

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **“Supporting rural community adaptation to climate change in mountainous (PIMS 5189)”**.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Supporting rural community adaptation to climate change in mountainous			
Atlas ID:	00079962		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00089831	GEF financing:	5 379 452	-
Country:	Djibouti	IA/EA own:	-	-
Region:	RBAS	Government:	12 400 000	-
Focal Area:	Adaptation to climate change	Other:	-	-
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	-	Total co-financing:	28 630 000	-
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Urban Planning, the Environment and Tourism (MUET))	Total Project Cost:	34 009 452	-
Other Partners involved:	MAEPH, CERD, SEAS, ADDS	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		November 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2018	Actual: December 2019

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Since 2007, Djibouti has been facing an episode of prolonged drought that has severely affected agricultural pastoral production and rural livelihoods. Precipitation was 75% below average in some areas. Data analyses carried out as part of the Initial National Communication (INC) to the UNFCCC predicted precipitation reductions of between 4% and 11% until 2050. Already, the first manifestations of climate change and associated changes in precipitation and water regimes have been felt. The INC and the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) have shown a marked increase in temperature of 1.5°C since 1990 across Djibouti and reductions in rainfall since 1960 (between 6-15%, depending on the region).

The consequences of climate change are detrimental to rural areas, which depend on subsistence agriculture and pastoralism and have very limited access to infrastructure, services and markets. Pastoral activities consist of

extensive nomadic livestock (mainly sheep, goats and camels), which often represents the only source of subsistence. However, due to the impacts of drought, transhumance is limited by a reduction in grazing routes with enough water and grazing. More than 70% of the population and herds do not have access to water within a reasonable distance. Similarly, livestock sales have been reduced due to poor animal health and difficulty in travelling long distances to markets.

The objective of the project is to reduce the climate-related vulnerabilities faced by people living in Djibouti's mountainous regions through institutional strengthening, smart water management and targeted investment. Therefore, the project specifically targets rural communities living in the Assamo and Adailou regions to develop their adaptive capacities and move towards development that is resilient to climate shocks. Thus, the project aims to facilitate adaptation to climate change at the regional (sub-national) and local levels while strengthening a coordinated national response. At the national level, the National Climate Change Committee will be reactivated to coordinate intersectoral climate change adaptation actions to ensure maximum use of resources and co-benefits, informed medium- and long-term planning and effective and transparent use of funds. At the regional level, LDC Fund funds will be used to strengthen targeted drought and flood preparedness. At the local level, with the support of local NGOs/CSOs, the project will reduce the vulnerability of rural mountain populations to climate change by mobilizing and storing surface and groundwater resources, reducing erosion through reforestation/vegetation, preparing for drought and flood risks and diversifying livelihoods while improving market access.

The project will use LDC funds to implement a three-tier strategy in the mountain villages of Adailou, located in the Tadjourah and Assamo regions, located in the Ali Sabieh region, using various innovative approaches described below:

- Reactivate the National Climate Change Committee and give it a clear mandate to develop and implement a national climate change strategy.
- The development of national expertise in dynamic modelling to ensure that adaptation is relevant, cost-effective and well-integrated into strategies covering a wide range of sectors (e.g. health, finance, economics and environment).
- Establishment of a national environment and climate change fund to operate more than 50 international public funds and 6,000 private equity funds providing climate change financing to ensure that climate change actions are a priority and that government funds are specifically earmarked for climate actions.
- Creation of watershed management committees (to date, not developed in Djibouti).
- Creation of gabion building cooperatives (to date, not developed in Djibouti) to ensure the diversification of livelihoods.
- Promotion of the exchange of inter-community knowledge on the development of nurseries, reforestation and the marketing of craft products.
- Strengthen community self-resilience to climate change by empowering regions and communities to participate in flood and drought preparedness measures.
- Combine the distribution of cooking stoves with microfinance to support a targeted effort to reduce deforestation in mountain areas that are highly exposed to land degradation induced by climate change.

To achieve the objectives, the project has three components corresponding to the 3 strategic levels (national, regional and local), namely:

- **Component 1:** Coordination of national efforts to strengthen the country's resilience to climate change through an enabling environment at different sectors and levels (national to local) to promote the coherent integration of a wide range of climate change policies and activities;

- **Component 2:** Reducing vulnerability to climate change for vulnerable communities in two targeted mountain regions: Adailou and Assamo;
- **Component 3:** Strengthening human and institutional capacities to increase sustainable rural livelihoods among vulnerable communities in two targeted regions, Adailou and Assamo.

Overall, the synergies and linkages between the three components are as follows:

Component 1 aims to address the needs and gaps identified at the national level by the NAPA, initial national communication to the UNFCCC, national capacity self-assessment and a series of other studies for future climate change interventions to maximize their impact and the effectiveness of adaptation. With the establishment of an active National Climate Change Committee (NCC) and a national climate change strategy to guide government and donor interventions, joint policies and coherent programming on the ground will be put in place for future projects through better inter-agency coordination, better information sharing, better identification of co-financing / leveraged financing opportunities and better dissemination of lessons learned and project impacts.

Component 2 will work in the field, facilitating water mobilization, reforestation and capacity building for agro-pastoralists and pastoralists on sustainable adaptive practices such as soil and water conservation methods and effective irrigation practices. All best practices can be extended with the support of the NCPC and its Component 1 Secretariat.

Component 3 will exploit the improved water resources and agro-pastoral practices of component 2 and strengthen the ground-level resilience of communities by enabling rural mountain populations to diversify their income-generating activities. The diversified activities to be introduced include poultry farming, beekeeping, nursery development and artisanal gabion production. Sales such as eggs, honey and dairy products will be supported by the construction or rehabilitation of stalls in the nearest cities of Adailou and Assamo (respectively in Tadjourah and Ali Sabieh). In addition, component 3 will support regional and community levels in disaster risk preparedness. With capacity building at the regional and community level, RCMP/RRC preparedness will become more focused and sustainable for mountain populations that had previously been marginalized. The project funded by the Adaptation Fund will set a precedent by supporting the community and allow other rural areas to build their RCMP/RRC capacity. In addition, capacity-building of regional risk and disaster management committees will support Djibouti's national decentralization policy, which is becoming a legal framework.

The main expected project results are as follows:

Outcome 1: Institutional capacity building for coordinated and resilient climate change planning; mechanisms and a risky investment environment in place to catalyse financing for climate change adaptation

Outcome 2: Improved water management in targeted areas to conserve limited water resources and manage temporal flows to reduce flooding and erosion

Outcome 3: Improved resilience to hydrological and climate risks, Increased resilience to climate-related economic shocks through income generation and diversification.

The final evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as outlined in the UNDP evaluation guidelines for GEF-funded projects. It will focus on the adaptation to climate change component.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of the project's objectives and to draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of the project's benefits and contribute to the overall improvement of UNDP programs.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. The evaluator should develop a set of specific questions covering each of these criteria by applying the generic list in *(fill in Annex C)* of these Terms of Reference, and submit the table as part of the proposed methodology as well as in the initial evaluation report and the final report in annex.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Djibouti, including the following project sites:

- Adailou – Gaoura - Gurrori
- Assamo – Guistir – God Dawao

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- UNDP: Resident Representative, the Environment Unit, and the GEF Regional Technical Advisor
- The executive agency: director, experts, units concerned
- The project team, the project manager, the technical and administrative team.
- Key government ministries/departments (Agriculture, Transport, Tourism etc.)
- The steering committee
- The GEF Operational Focal Point
- NGOs and communities involved in the project
- Djibouti Study and Research Centre (CERD)
- Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and the Sea, in charge of Water Resources (MAEPH)
- State Secretariat for Social Affairs (SEAS)
- Djibouti Social Development Agency (ADDS)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Djibouti. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. The roles and responsibilities of each of its members is defined as follows:

- **Agency implementation:** United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
- **Implementing Agency:** Ministry of Town Planning and Habitat of Environment through the Directorate of Environment and Sustainable Development (DESD).
- **Project Steering Committee:** The Steering Committee provides guidance for the implementation of the project. It includes the UNDP, the State Secretariat for National Solidarity (SESN), the Ministry of Higher Education and Research (CERD), the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries in charge of fisheries resources (Focal Point - Major Works Directorate), the Prefecture of Tadjourah and Ali Sabieh, the Regional Councils of Tadjourah and Ali Sabieh.
- **The Project Management Unit:** Ensures the implementation of the operational and functional activities of the project. The project management unit consists of a National Project Director responsible for the proper execution of the project. The daily activities are carried out by a project coordinator assisted by a financial assistant, an administrative assistant and two regional focal points.
- **Technical Committee:** The technical committee provides technical guidance for the definition of field actions. It is made up of the focal points (the Major Works Department, the Rural Hydraulics Department, the Agriculture and Forestry Department, the Livestock Department, CERD, SESN, UNDP) and the Project Management Unit.
- **Regional Committees (RCs):** The RCs will provide a support role to the PIU to ensure no duplication of activities with other adaptation related initiatives. The two regions for the pilot projects, Ali- Sabieh and Tadjourah, will each have an RC consisting of the head (Préfet) of the region, 2 regional council members and heads of locally based NGOs/CSOs. The regional head will be responsible for two-way communication with all communities in the RC's jurisdiction.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
----------	--------	-----------------

²A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

Preparation/ Inception Report	2 days	<i>From signature date</i>
Evaluation Mission in English	15 days	<i>From inception report</i>
Draft Final Evaluation Report	11 days	<i>From Evaluation Mission</i>
Final Report with UNDP comments	2 days	<i>From final report</i>

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Evaluation Mission	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

*Background note on evaluation and other knowledge-based products, or participation in knowledge sharing activities, as appropriate.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will have overall responsibility for the final evaluation and to produce the expected results. He/she will report technically and administratively to the UNDP office in Djibouti. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

Will be responsible for the following tasks:

- Guide and manage the evaluation including the field mission, in coordination with the UNDP country office and the project team;
- Ensure that the evaluation meets the standards for UNDP-GEF final evaluations in all dimensions;
- Define the evaluation methodology (data collection and analysis, etc.);
- Prepare the draft report beginning

- Define the division of labour in the evaluation team;
- Conduct relevant interviews and analyses (on strategy, results achieved, partnerships, etc.);
- Prepare the presentation of the provisional results during the field mission;
- Prepare the draft evaluation report;
- Review and finalize the evaluation report.

Will have to own:

- University education in a relevant field (environmental management, ecology, natural sciences, social or economic sciences);
- A minimum of 7 years of relevant international professional experience, including sound technical knowledge in the areas of climate change and/or natural resource management;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Knowledge and/or experience of UNDP and GEF, including relevant evaluation and monitoring strategies and policies;
- Competence in adaptive management applied in the evaluation of international natural resource management projects;
- Demonstrated analytical skills;
- A good command and communication skills in French, English and, if possible, Arabic.

The consultant will be recruited by the Government and UNDP will participate in the identification and selection.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

As stated in the procurement notice

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will consider the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: <u>CPAPFOCUSAREA2(SUSTAINABLEENVIRONMENTANDCLIMATECHANGE)OUTPUT2:Vulnerablecommunitiesbetterequippedwhenfacedwithclimatechange</u> <u>CPAPFOCUSAREA2OUTPUT3:Moreeffectivepreservationinterventionsfortheenvironmentandecosystems</u></p>					
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: <u>CPD Indicator:</u> By 2017, the capacity of environmental management process is enhanced, the results of socio-economic surveys are available, the unemployment situation has improved, jobs are created, the resilience of communities to climate change is strengthened</p>					
<p>Primary Applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Promote climate change adaptation</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme: Objective 2: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of population covered by climate change riskmeasures 					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective ⁷⁵ Reduction of climate-related vulnerabilities facing the inhabitants of mountainous regions of Djibouti through institutional strengthening, climate-smart water management and targeted investment.	1. Number of households with enhanced livelihoods through access to water, improved ecosystem services and reforestation	1. The 2010 Rapid Drought Impact Assessment found that the total economic loss attributed to the recent drought amounted to 3.9% of GDP. Due to the impacts of drought, transhumance is being constrained by a reduction in grazing routes with sufficient water and pasture. More than 70% of the population and herds do not have access to water within a reasonable distance. In the mountainous areas, communities are disproportionately poor due to the lack of infrastructure, limited market access and harsher agricultural conditions relative to lowland areas. Habitat loss is a major threat in the Horn of Africa's dryland highlands as well. ⁷⁶ In Djibouti,	1. <u>TARGET: USD 2,000 HHs</u> ⁷⁹ have enhanced livelihoods due to water mobilisation and reforestation	1. Initial socio-economic survey and final survey.	ASSUMPTION: There is sufficient political support and capacity within the agencies dealing with adaptation for successful execution and implementation of the project. RISK: The National Climate Change Committee fails to meet regularly due to lack of incentives.

	<p>2. Reactivation of the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) to coordinate climate change and resilience-building projects /activities.</p>	<p>mountain vegetation is a vital natural resource and a source of livelihood for the mostly nomadic pastoralists. Without any alternatives, pastoralists are currently forced to over-exploit mountain resources, contributing to further weakening of the natural environment.⁷⁷ Deforestation, occurring at a rate of 3% per year,⁷⁸ has worsened the impacts of flash floods and erosion by reducing rates of waterretention.</p> <p>BASELINE 1: All target farmers and pastoralists require strengthened livelihoods to become less vulnerable to climate shocks. Livelihoods need to be strengthened by mobilizing water with physical infrastructure for use during the dry season (e.g., earth dams and retention basins, boreholes, etc). Also, livelihoods need to be strengthened with reforestation/afforestation and sustainable land use practices. Farmers and pastoralists need to be provided technical and applied knowledge on soil and water conservation methods and other sustainable practices to ensure that they can continually make use of productive ecosystemservices.</p> <p>2. In 1999, a National CC Committee (NCCC) was formally established by Presidential Decree. The Committee was able to convene only 2 meetings before it was dissolved due to an unclear mandate and a lack of institutional and financial backing. Most Government institutions have limited understanding of the transversal impacts of climate change on diverse socio-economic</p>	<p>2. TARGET: Reactivation of the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) with a clear mandate and a technically-capable Secretariat. The NCCC will be authorised to have</p>	<p>2. Legal mandate of the NCCC.</p> <p>Minutes from NCCC meetings.</p>	<p>RISK: Investments in water mobilisation, agriculture and pastoral systems are jeopardised by an unanticipated increase in the frequency offlood events and continued drought.</p>
--	---	---	---	---	---

		sectors (e.g. health, poverty, employment). 2. <u>BASELINE</u> : The former National Climate Change Committee has effectively ceased to exist.	the power of a Government Permanent Secretariat and the Ministry of Environment (MHUE) will be officially designated as the host for the Secretariat.		
--	--	---	---	--	--

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source verification of	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Outcome 1 Institutional capacities for coordinated, climate-resilient planning strengthened.</p> <p>Mechanisms and a de-risked investment environment established to catalyse finance for climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>1. Development of a National Climate Change Strategy to guide the NCCC on appropriate coordination mechanisms and diversified, financing strategies to support adaptation-related activities in the long-term.</p> <p>2. Development of a roadmap outlining how to establish and capitalize a Fund for the Environment and Climate Change.</p>	<p>1. There is no national strategy on how to approach the challenge of climate change, how to coordinate climate change-related projects, or how to prioritise adaptation activities based on their cross- sectoral benefits and impacts. The country has no expertise in cost- benefit or adaptation economics which can support dynamic modelling.</p> <p>1. <u>BASELINE</u>: A National Climate Change Strategy does not exist in Djibouti.</p> <p>2. Current Government funds are used to address extreme short-term challenges such as poverty and malnutrition. The Government often finds it difficult to justify the allocation of scarce fiscal revenues to longer-term needs. As a result,</p>	<p>1. <u>TARGET</u>: Creation of a National Climate Change Strategy informed by dynamic modelling results which guides the NCCC's work and provides strategic coherence to climate change initiatives in Djibouti.</p> <p>2. <u>TARGET</u>: Roadmap defining how to establish and capitalize a National Environment and Climate Change Fund which supports climate-smart</p>	<p>1. Review of the NCC Strategy.</p> <p>Review of adaptation projects/programmes and their uptake into the NCC Strategy.</p> <p>2. Review of the roadmap on how to establish and capitalize an Environment and Climate Change Fund.</p>	<p>ASSUMPTION: Institutions have the will and ability to engage in coordinated long-term planning to mitigate potential climate change risks.</p> <p>ASSUMPTION: Relevant Ministries have an interest in fully integrating adaptation strategies into their long-term planning.</p> <p>ASSUMPTION: The Government of Djibouti has sufficient incentive to design a Fund for the Environment and Climate Change which can be effectively targeted</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source verification	of Risks and Assumptions
		<p>existing budget plans (excluding donor support) do not have long-term financing mechanisms which target activities, projects or programmes that build resilience to climate change. In addition, although there are more than 50 international public funds and 6,000 private equity funds providing climate change financing, Djibouti has no capacity to access and channel these funds to address the climate and development needs identified by the NAPA and NAPs. Djibouti requires capacity reinforcement in how to identify which funds are appropriate, how to coordinate the actions funded by such funds, and how to strengthen national ownership of climate finance.</p> <p><u>2. BASELINE:</u> No mechanism to attract and channel funding for medium- to long-term climate resilience-strengthening activities.</p>	<p>adaptation activities for rural and urban populations in the long-term and which supports ongoing and future climate resilience projects.</p>		<p>towards adaptation-related activities in a transparent manner with appropriate financial management.</p> <p>RISK: Institutions working in adaptation have little financial literacy and capacity to establish funds and financial instruments and to assess the costs and measures of different adaptation options</p>
<p>Outcome 2 Improved water management in the targeted regions (Adailou and Assamo) to conserve scarce water resources and manage temporal flows to reduce flooding and erosion.</p>	<p>1. Number of micro-dams, cisterns, retention basins and bank fortifications built with the dual goals of reducing downstream impacts during flood events and retaining water to replenish groundwater resources.</p> <p>2. Percentage of total hectare of agro-pastoralists' land which is irrigated by boreholes.</p>	<p><u>BASELINE 1-3:</u> The rural mountainous populations are at extreme risk because they do not have enough water for drinking and irrigation. They are also subject to loss of crops and livestock due to the fact that the most fertile areas are within or adjacent to wadis which are susceptible to flash flooding. Due to the geomorphic context, the region is subject to significant erosion and surface water cannot be effectively captured to recharge groundwater resources.</p>	<p><u>TARGETS 1-3:</u> 1. Design and construction of 3 micro-dams; fifteen (15) 100 m³ cisterns, where each will provide potable water to 15 families; 16 semi-underground sills (8 in Adailou and 8 in Assamo); 2,000 m³ and 4,000 m³ of bank fortifications with</p>	<p>1-3: Construction log of the Department of Large Works (micro-dams, cisterns, sills, gabion reinforcement)</p> <p>Borehole drilling log (Ministry of Water).</p>	<p>ASSUMPTION: Initial hydrogeological studies and technical assessments are accurate in their predictions of water capture and storage capacities.</p> <p>ASSUMPTION: Local populations, including nomadic</p>

			rock-filled		
--	--	--	-------------	--	--

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source verification	of	Risks and Assumptions
	3. Number of hectares of land replanted and reforested in Assamo, Adailou and Ayladou to: i) regenerate dwindling species and valued pastoral species and ii) reduce erosion.	<p>There is a need to reforest and re-vegetate the mountain regions.</p> <p>The agro-pastoral communities also require the technical and operational capacities to produce diversified crops and develop more sustainable agro-pastoral and pastoral practices (e.g. producing drought- and salt-tolerant forage and a diverse variety of crops to generate revenues throughout all seasons).</p> <p><u>BASELINE 1-3:</u> 1 borehole in each zone, 10 shallow wells in Adailou, 14 in Assamo, 2 ha of agro-pastoral plots in Adailou (not irrigated) and 10 ha of agro-pastoral plots (not irrigated) in Assamo, 10 ha of reforestation/re-vegetation/re-seeding activities.</p>	<p>wirework (i.e. gabion) in Adailou and Assamo respectively to protect wadi banks and agricultural plots from erosion.</p> <p>30 hectares irrigated in Assamo and 30 hectares in Adailou.</p> <p>70 ha in Assamo and 380 hectares in Adailou replanted and reforested.</p>			<p>pastoralists, will not trespass into protected reforestation and re-vegetation areas due to being informed of the purpose of these areas to restore the natural environment and reduce erosion, and due to introducing security guards and robust fencing as protection measures.</p> <p>RISK: Works associated with water mobilization and retention infrastructures lead to unanticipated environmental impacts.</p> <p>RISK: Limited capacity of local populations to perform maintenance on boreholes and solar-powered well pumps.</p>
	4. Number of pastoral centers (pastoretums) in each region	<p><u>BASELINE 4:</u> The pastoralists in each region have had no capacity reinforcement on soil conservation measures, re-seeding, veterinary medicine and animal hygiene to ensure more sustainable pastoralist practices. Pastoretums provide an enclosed and guarded plot to practice sustainable pastoralism with expert knowledge transfer. However, neither region has had the opportunity to learn in such a manner.</p>	<p><u>TARGET 4:</u> 1 pastoretum in each region created.</p>	4. Ministry of Livestock records on the pastoretums		
	5. Number of women's tree seedling nurseries created in both Adailou and Assamo to i)	<p><u>BASELINE 5:</u> 1 tree nursery in Assamo (0 nurseries in Adailou).</p>	<p><u>TARGET 5:</u> At least 1 women's tree seedling nursery</p>	5. Irrigation and nursery records kept		

			rsery		
--	--	--	-------	--	--

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source verification	of Risks and Assumptions
	produce seeds, ii) multiply species (e.g. wind-blocking plants, fruit-bearing trees, etc), and iii) support reforestation;		created in both Adailou and Assamo.	by the Ministry of Agriculture.	
	6. Creation of Catchment and Water Point Management Committees.	BASELINE 6: No Catchment Management or Water Point Management Committees exist in either Assamo or Adailou to enable the sustainable management of water use. Most diesel-powered wells have become non-functional due to the high price of diesel and the fact that there is no one with the ability to maintain the pumps locally.	TARGET 6: 5 Catchment Management Committees formed (4 in Adailou in the Weima watershed and 1 in Assamo, the Juba watershed) and 27 Water Point Committees formed in total (one around each water point). All Committees will have 4 people including 1 female representative.	6. Conventions signed, confirming creation of Catchment and Water Point Management Committees and Operation and Maintenance training provided by the Ministry of Water to the communities	
				Meeting minutes / records of the Catchment and Water Point Management Committees	
Outcome 3 Improved resilience to hydrological climate change risks. Enhanced resilience to climate-mediated economic shocks through income generation and diversification.	1. Number of Automatic Weather Stations (AWSs) procured and installed.	1. The Executive Secretariat for Risk and Disaster Management advises the National Committee on Natural Disasters on technical matters and coordinates prevention, mitigation and response activities. In line with Djibouti's decentralization approach, SEGRC established Local Risk and Catastrophe Management Committees (LRCMCs) to transfer risk-related responsibilities to the regional level. Additionally,	TARGETS 1. One automatic weather station procured and installed in each region. See Annex 8c).	1. National Meteorological Service Procurement records.	ASSUMPTION: One weather station in each project zone is sufficient to extend the weather and climate monitoring network to help with forecasts and previsions.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source verification	of Risks and Assumptions
	2. Number of community adaptation measures implemented to build drought or flood-resilience.	<p>SEGRC drafted general flood action plans for each region in Djibouti with the support of FAO. In spite of these efforts, the LRCMC lacks the technical and operational capacities to prepare community populations for droughts and floods. Similarly, the action plans are general and focused predominantly on the regional capitals, which are located in the lowlands. As such, they do not consider the highland, steep, varied terrain and, most notably, the remote mountainous communities of Assamo and Adailou. Exacerbating the need for information in the highlands is that there are only limited rainfall measurements and non-in-situ hydro-meteorological measurements taken to support disaster preparedness decisions (early warnings) in either the Adailou or Assamo watersheds. Limited data collection prevents the identification of risks, delineation of vulnerable zones and projections for extreme weather events.</p> <p><u>BASELINE 1:</u> 1 rain gauge in Adailou and 5 rain gauges in Assamo. No weather stations located in either zone.</p> <p>2. Rural communities in Djibouti, particularly those in remote mountain villages, lack knowledge on the uses of earth dams for water harvesting and the importance of</p>	<p><u>TARGET 2.</u> One (1) community DRR/DRM adaptation measure implemented in each region (e.g. water point reinforcement with gabion, micro-dam-de-silting).</p>	<p>2. Training log for regions and communities maintained by the Executive Secretariat on Risk and Catastrophe Management.</p>	<p>RISK: There is insufficient technical and operational capacity within the regional governments to coordinate drought and flood preparedness.</p> <p>RISK: Targeted farmers and pastoralists are sceptical and unwilling to engage in poultry breeding, bee-keeping and gabion fabrication. so as to diversify their livelihoods and/or income diversification strategies do not significantly increase household incomes.</p> <p>RISK: Limited long-run support for rural mountain regions in terms of sustainable livelihood development.</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source verification	of Risks and Assumptions
	3. Number of rural inhabitants (disaggregated by gender and type of activity) who actively participate in beekeeping, poultry raising	<p>maintaining dams for flood mitigation, as well as the means to properly maintain them. This is in spite of the fact that action plans have been drafted for the Ali Sabieh and Tadjourah regions by the Executive Secretariat on Risk and Catastrophe Management. No targeted action plans are concerned with the mountain regions (e.g. consideration of higher erosion rates).</p> <p><u>BASELINE 2:</u> No community DRM/DRR adaptation preparedness plans.</p> <p>3. Due to the fact that the mountainous regions of Assamo and Adailou are remote and isolated from selling points, they have limited means to diversify their livelihoods. In Adailou, the rural population has no other option than to farm with traditional, ineffective methods (due to lack of knowledge on appropriate farming practices) or to continue grazing livestock in spite of recurring drought. In Assamo, the region has one fruit that is grown locally (goyave) and this is increasingly susceptible to climate shocks. Stakeholder consultations indicate community members want to diversify their livelihoods with poultry breeding and beekeeping.</p>	<p><u>TARGET 3.70</u> households (HHs) active in poultry breeding in Assamo and 50 HHs in Adailou. 14 people in Adailou and 6 in Assamo active in beekeeping and which have been provided appropriate materials.</p>	3. Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment annual surveys (disaggregated by gender and type of activity).	

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source verification	of Risks and Assumptions
	4. Number of local market stalls rehabilitated / created to facilitate access of Adailou and Assamo farmers/cultivators/pastoralists to larger regional markets.	<p><u>BASELINE 3:</u> No community members are active in poultry breeding and beekeeping.</p> <p>4. In Assamo and Adailou, there is a need to rehabilitate/create market stalls to help incentivize crop and milk product diversification. As indicated during stakeholder consultations, selling points are desired to fix prices, to sell “fresh local produce” and to act as training and tourist tasting centers.</p>	<p><u>TARGET</u></p> <p>4. Rehabilitation of the Ali-Sabieh market stall and creation of the Tadjourah market stall.</p>	4. Sales records of the market stalls in Ali Sabieh and Tadjourah.	
	5. % change in revenue to artisanal activities, poultry- breeding, bee-keeping and nursery sales (disaggregated by gender).	<p><u>BASELINE 4:</u> A market stall in Ali-Sabieh exists but it needs to be rehabilitated and extended to have a permanent structure. The market stall in Tadjourah needs to be created.</p> <p>5. In Assamo, prior to the repeated drought, there was a culture of producing guava jams. Currently, there is no diversification of activities as the entire population is dependent on farming/ husbandry which has limited production due to inefficient practices and susceptibility to climate shocks (most notably the present 4-year drought).</p> <p><u>BASELINE 5:</u> Only limited and irregular sales of guava in Assamo. No sales of products in Adailou. No participation of community members in livelihood diversification measures in either region.</p>	<p><u>TARGET</u> 5.%</p> <p>change in revenue for community members (including % increase in supply of eggs, chicken, honey, nursery seedlings and gabion)</p> <p>-</p> <p>disaggregated by gender.</p>	5. Mid-term and final survey of community members demonstrating revenues accrued from selling eggs, chicken, honey and gabion (disaggregated by gender and type of activity).	

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

1. PIF 2.
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Performance Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Adaptation project of Adaillou/Assamo Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- i. Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)
 - a. Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - b. UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - c. MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - d. Region and countries included in the project
 - e. GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - f. Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - g. MTR team members
 - h. Acknowledgements

 - ii. Table of Contents

 - iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)**
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
 - 2. Introduction (2-3 pages)**
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
 - 3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)**
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address threats and barriers targeted

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Findings (12-14 pages)

4.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design
- Results Framework/Log frame

4.2 Progress Towards Results

- Progress towards outcomes analysis objectives
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objectives

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and review systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4.4 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)

5.1 Conclusions

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

5.2 Recommendations

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

6. Annexes

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

Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard*)

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

The main stakeholders of the project are:

- Ministry Urban, Environment and Tourism (MUET),
- Ministry of Agriculture, Water, Fisheries, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEPERH)
- Secretariat of State for Social Affairs (SEAS)
- The Center for Studies and Research in Djibouti (CERD)
- Djibouti Meteorological Agency
- Local authorities including Prefects and Regional Councils
- Local NGOs
- The beneficiary communities

ANNEX I: PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES, MILESTONES AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluator should present the detailed programme based on the outline plan in ToR