit on the number of questions asked, with the aim of preventing the interviews from being too long (45 minutes) (see [Annex 8. Interview protocols](#)).
166. The *methodology for data collection and triangulation* was based on two categories of information/sources: a) in-depth interviews with project stakeholders, and b) additional document review. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods were adopted to identify key recommendations in relation to progress on expected results and outcomes of the Binational Project, and expected outputs and processes, specifically in relation to the findings in the reporting document.
167. Complementary to the interview, email communication and internet communication platforms (i.e. WhatsApp, and Teams) were used to gather additional evidence.

Data analysis – Triangulation

168. Data analysis involved coding and organizing the findings according to a thematic analysis approach within the framework of the Binational Project structure. Data were triangulated from all sources (documents, interviews and meetings) to provide evidence for the MTR report.
169. The review sought to identify recommendations for decision-making to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency in project implementation. The MTR also considered the contextual conditions in relation to the expected outcomes and impacts of the project.
170. Data analysis was carried out in a systematic manner, ensuring that all findings, conclusions, and recommendations were supported by evidence. Appropriate tools, such as a data analysis matrix, were used to ensure adequate analysis, including records for each evaluation question/criterion, information and data collected from different sources and with different methodologies.

171. The MTR reviewed the key financial management aspects of the project, project costs and financing data, including annual expenditures, were analyzed. Variances between planned and actual expenditures were assessed and explained. The evaluator was assisted by WFP's Head of Programs in Colombia and WFP's National Program Officer in Ecuador, with support from the Binational Project Coordination, WFP's M&E units in each country, and the Regional Bureau and Head Quarter climate finance team to obtain the financial data to be included in the MTR. The MTR included the extent to which the Binational Project was achieving impacts or making progress towards achieving impacts. Key findings to be highlighted in the review included whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in the development of community knowledge on climate change risks and food and nutrition security, and b) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

Report writing

172. The MTR is written in response to the evaluation questions defined according to the proposed structure. The MTR describes the evaluation and analysis methods; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the time constraints, the approaches and methods employed generated data that helped answer the questions and achieved the purposes of the MTR.

173. The MTR presents a detailed analysis of the findings organized by criteria and supported by evidence (point 3 of the report structure). A chapter is included with a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. The report does not exceed 40 pages in length, excluding annexes.

Final Version of mid-term review

Preparation of Executive Summary

174. As part of the final version of the Executive Summary, this section will include the objective, purpose, review questions, target audience, methodology, key findings, conclusions, and general recommendations.

Final review and "tracking tool" of the comments received

175. Once comments on the MTR Reference Group report are received; the consultant will process the comments, produce the final version of the MTR report (Final Review Report) and provide an "tracking tool", detailing with all comments received indicating whether they have (or have not) been addressed in the final version of the MTR.

176. The review process aims to avoid factual errors and omissions, and to ensure that the MTR report covers all aspects established in the TOR. In this regard, all comments will be considered and responded to.

Annex 2. Documents reviewed (Guides and documents)

All the documents contained in the MTR Binational Project Repository were reviewed, a folder that can be found at the following: [General](#)

Annex 3. Recommendations category 2 - Specifics to improve M&E

#	Specific Recommendations on monitoring
ii.a	<p>Measurement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Close the monitoring of output indicators if the corresponding activities have already been completed. ii. Establish the baseline of the two indicators that need to be adjusted iii. (AI04 Percentage of women with physical, political, and economic empowerment; AOC22 Emergency Preparedness Capacity Index); if necessary, simplify the methodology to be cost-effective. iv. Evaluate whether the impact indicator AI04 (Percentage of women with physical, political and economic empowerment) can be measured using the result indicators AOC12 (Percentage of women who participate in dialogue and advocacy processes), AOC31 (Percentage of households where women, men or both (women and men) make decisions about the use of income), as well as from the products in which the information disaggregated by gender has been obtained. v. Evaluate if the outcome indicators AOC31, AOC32 (Number of natural assets implemented to support or adapt to climate change events), are specific and measurable based on their products; adjust the goals for the remaining time of the project. vi. Regarding the Output Indicator 3.1.3, eliminate the two indicators on irrigation water: “Percentage of households that have improved access to water for agricultural use [AOP313a1]” and “Percentage of households that have improved access and control to water for agricultural use [AOP313b1],” since none of the communities prioritized these measures during the consultation on the adaptation measures. vii. Regarding the Output Indicator 3.1.5, eliminate the two sub-indicators: “Types of income sources for households generated under the climate change scenarios, disaggregated by household head [AOP315b]” and “Percentage of increase in household income generated by ecosystem services and agricultural systems [AOP315c],” as they are not achievable within the project period. The results that these two indicators intend to measure are the effects in the longer term that should allow enough time for the communities to commercialize the reintroduced species and thus generate incomes. In line with this recommendation, it is advised to eliminate the indicators of the Adaptation Fund on Outcome 6: “Outcome 6.2 Increase in targeted population's sustained

	<p>climate-resilient alternative livelihoods [AROC62]" and "Output 6.1.2 Increased income or avoided decrease in income [AROP612]."</p> <p>viii. With regard to the Result Tracker of the Adaptation Fund, eliminate the three indicators under Outcome 4, for they are not relevant to the scope of the project: "Outcome 4.1 Increase in the response capacity of the Services Sector related to Food Safety, given the changing needs of the environment due to climate change," "Outcome 4.2 Assets (physical capital) produced, developed, improved or strengthened," and "Output 4.1.1 Number of community services of the Food Safety Sector that respond to the new conditions resulting from climate variability and change."</p> <p>ix. Simplify the methodology to measure Outcome and Output indicators (1.1, 1.2, 5.1, 6.1, 6.1.2) of the Result Tracker of the Adaptation Fund, focusing on reporting outputs that could be reported using the information from the associated indicators of the project results framework (e.g., number of projects/programs completed or improved, number of natural capital assets protected or rehabilitated, etc.).</p> <p>x. Simplify the methodology of the indicators of effectiveness evaluation (Outcome 4.2) and changes in assets (5.1) based on the WFP's methodology used to monitor the benefits of the targeted populations for the interventions.</p> <p>xi. Eliminate the Outcome Indicator 7.2 "Number of specific development strategies with climate change criteria incorporated [AROP72]" as it does not correspond to the scope of the project.</p>
ii.b	<p>Data collection</p> <p>xii. Tend to optimize the data collection process, in cases where the application of household surveys and/or semi-structured interviews is required.</p>
ii.d	<p>Indicators associated to mitigation measures (see Annex 4)</p> <p>xiii. i. Eliminate 13 of the 26 safeguard indicators that are not SMART (13) or report the results of other indicators (project results framework, Results Tracker of the Adaptation Fund, or CSP) that measure similar results.</p> <p>xiv. ii. Submit the proposal to the AF of the updated Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) with the adjusted battery of safeguard indicators.</p>

Annex 4. Proposal for adjustment to the safeguard indicators within the framework of the ESMP

Mitigation measures	Associated indicator	Proposed adjustment	
Principle 9. Protection of natural habitats > Associated risk: Activities not designed adequately might have negative environmental impacts			
Establish quality standard for all adaptation measures	Quality standards produced and applied	Report the CSP indicator from [EC.CC.4.1]	Proportion of field-level agreements (FLAs)/ memorandums of understanding (MOUs)/construction contracts (CCs) for CSP activities screened for environmental and social risks

Ensure that only native species will be introduced, using indigenous practices	Species introduced/planted	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART; duplicated indicator
Promote the storage of traditional and native varieties' species; Encourage biodiversity; Avoid monoculture	Number of diverse species introduced/ planted	Report the project indicator from [AOP315a]	Number of traditional and/or endemic species considered in the adaptation measures implemented
Provide protection from contamination from livestock (e.g., live fencing) to natural water sources to be conserved through the project	Quantity and quality (visual) of water in surrounding streams and rivers	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART; not applicable
Ensure that all materials used will be eco-friendly and locally available			
<p>Principle 15. Land and soil conservation > Associated risk: Degraded soils are not the most appropriate to benefit from adaptation measures: As reported in PPR4, the Prodoc does not indicate how the implementation of the project could have a negative impact on the landscape (soil), but instead focuses on whether degraded soils are the best for intervention. In any case, (a) does not apply to the project, which is present in areas that do not present high levels of degradation; (b) the prioritized climate change adaptation measures consider the reforestation of deforested areas (mangrove, forest), agroecological production, conservation and protection of water sources, and the implementation of agroforestry and silvopasture systems that include nitrogen-fixing plants .</p>			
Establish quality standard and decide requirements for all adaptation measures, with specific attention to degraded soils	Number planting models which include nitrogen fixed species and other measure that protect the soil	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART, the risk is not relevant to the scope of the project
Integrate soil fertility' measures			
Introduce vegetative protection measures, including the use of native nitrogen fixing species			
Train community members on the correct use of inputs and soil protection measures	Community members trained	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART, the risk is not relevant to the scope of the project
Integrate traditional knowledge and practices on soil protection	Practices and knowledge integrated	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART, the risk is not relevant to the scope of the project
Avoid the use of agrochemicals and rely on composting and traditional practices	Agrochemicals used	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART, the risk is not relevant to the scope of the project
Match land use to land capability	Maps produced showing land use and land capability for the main micro-watersheds	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART, the risk is not relevant to the scope of the project
Screening of community-based adaptation plans will include an assessment of potential impacts and risks	N/A	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART, the risk is not relevant to the scope of the project

produced by high soil degradation			
Principle 3. Marginalized and vulnerable Groups > Associated risk: Traditional knowledge and practices can be appropriated by third parties			
Train community members to protect traditional knowledge, and share only according to established protocols	Community members trained	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART, not relevant depending on the approach carried out by the project for the protection of intellectual property
Elaborate protocols for collection, sharing and dissemination of traditional knowledge and practices, following appropriate policy recommendations and regulations	Protocols finalized and implemented	Adjust the indicator	Proportion of FLAs / MOUs agreements signed for the development of activities that incorporate intellectual property clauses
Support communities to add value to local species and market and consume the products locally	Value added and marketing strategies established	Report the project indicator from [AOP112]	Number of studies on value chains / commercialization of traditional and/or endemic species
Principle 7. Indigenous peoples > Associated risk: Actions which include western science or technology are not fully embraced by Awá due to conflict with their Cosmo vision			
Prioritize native species and traditional practices	Introduced species included in the project	Adjust the indicator	Number of traditional and/or endemic species considered in the adaptation measures implemented
Take into account local hunting and gathering practices, respecting land property and customary rights	Traditional practices identified in a participatory manner, respecting land property and customary rights	Adjust the indicator	Number of adaptation measures that contemplate the use of ancestral or traditional practices
Develop participatory approaches, interfacing scientific and traditional knowledge	Participatory approaches developed and applied	Report the Project indicator [AOP311]	Number of methodologies developed to integrate scientific and traditional knowledge
Encourage the hiring of Awá and Afrodescendants project staff	Number of Awá and Afro staff members	Eliminate the indicator	Included in the previous indicator and could be reported with disaggregation.
Ensure local expertise is used for project implementation	Local experts engaged in project implementation	Adjust the indicator	Number of local people hired as part of the implementation team (disaggregated by ethnic origin*, gender, educational level, and EE/CP) Ethnic origin = Afro-descendants, Awá, mestizos, others; EE = Executing Entities; CP = Cooperating partners
Ensure that Awá Cosmovision is mainstreamed through the planning and formulation of Awá communities' adaptation plans (CBAP)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Include culturally sensitive criteria in the screening	N/A	Report the CSP indicator [EC.CC.4.1]	Screening is already considered with the indicator: "Proportion of field-level agreements (FLAs)/memorandums of

process of community-based adaptation plans			<i>understanding (MOUs)/construction contracts (CCs) for CSP activities screened for environmental and social risks"</i>
Principle 5. Gender equality and women's empowerment > Associated risk: Gender empowerment and equality not fully supported by male-dominated leadership			
Hire women technical experts from the Afro and Awá communities	Number of Awá women technical experts hired	Adjust the indicator	Number of people from the Afro-descendant and indigenous Awá communities hired as part of the implementation team (disaggregated by gender)
	Number of Afro women technical experts trained	Adjust the indicator	
All project staff trained	N/A	N/A	N/A
Incorporate gender sensitive approaches into trainings and workshops	Percentage of trainings and workshops which incorporate gender sensitive approaches	Maintain without change	Percentage of trainings and workshops which incorporate gender sensitive approaches
Complete a gender screening at project outset	Gender screening completed before implementation of project activities	Report the CSP indicator [EC.CC.4.1]	Proportion of field-level agreements (FLAs)/memorandums of understanding (MOUs)/construction contracts (CCs) for CSP activities screened for environmental and social risks
Carry out a social and economic baseline, incorporating a gender perspective	Baseline completed on time	Eliminate the indicator	The baseline should be measured as part of the project monitoring; it should not and could not be an indicator itself.
All project stakeholders' meetings should review progress, considering gender issues	Percentage of Note for the Record of meetings that address gender issues	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART
All community members will be trained on how to use the project Grievance mechanism and encouraged to activate it when necessary	Number of training sessions held	Adjust the indicator	Number of training sessions on CFM held
Ensure that gender is mainstreamed through the planning and formulation of community-based adaptation plans	Percentage of community-based adaptation plans that have considered gender	Maintain without change	Percentage of adaptation measures designed with a gender approach
Include a gender comprehensive assessment in the screening of community-based adaptation plans	Gender assessment carried out before project starts Number of gender assessments completed	Eliminate the indicator	Not SMART; duplicated indicator

Annex 5. Terms of reference

TYPE OF CONTRACT:	WAE
WORKPLACE:	Remote
CONTRACT PERIOD:	54 days from the start date of the consultancy, for a maximum of 3 months.
JOB TITLE:	International consultancy for mid-term review of the Binational Project called "Construction of adaptation capacity through food and nutritional security actions in vulnerable Afro-descendant and indigenous communities in the Colombian-Ecuadorian border area"

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF OFFICE

The Adaptation Fund of the Kyoto Protocol of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (hereinafter called the Adaptation Fund, AF), approved in July 2017 the Binational Project called "Building the adaptive capacity through food and nutrition security actions in vulnerable Afro-descendant and indigenous communities in the Colombian-Ecuadorian border area" (hereinafter called the Binational Project). The Multilateral Implementing Agency of this project is the World Food Programme of the United Nations (WFP) of Colombia and Ecuador and has the endorsement of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia [Minambiente] and the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecologic Transition of Ecuador [MAATE], that have the role of Designated Authorities. The Awá community organizations, belonging to the Great Binacional Awá Family, and of Afro-descendants, the South Pacific Community Councils Network (Recompas) of Colombia and the Afro-Ecuadorian Confederation of Northern Esmeraldas (CANE) are the Executing Entities (EE) of the Project. The Binational Steering Committee (BSC) is the highest decision-making body for the Project, which is made up of Minambiente, MAATE, WFP Colombia and WFP Ecuador.

The intervention area of the project is approximately 915,000 hectares, located along the Colombian-Ecuadorian border area, in the Mira-Mataje and Guátara-Carchi binational basins, which are shared by Afro-descendant and indigenous Awá populations. In the intervention area there are 138 targeted communities, of which 66 are in the provinces of Esmeraldas, Carchi, Sucumbíos and Imbabura in Ecuador, and 72 in the territory of the departments of Nariño and Putumayo in Colombia.

A total of 19,867 direct beneficiaries are estimated. According to data from the project's baseline, around 42% of the households self-identify as Afro-descendant in Colombia and 52% in Ecuador, while the Awá population is 53% and 39% respectively. These populations are characterized by a situation of multidimensional vulnerability. Depending on the country, less than 30% of the households have access to water safe for human consumption through the public network, less than 21% are connected to the sewage system. Additionally, the impacts of climate change and climate variability, such as the increase in the frequency and intensity of extreme events, among others, combined with environmental degradation, reduce their access to productive assets and livelihoods. These populations also experience conditions of food insecurity related to limitations in the production, access, use and stability of food. About 42% of the population has a poor diet or close to the threshold. Similarly, up to 85% of households have only a slightly or moderately diverse diet. This project proposes to improve food security and nutrition through climate change adaptation actions, considering the following objectives:

1. Reduce the climatic vulnerabilities of local Afro and indigenous communities and the ecosystems on which they depend, to promote food and nutritional security, gender equality and contribute to the construction of peace.
2. Strengthen the adaptation capacities of both Afro-descendant and indigenous Awá communities in the cross-border region, as well as regional/local institutions to address the threats posed by climate change.

To achieve these objectives, the project is structured into three components:

1. Develop awareness and knowledge in the community about the risks of climate change and food and nutrition security in the two binational border basins.
2. Increase binational, community, and institutional capacity to sustainably address recurring climate risks, particularly those that affect food and nutrition security.

3. Reduce recurring climate vulnerabilities through adaptation measures based on an ecosystem and community approach to reduce food insecurity.

The project document of the Binational Project establishes monitoring & evaluation agreements based on the requirements of the Adaptation Fund and following the procedures of the WFP. Within this framework, an midterm review (MTR) is contemplated to be carried out at the midpoint of project implementation, which consists of an exercise led by WFP that considers both the design (conceptualization) and the progress of the Binational Project to date.

The findings of the MTR will inform operational decision-making, support learning (lessons learned) and guide the adjustments required in the ongoing project, such as corrective actions that facilitate the achievement of the expected results. The development of this consultancy takes as its starting point the progress made in a first stage of the mid-term review that was carried out from March to mid-August 2022 (see Scope section).

General objective

The objective of this consultancy is to carry out the mid-term review of the Binational Adaptation project, based on information available from the project, and primary information with key stakeholders to review its performance based on the planning established in the results framework.

The mid-term review aims to provide the Implementing Entity, technical team, Executing Entities, partners and other interested parties with recommendations for decision-making in order to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency in the implementation of the project. Provides key inputs that allow immediate corrective action to be taken.

For this, a series of preliminary review questions have been established that will allow the generation of a report and recommendations, to guide decision-making on the progress of the project's implementation. This report must be easily understandable, evidence-based, reliable, useful, as well as applicable to the remaining time of the project.

Scope

Assessing climate change adaptation interventions is challenging as they are diverse and encompass multiple factors. Few evaluations of climate change adaptation interventions have been conducted around the world. There are some risks in assessing adaptation because sometimes project assessments occur too soon with respect to the reference time to analyze climate scenarios. Therefore, one option is to assess adaptive capacity rather than the adaptation measures themselves. This approach makes it possible to assess the effectiveness of systems based on their flexibility and willingness to change, rather than the effectiveness of measures at a given time (AF. "Evaluation Framework", pp. 17-20. s/f).

Considering the above, adaptation projects should be evaluated as a contribution rather than attribution to a result, since there are many other actors and events that influence the implementation of a project.

In this context, the mid-term review will be developed based on a set of key review questions posed to shed light on the achievement of the results established in the Project's results framework, considering two lines of analysis: 1) about advances in results and expected effects to achieve the increase of the capacity of adaptation to climate change for food and nutrition security; 2) on advances in expected products and processes. The MTR will be based mainly on a review of secondary information, available in the WFP information systems and repositories of the Binational Project. Additionally, it will be complemented by the collection of qualitative data, from a limited number of online interviews with the authorities,

Similarly, it is expected that within the framework of this consultancy the Theory of Change for the Binational Project will be reconstructed, considering the logical framework that has been structured in detail.

Based on the scope, the person in charge of the review is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, baseline (national and binational), reports, files, studies/consultancy results, audit reports, , national strategic and legal documents, and any other material useful for the evidence-based evaluation. In addition, the scope of the products obtained in the first stage of the mid-term review, based on which this consultancy will be developed, is the following:

Progress of the first consultancy	Scope obtained in the first consultancy	Expected scope of the second consultancy
Product 1. Reconstruction of the Theory of Change for the Binational Project	First approach to the visual diagram; Methodological matrices on causal links with generating questions to be developed	Facilitate technical feedback from the Project Team/WFP; to generate a complete version of the Theory of Change.
Product 2. Analysis of progress in results and expected effects	First stage equivalent to an internal review (interviews and inputs within the WFP), of the review questions on results and effects.	Second stage equivalent to an external review of the review questions on results and effects, through interviews with key entities that make up the Governance of the project.
Product 3. Analysis of the advances in expected products and processes	First stage equivalent to an internal review (interviews and inputs within the WFP), of the review questions about products and processes.	Second stage equivalent to an external review of the review questions about products and processes, through interviews with key entities that make up the Governance of the project.

From the previous ones, products 4 and 5 that are detailed in the product schedule will be developed.

Review questions

PROGRESS IN RESULTS AND EXPECTED EFFECTS

1. To what extent do the activities carried out to date contribute to achieving the integration of traditional/ancestral knowledge with scientific/technical knowledge, considering the objectives of the project?
2. To what extent do the activities carried out to date contribute/will allow to create or strengthen the political and economic empowerment of women, so that they are "agents of change for adaptation to climate change in SAN"?
3. To what extent do community consultations on livelihoods (SLP), community-based participatory planning (CBPP), as well as the various prioritization, socialization and/or validation activities with communities contribute to the design of climate change plans and adaptation measures are coherent with the needs of the communities? How will the activities carried out to date contribute to the appropriation of the adaptation measures by the prioritized communities and key local institutions, and to their sustainability over time?
4. Considering the activities carried out to date, is it possible to increase the adaptive capacity to manage the risks associated with climate change and variability in the SAN at the different levels planned for the project (ecosystem, community, households, livelihoods? life and institutional (local and national)? What are the lessons learned (positive/negative) from the implementation of climate resilience and adaptation measures relevant for future interventions? Which have the greatest potential to be scalable and/or replicable?
5. To what extent have the activities carried out to date generated any unwanted effects (positive or negative) on the lives of the participants, their worldview, their cultural practices and their surrounding environments/ecosystems?

ADVANCES IN EXPECTED PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES

1. What are the factors that have limited progress on product targets using M&E data? For each product, suggest changes that need to be made at implementation or are required at the design level that should bring us closer to achieving the intended results.
2. What are the factors that have influenced the quality of the implementation of the planned activities with respect to the actual execution of the project, including financial management, implementation arrangements, and the involvement of national and local stakeholders? Identify key recommendations to improve project progress.
3. Has the capacity of WFP and the Executing Entities been adequate for the execution of the project? What are the aspects that should be strengthened and/or the corrective actions suggested?
4. What are the main lessons learned, good practices from the results achieved to the date of the review? Consider the lesson questions for the annual project performance report (PPR) format for the mid-term review, and some recommendations for priority examples that should be communicated more widely.
5. Carry out an analysis of the M&E Strategy, identifying what changes are required both at the design level of the results framework and at implementation, based on their contribution to monitoring the expected results and impacts? Regarding risks and safeguards, what changes are required in the matrix of risks and financial assumptions (Table 10) and Screening of social and environmental risks of the project based on the 15 principles of the FF Environmental and Social Policy? (Tables 7 and 10 located on pages 56 and 66 of the project document, respectively).

The mid-term review methodology should be developed in depth, as part of the first deliverable. This document must include a description and justification of this, from which the proponent hopes to develop the consultancy based on the expected products. It should be argued why the proposed methodology is the most appropriate, explaining how the review questions will be addressed, the review of secondary information, as well as the collection of qualitative information necessary for the MTR.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The position holder will have the following responsibilities:

1. Coordinate meetings with the WFP team assigned for the MTR and with other relevant actors, documenting the main findings, agreements, or others. Maintain an orderly file with the recordings of the meetings and attendance reports, guaranteeing the traceability of the delivered products.
2. Analyze the secondary information provided, based on the review questions established in these terms of reference and others that may arise during the development of the review. This information will be available on a common access site for internal use (ie Teams). Conduct interviews (online or face-to-face) with relevant stakeholders for the development of each one of the components of the Project.
3. Compile all the inputs provided by the people within the WFP and review consistency against the technical guidelines provided. For such purposes, it must provide the methodologies, formats or compilation tools, and any other necessary input to facilitate the gathering of information.
4. Reconstruct the Theory of Change for the Binational Project, considering the logical framework of the project, and considering the conceptualization of the operational management model "Climate Resilience Network for Zero Hunger".
5. Ensure uniformity of criteria in the inputs provided to answer the review questions, in accordance with the established technical guidelines.
6. Coordinate the validation workshop to be held as part of the MTR report review stage and document the discussions and resolutions that arise in this space.
7. Prepare the mid-term report in Spanish, following the technical guidelines provided by the WFP team, and considering the guidelines of the Adaptation Fund. The FA guide on final evaluations will be used as a reference, as well as the suggested structure for the corresponding report (reference: Annex a Final Evaluation Report Template)².

² https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Guidelines%20for%20Proj_Prog%20Final%20Evaluations%20final%20compressed.pdf

8. Comply with the observations made by the WFP, through the designated persons, during the term of the contract, immediately correcting any inconvenience in the provision of the service.
9. Give immediate notice to the persons designated by the WFP, in case of new developments that may affect the normal execution of the contract.
10. Make the modifications, corrections and/or adjustments required by the WFP, to guarantee compliance with the objectives of the contract.
11. Carry out other activities that are inherent to the nature of the object of the contract for the successful development of the MTR.

EXPECTED PRODUCTS

The consultant will be responsible for presenting the following products within 12 weeks:

No	PRODUCT	DATE OF DELIVERY
1	Workplan , detailing all the activities, times of delivery of the products required for this consultancy (in line with the schedule), as well as the detailed methodology.	1 WEEKS
2	Theory of Change for the Binational Project considering the logical framework of the project and the operational management model "Climate Resilience Network for Zero Hunger"	4 WEEKS
3	First version of the mid-term review report in Spanish, which compiles the analyzes carried out, as well as the main conclusions and recommendations for decision making.	8 WEEKS
4	(4.1) Final version of the mid-term review report in Spanish, adjusted based on the observations made to the document; (4.2) Executive Summary in Spanish of the main findings of the mid-term review, both documents approved.	12 WEEKS
	TOTAL	12 WEEKS

WFP LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK > COMMON STANDARDS OF BEHAVIOR:

Lead by example with integrity	Demonstrates and encourages others to uphold WFP's values, principles and standards and encourages others to do the same	Diversity of values using inclusive and respectful language	Stays focused and calm when under pressure, encourages others to do the same, and offers guidance and support in handling difficult situations	Demonstrates humility and a willingness to learn and shares knowledge, frequently seeking and acting on feedback, and seeking opportunities to develop
Drive results and deliver on commitments	Identifies and line up goals to results required, keep to yourself and/or others responsible	Delegates accountable and provides appropriate support to empower	Easily responds to change in different contexts and adapt accordingly	

	for delivering results for maximum impact	others to deliver results		
Promotes inclusion and collaboration	Promotes inclusive teamwork and psychological safety by encouraging colleagues to collaborate sharing ideas and pose issues openly	Supports development for others by giving timely and constructive feedback	Seeks trust and listen carefully to various points of sight to capture, learn, build and share new insights	
Apply strategic thinking	WFP vision and results are communicated and delivered operational to offer solutions significant	Demonstrates curiosity, designs, and implements new ways of doing things when relevant	Collects data and different perspectives, shares knowledge and use evidence to inform	Implements decisions, considering the risks and implications of actions for teams, projects, and other initiatives

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS REQUIRED

Education:	Professional with university studies in Social Sciences, Economics, Administration, Environmental Sciences, or others related to the purpose of the consultancy. Preferably with postgraduate studies in adaptation to climate change or one of the areas related to nature of the Binational Project.
Specific Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum ten (10) years of experience in the design and implementation of intermediate and/or final evaluations, mid-term reviews for climate change adaptation, environmental and/or sustainable development projects or programs. • Minimum five (5) years of specific experience in the design, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation of climate change adaptation, environmental, and/or sustainable development projects at the community level, preferably with a focus on food and nutrition security. • Desirable previous experience in mainstreaming the gender approach, in projects of this nature and/or with Peoples and Nationalities or intercultural approaches. • Experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies, as well as for the preparation of reports. • Experience in evaluating projects within the United Nations system will be valued. Previous experience with WFP is desirable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferably be based in Colombia or Ecuador, or in any case have demonstrable knowledge and experience within the project intervention area. • Office knowledge (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, etc.).

Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer Orientation: Ensures that it understands its customers and focuses on the proper attention to them. Works with colleagues in a coordinated manner to resolve areas of dissatisfaction. • Initiative: Proposes methods to improve work processes. Proactively identifies potential problems in the work unit and implements actions to avoid them. Adjusts your work in aspects under your supervision in challenging circumstances. • Concern for order: Develops Strategies for rapid response in pressure situations and develops systems to organize data for future use.
Languages:	Fluency in Spanish and English, both oral and written.
Others:	Ability to keep accurate and precise records and to interpret and analyze a variety of data and resolve discrepancies. Courtesy, tact and ability to work effectively with people of different national and cultural backgrounds.

Assignment, duration, dates

- The total duration of the consultancy will be a maximum of three (3) months.

Supervision

- Direct supervision of the WFP Program Manager in Colombia and the WFP National Program Officer in Ecuador, with support from the Binational Coordination of the Binational Project, in coordination with the Ministries of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition of Ecuador and the Ministry Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia.
- In close coordination with the WFP M&E Units in each country, and with the regional and headquarters climate finance team.
- You must act in accordance with the policies, guidelines, plans, procedures of the WFP.

Annex 6. Interviewed stakeholders

No.	No of Actor.	Category (Entity type)	Country	Name	Institution	Post	Project involvement level	Information level	Responsibility Level	Period involved with the project	Involvement in Component / Result / Product
1	1	Executing Entity	Colombia	Ricaurte Ocampo	Alto Mira and Border Community Council	Legal representative	low	low	high	2021-2022	Agreement signing - Has participated in negotiation activities. He has participated in all three components
2	1	Executing Entity	Colombia	Omar Revelo	Bajo Mira and Border Community Council	Alto Mira and Bajo Mira liaison coordinator	high	high	low	2021-2022	Coordinate activities of the agreement between Alto Mira and Bajo Mira executing partners. He has participated in all three components.
3	2	Executing Entity	Colombia	Maritza Landazuri	Bajo Mira and Border Community Council	Legal representative	high	high	high	2020-2022	Signing agreement- in the year 2018-2019 he was our liaison with the organization Recompas and communities. Today he is the legal representative. He has participated in all three components.
4	2	Executing Entity	Colombia	Willintong Guerrero	Mira and Border High Council	Chairman	high	high	high	2020-2022	He has participated since the beginning of the project, has been re-elected to the board.

5	4	Executing Entity	Colombia	Alfonso Maya	Acipap	Legal representative	medium	high	high	2021-2022	He participated together with Amilcar in the development of the agreement. He is currently Legal Representative and participates in implementation activities, negotiation. He has participated in components 1 and 3.
6	4	Executing Entity	Colombia	Amilcar Chapuez	Acipap - Binational Coordinator of the great Awa family	Technical (Volunteer)	high	high	medium	2018-2022	He participated in the formulation of the project. He is the leader of the territory, and all the governors elected him as Binational Representative of the Great Binational Awá Family (GFAB Coordinator). He knows all the technical and administrative processes of the project. He is the focal point for the agreement with Acipap. He has participated in all the components.
7	5	Executing Entity	Colombia	Rider Pai	UNIPA	Legal representative	low	high	high	2021-2022	He is the Senior Counselor of UNIPA, He is currently the Legal Representative with whom an agreement has been signed. He participates in the technical and management committees. He participates in some of the implementation activities. He has participated in component 2.
8	5	Executing Entity	Colombia	Claudia Carrion	UNIPA	Technical and administrative support	medium	high	low	2021-2022	He belongs to UNIPA, Rider's right-hand (UNIPA legal representative), since 2011 he has become the technical link between UNIPA and WFP.

9	6	Executing Entity	Colombia	Helber Gomez	NULPE shelter	Technical	medium	high	low	2021-2022	Right hand of the governor of NULPE, he represents the communities and the governor in meetings with WFP for the execution of the previous agreement, and the currently pending new agreement. He is a technician. He has participated in adjusting the implementation of component 3.
10	7	Executing Entity	Ecuador	Ines Morales	CANE	Chairwoman	high	high	high	2018-2022	She is the president of the Executing Entity for 38 communities. She is linked to all components
11	7	Executing Entity	Ecuador	Italo Quintero	CANE	Technical coordinator	high	high	high	2018-2022	He is the technical coordinator of the Executing Entity for 38 communities. He is linked to all components
12	8	Executing Entity	Ecuador	Jose Nastacuaz	FCAE	President	high	high	high	2020-2022	He is the president of the Executing Entity linked to 28 communities. He is related to all components
13	9	National Government	Colombia	Guillermo Prieto Palacios	Minambiente	Director in charge of the Climate Change and Risk Management Group	high	high	high	2018-2022	Minambiente is the designated entity in Colombia. He participates in Technical Committees and Steering Committees. He and his direct team from the adaptation group have participated in the development of community-based adaptation plans, pre-design of adaptation measures, implementation of adaptation measures and capacity strengthening. Component 2 (SAT) and 3.

14	9	National government	Colombia	Angelica Mosquera	Minambiente		high	high	medium	2019-2022	Since June 2019. She monitors projects with indigenous peoples and climate change.
15	10	National government	Colombia	Yolanda Gonzalez Hernandez	IDEAM	Director	medium	high	medium	2018-2022	She is part of the Technical Committee and Steering Committee and signed the FLA with WFP to implement the early warning systems (SAT), and represents the institute attached to Minambiente; competent in generating official climate information and alerts.
16	10	National government	Colombia	Helm Guzman	IDEAM	Coordinator of Climatology and Agrometeorology Group, Sub-directorate Meteorology	low	high	low	2018-2022	Delegate in the Technical Committee and Steering Committee. He supported the implementation of the FLA as liaison and technical adviser, and in the initial structuring of the early warning system. Component 2 (SAT)
17	11	National government	Ecuador	Pablo Caza	Ministry of Environment, MAATE	Project Focal Point	high	high	Low	2018-2022	MAATE is the designated entity in Ecuador. He participates in Technical Committees and Steering Committees, has participated in the preparation of community-based adaptation plans, approval of the design of adaptation measures and monitoring of the implementation of adaptation measures and capacity strengthening.

18	12	National government	Ecuador	Marlon Acosta	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, MAG	Project Focal Point	high	high	medium	2018-2022	He participates in Technical Committee and Steering Committee. He has participated in the preparation of community-based adaptation plans, design of adaptation measures, monitoring the implementation of adaptation measures and capacity strengthening.
19	12	National government	Ecuador	Tatiana Paredes	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, MAG	Delegate to Project Committees	medium	medium	high	2021-2022	She participates in Technical Committee and Steering Committee and has participated in the preparation of community-based adaptation plans, design of adaptation measures, monitoring the implementation of adaptation measures and capacity strengthening.
20	13	Local government	Colombia	Angelica Camacho	Corpoamazonía		medium	medium	low	2021 - 2022	
21	14	Local government	Colombia	Hugo Mideros	Corponariño	Director	medium	high	low	2019-2022	He is part of the Steering Committee and Technical Committee as representative of the regional environmental authority of one of the departments (Nariño). Participated in all of the three components.
22	15	Local government	Colombia	Pablo Aguirre	Governorate of Nariño	Environment Secretary	medium	high	medium	2019-2022	Part of the Steering Committee and Technical Committee as territorial government entity of one of the departments (Nariño). Has participated in the third component

23	17	Local government	Ecuador	Viviana Carabali Nazarene	Provincial Government of Esmeraldas	Environmental Management Technique	medium	high	medium	2019-2022	Part of the Technical Committee of the -project and participated in the review and approval of community-based adaptation plans, AOP, adaptation measures, monitoring of the implementation of adaptation measures.
24	18	Local government	Ecuador	Luis Cumba	Provincial Government of Carchi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2021 - 2022	<i>Interview did not take place</i>
25	19	Local government	Ecuador	Roberto Montesdeoca	Provincial Government of Imbabura	International Cooperation Technician	medium	high	medium	2018-2022	Part of the Technical Committee. He has participated in the review and approval of CBAP, adaptation measures, monitors the implementation of adaptation measures and capacity strengthening.
26	20	Academy	Ecuador	Marco Ruben Burbano Pulles	State Polytechnic University of Carchi-UPEC	Research Director	medium	high	medium	2020-2022	Participated in the implementation of adaptation measures with the implementation of resilient orchards, botanical gardens, characterization of native species, specialization course in climate change, gender, food security, risks.
27	21	Academy	Ecuador	Karla Fernanda Solis Charcopa	Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador - Esmeraldas Headquarters-Pucese	Coordinator for the Binational Project at Pucese	medium	high	medium	2020-2022	Participated in the implementation of adaptation measures with the implementation of a botanical gardens, ethnobotanical inventory of native species, specialization course in climate change, gender, food security, risks.

Annex 7. Matrix of evaluation/review questions

	Topic		Comment	Source
3.1	Findings on project design			
		Theory of Change (ToC) Feedback		
	1	Were the results and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change? * Was there a clearly defined and robust ToC? Did the ToC include: i) a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, ii) the desired results, iii) an analysis of the barriers and enablers to achieve the results, iv) consideration of how to address the barriers, v) a plan for phasing out of the project and vi) the responses that the project should focus on?	Sample ToC Questions	Guidance AF
		Risks encountered in project design		
	2	Were lessons from other relevant projects adequately incorporated into the project design?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	3	Were the capacities of the Executing Entities and their counterparts adequately consulted when the project was designed?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	4	Were agreements properly determined and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	5	Example: For each outcome, cross-sectional outcome, and output, which risks were identified in the design? Were the risks adequately captured in project design documents? Were the established assumptions and risks established logical and sound, and did they help determine the planned activities and outputs?	Example of questions about risks identified in the design	Guidance AF and GEF
		Indicators and bases of the project		
	6	Were the objectives and components of the project clear, hands-on approach and feasible within the established time frame?	Products and/or processes	AF

		<p>Example: Does an indicator sheet and methodology for measuring the indicator exist?</p>	Example Design Questions	Guidance AF, GEF and consultant's proposal
	7	Were climate models considered and vulnerability assessments carried out? What was the quality of the models used?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
3.2	Achievement of results and progress criteria			
		Relevance		ToR
	8	To what extent do community consultations on livelihoods (SLPs), community-based participatory planning (CBPP), as well as the various prioritization, socialization and/or validation activities with communities contribute to the design of climate change plans and adaptation measures that are coherent with the needs of the communities?	Results	ToR
	9	Were the promoted activities relevant to improve resilience, reduce vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity?	Results	AF
	10	Does the project support concrete adaptation activities that anticipate and address the adverse effects of climate change?	Results	AF
	11	Were the results of the project consistent with the goal, objectives and strategic priorities of the AF and the priorities of the country/region?	Results	AF
		Effectiveness		ToR
	12	To what extent do the activities carried out to date contribute/will allow to create or strengthen the political and economic empowerment of women, so that they are "agents of change for adaptation to climate change in FSN"?	Results	ToR
	13	Considering the activities carried out to date, is it possible to achieve an increase in adaptive capacity to manage the risks associated with climate change and variability in FSN at the different levels envisaged for the project (ecosystem, community, household,	Results	ToR

		livelihood and institutional (local and national)?		
	14	To what extent did the activity manage to reduce vulnerability and/or increase adaptive capacity?	Results	AF
	15	Does the activity provide environmental, social and economic benefits to the communities involved, particularly the most vulnerable communities?	Results	AF
	16	Has the AF provided support to vulnerable developing countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol to implement their own measures that increase climate resilience?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	17	Have adaptation activities addressed the adverse impacts and risks posed by climate change?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
		Efficiency		ToR
	18	To what extent do the activities carried out to date contribute to achieving the integration of traditional/ancestral knowledge with scientific/technical knowledge, taking into account the objectives of the project?	Results	ToR
	19	Did the project justify the requested funding based on the total cost of adaptation?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	20	Were the cost guidelines established by the Adaptation Fund for Executing Entities cost-effective?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	21	What has been the average time for the project cycle?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	22	How was the development and implementation process compared to other projects?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	23	Whenever possible, the evaluator should also compare	Expected	AF

		the costs incurred and the time required to achieve the results with those of similar projects.	products and/or processes	
3.3	Risk and progress towards impact		Focus of this section: Risks to project progress (outcomes) towards impact	
	24	How will the activities carried out to date contribute to the ownership of the adaptation measures by the prioritized communities and key local institutions, and to their sustainability over time?	Results - progress towards impact	ToR
	25	To what extent have the activities carried out to date generated any unwanted effects (positive or negative) on the lives of the participants, their worldview, their cultural practices and their surrounding environments/ecosystems?	Results - progress towards impact	ToR
	26	What are the factors that have affected the quality of implementation of planned activities with respect to actual project execution, including financial management, implementation arrangements, and involvement of national and local stakeholders?	Expected products and processes	ToR
		Financial and Economic Risks		
	27	Are there financial or economic risks that may jeopardize the delivery of project results?	Results	AF
		Socio-political risks		
	28	Are there social or political risks that could jeopardize the results of the project?	Results	AF
	29	What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) is insufficient to allow for the results/benefits of the project to be sustained?	Results	AF
	30	Do the various key stakeholders perceive that it is in their interest that the benefits of the project continue to develop?	Results	AF
	31	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness to support the long-term objectives of the project?	Results	AF
		Institutional framework and governance		

	32	Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes within which the project operates present risks that may jeopardize the benefits of the project?	Results	AF
	33	Are the necessary systems in place to ensure accountability and transparency, and technical knowledge?	Results	AF
3.4	Evaluation of processes that influence the achievement of project results			ToR
		Country ownership		AF
	3.4	Was the project concept in line with the national sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country (or of the participating countries in the case of multinational projects)?	Results	AF
	35	Do the project results contribute to national development priorities and plans?	Results	AF
	36	Did the country's government and civil society representatives participate in the project?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	37	Has the government, or governments in the case of multinational projects, approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the objectives of the project?	Results	AF
	38	What was the role of local communities?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
		Stakeholder Engagement		
	39	Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and M&E? For example, has the project implemented appropriate public awareness and outreach campaigns?	Expected products and/or processes - M&E evaluation	AF
	40	Has the project consulted and used the skills,	Expected	AF

		experience, and knowledge of relevant government entities, non-governmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities? project?	products and/or processes	
	41	Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, who could affect the results, and who could contribute information or other resources, considered when making decisions?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	42	Were relevant vulnerable groups (including women, children, elderly, disabled, poor) and powerful allies and opponents of the processes adequately involved?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	43	Were the gender equality perspectives of the people affected and involved in the project assessed?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
		Financial management		
	44	Did the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that enabled the implementing agency to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for the timely flow of funds?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	45	Was there due diligence in fund management and financial audits? Project financial audits, if available at the time of appraisal, should be used as a source of information.	Expected products and/or processes	AF
		Supervision and support of the Implementing Entity		
	46	Did the Implementing Entity staff identify challenges in a timely manner and accurately estimate their significance?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	47	Did the staff of the Implementing Entity provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications on time and restructure the project when necessary?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	48	Did the Implementing Entity provide adequate staffing	Expected	AF

		levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?	products and/or processes	
		Skills and abilities of the Executing Entities		
	49	Has the capacity of WFP and the EE been adequate for the execution of the project?	Expected products and/or processes	ToR
		Delays in the set-up and implementation of the project		
3.5	Evaluation of the M&E strategy			
		M&E plans		
	50	What is the performance of the M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards the achievement of project objectives?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	51	Was the plan based on the project's Results-Based Management Framework?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	52	Did the plan provide a schedule for various M&E activities, such as targeted assessments, reviews, and supervision, as well as an adequate budget?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
		M&E Implementation, Budgeting and Financing		
	53	Was an M&E system in place that facilitated timely monitoring of progress towards project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continuously throughout the project implementation period?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	54	Were the project performance reports (PPR) complete and accurate, with well justified qualifications?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	55	Was the information provided by the M&E system used during project implementation to improve	Expected products	AF

		performance and adapt to changing needs (adaptive management)	and/or processes	
	56	Did the project have an M&E system in place with adequate training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data continues to be collected and used after project closure?	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	57	The consultant will determine whether the M&E plan is adequately budgeted at the project/program planning/design stage, and whether M&E was adequately and timely funded during implementation.	Expected products and/or processes	AF
	58	What are the factors that have limited progress on product targets using M&E data?		ToR
4.2	Lessons learned		They emerge from the findings	
	59	What are the main lessons learned and good practices from the results achieved to the date of the review?		ToR
	60	Consider the lessons learned questions in the annual project performance report (PPR) format for the mid-term review, and some recommendations for priority examples that should be communicated more broadly.		ToR
	61	What are the lessons learned (positive/negative) from the implementation of climate resilience and adaptation measures relevant to future interventions?		ToR
	62	For each result, cross-cutting result, and output, suggest changes that need to be made in implementation or required at the design level that will move us closer to achieving the intended results.	design risks	ToR
4.3	Good practices		They emerge from the findings	
4.4	Recommendations		They emerge from the findings	
	63	Identify key recommendations to improve project progress.		ToR
	64	What are the aspects that should be strengthened and/or the corrective actions suggested?		ToR
	65	Carry out an analysis of the M&E Strategy, identifying what changes are required both at the design level of		ToR

		the results framework and at implementation, based on their contribution to monitoring the expected results and impacts?		
	66	Regarding risks and safeguards, what changes are required in the matrix of risks and financial assumptions (Table 10) and screening of social and environmental risks of the project based on the 15 principles of the AF Environmental and Social Policy? (Tables 7 and 10 located on pages 56 and 66 of the project documents, respectively).		ToR

Annex 8. Interview protocols

This annex shows a prototype of the interview protocols according to the type of institution:

- Prototipe 1: EE (UNIPA / Acipap / Camawari / FCAE / CANE / Ccamyf / Ccbmyf)
- Prototipe 2: Designated Authorities (Minambiente / MAATE)
- Prototipe 3A: Implementing partners – national institutions (MAG / IDEAM)
- Prototipe 3B: Implementing partners – regional and local institutions (Corponariño/ Corpoamazonía/ Imbabura Provincial Government/ Carchi Provincial Government/ Esmeraldas Provincial Government/ Nariño Government)
- Prototipe 3A: Implementing partners – Academy (Pucese / UPEC)

Prototipe 1: EE

Data	[***]
Local	Virtual
Name/Institution of the person consulted(see details at the end)	Executing Entity
Responsible(<u>underline note taker</u>)	Isabella Guerrero

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol (45m - 1h)

II -Substantive part:

1. We would like to start by hearing a little about your relationship with the project. How are you related to the Binational Project? (Consultant)
2. How has the Executing Entity been involved during the design and implementation stage of the Binational Project?

II – Review matrix questions/questions:

Q4.Were agreements correctly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?

Q6.To what extent were the project objectives and components clear, practical, and feasible within the allocated time?

Q10.Does the project support concrete adaptation activities that anticipate and address the adverse effects of climate change?

Q18.To what extent do the activities and products developed to date contribute to achieving the integration of traditional/ancestral knowledge with scientific/technical knowledge, considering the objectives of the project? What do you consider to be the main activities that have been carried out with the greatest commitment and satisfaction?

Q22. How was the process of preparation and implementation of the agreement? How long did it take for the signing? What is the level of coordination with WFP and the other Executing Entities?

Q26. What are the factors that have influenced the quality of the implementation of the planned activities with respect to the actual execution of the project, including financial management, implementation arrangements, and the involvement of national and local stakeholders?

Q28. Are there social or political risks that could jeopardize the results of the project?

Q33. Are the necessary systems in place for accountability and transparency, and technical knowledge?

Q39. What was the role of local communities?

Q40. Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and M&E?

Q42. Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, who could affect the results, and who could contribute information or other resources, considered when making decisions?

Q43. Were relevant vulnerable groups (including women, children, elderly, disabled, poor) and powerful allies and opponents of the processes adequately involved?

Q46. Was there due diligence in fund management and financial audits?

Q47. Did Implementing Entity staff identify challenges in a timely manner and accurately estimate their significance?

Q50. Has the capacity of WFP and the Executing Entities been adequate for the execution of the project?

Q60. What are the main lessons learned, good practices from the results achieved to the date of the review?

Q65. What are the aspects that should be strengthened and/or the corrective actions suggested in the design, implementation and execution stage to achieve the results of the project?

No.	actor no.	Category (Entity type)	Country	Name	Ethnic group	Institution	Post	Linkage intensity	information level	Responsibility Level	Period involved with the project
1	1	National Institutions						Low	Low	high	2021-2022

Prototype 2: Designated Authorities

Data	[***]
Local	Virtual
Name/Institution of the person consulted(see details at the end)	Designated Authorities
Responsible(underline note taker)	Isabella Guerrero

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol (45m - 1h)

I – Substantive Part:

1. We would like to start by hearing about your relationship with the project. How are you related to the Binational Project?

II – Review matrix questions/questions:

Q10. Does the project support concrete adaptation activities that anticipate and address the adverse effects of climate change?

Q29. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) is insufficient to allow the results/benefits of the project to be sustained?

Q32. Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes within which the project operates present risks that may jeopardize the benefits of the project?

Q36. Do the project results contribute to national development priorities and plans?

Q38. Has the government, or governments in the case of multinational projects, approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the objectives of the project?

Q47. Did Implementing Entity staff identify challenges in a timely manner and accurately estimate their significance?

Q50. Has the capacity of WFP and the Executing Entities been adequate for the execution of the project?

Q60. What are the main lessons learned, good practices from the results achieved to the date of the review?

Q65. What are the aspects that should be strengthened and/or the corrective actions suggested in the design, implementation and execution stage to achieve the results of the project?

No.	actor no.	Category (Entity type)	Country	Name	Ethnic group	Institution	Post	Linkage intensity	information level	Responsibility Level	Period involved with the project
1	1	Designated Authorities						Low	Low	high	2021-2022

Prototype 3A: Delivery Partners – National Institutions

Data	[***]
Local	Virtual
Name/Institution of the person consulted (see details at the end)	Delivery Partners – National Institutions
Responsible (underline note taker)	Isabella Guerrero

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol (45m - 1h)

I – Substantive Part:

1. We would like to start by hearing about your relationship with the project. How are you related to the Binational Project?

II – Review matrix questions/questions:

Q03. Were the capacities of the Executing Entities and their counterparts adequately consulted when the project was designed?

Q10. Does the project support concrete adaptation activities that anticipate and address the adverse effects of climate change?

Q11. Were the results of the project consistent with the goal, objectives and strategic priorities of the AF and the priorities of the country/region?

Q29. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) is insufficient to allow the results/benefits of the project to be sustained?

Q36. Do the project results contribute to national development priorities and plans?

Q38. Has the government, or governments in the case of multinational projects, approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the objectives of the project?

Q40. Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and seeking their participation in project design, implementation and M&E? For example, has the project implemented appropriate public awareness and outreach campaigns?

Q47. Did Implementing Entity staff identify challenges in a timely manner and accurately estimate their significance?

Q50. Has the capacity of WFP and the Executing Entities been adequate for the execution of the project?

Q60. What are the main lessons learned, good practices from the results achieved to the date of the review?

Q65. What are the aspects that should be strengthened and/or the corrective actions suggested in the design, implementation and execution stage to achieve the results of the project?

No.	actor no.	Category (Entity type)	Country	Name	Ethnic group	Institution	Post	Linkage intensity	information level	Responsibility Level	Period involved with the project
1	1	Designated Authority						Low	Low	high	2021-2022

Prototype 1: Delivery Partners – Regional and local institutions

Data	[***]
Local	Virtual
Name/Institution of the person consulted (see details at the end)	Delivery partners – Regional and local institutions
Responsible (underline note taker)	Isabella Guerrero

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol (45m - 1h)

I – Substantive Part:

- i. We would like to start by hearing about your relationship with the project. How are you related to the Binational Project?

II – Review matrix questions/questions:

Q08. To what extent do community consultations on livelihoods (SLP), community-based participatory planning (CBPP), as well as the various prioritization, socialization and/or validation activities with communities contribute to the design of climate change plans and adaptation measures are coherent with the needs of the communities?

Q10. Does the project support concrete adaptation activities that anticipate and address the adverse effects of climate change?

Q24. How will the activities carried out to date contribute to the appropriation of the adaptation measures by the prioritized communities and key local institutions, and to their sustainability over time?

Q28. Are there social or political risks that could jeopardize the results of the project?

Q29. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) is insufficient to allow the results/benefits of the project to be sustained?

Q36. Do the project results contribute to national development priorities and plans?

Q39. What was the role of local communities?

Q40. Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and seeking their participation in project design, implementation and M&E? For example, has the project implemented appropriate public awareness and outreach campaigns?

Q41. Has the project consulted and used the skills, experience, and knowledge of relevant government entities, non-governmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities? project?

Q42. Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, who could affect the results, and who could contribute information or other resources, be considered when making decisions?

Q43. Were relevant vulnerable groups (including women, children, elderly, disabled, poor) and powerful allies and opponents of the processes adequately involved?

Q47. Did Implementing Entity staff identify challenges in a timely manner and accurately estimate their significance?

Q50. Has the capacity of the WFP and the Executing Entities been adequate for the execution of the project?

Q60. What are the main lessons learned, good practices from the results achieved to the date of the review?

Q65. What are the aspects that should be strengthened and/or the corrective actions suggested in the design, implementation and execution stage to achieve the results of the project?

No.	actor no.	Category (Entity type)	Country	Name	Ethnic group	Institution	Post	Linkage intensity	information level	Responsibility Level	Period involved with the project
1	1	Delivery partners – regional and local institutions						Low	Low	high	2021-2022

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol (45m - 1h)

I – Substantive Part:

- i. We would like to start by hearing about your relationship with the project. How are you related to the Binational Project?

II – Review matrix questions/questions:

Q6.To what extent were the project objectives and components clear, practical, and feasible within the allotted time?

Q18.To what extent do the activities and products developed to date contribute to achieving the integration of traditional/ancestral knowledge with scientific/technical knowledge, considering the objectives of the project? What do you consider to be the main activities that have been carried out with the greatest commitment and satisfaction?

Q39.What was the role of local communities?

Q40.Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and seeking their participation in project design, implementation and M&E? For example, has the project implemented appropriate public awareness and outreach campaigns?

Q42.Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, who could affect the results, and who could contribute information or other resources, be considered when making decisions?

Q60.What are the main lessons learned, good practices from the results achieved to the date of the review?

Q42.Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, who could affect the results, and who could contribute information or other resources, be considered when making decisions?

No.	actor no.	Category (Entity type)	Country	Name	Ethnic group	Institution	Post	Linkage intensity	information level	Responsibility Level	Period involved with the project
1	1	Implementing Partners – Academia						Low	Low	high	2021-2022