

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION

Location: São Tomé and Príncipe

Activity: Final Evaluation of Project – PIMS 4645 “Enhancing capacities of rural communities to pursue climate resilient livelihood options in the Sao Tome and Principe districts of Caué, Me-Zochi, Principe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata ”

Application Deadline: 16/09/2019

Type of Contract: Individual Contractor

Starting Date: 15/10/2019

Expected Duration of Assignment: 30 days

• 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 “Enhancing capacities of rural communities to pursue climate resilient livelihood options in the Sao Tome and Principe districts of Caué, Me-Zochi, Principe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata ” (PIMs 4645)

• BACKGROUND

Sao Tomé and Príncipe (STP) is a small island country particularly vulnerable to climate-related hazards, which is showing significant signs of change, such as decrease and variation of the rainfall pattern, longer episodes of drought, coastal erosion and temperature raise. In the future, this climate change pattern could lead to the decreasing of productive zones and culture productivity, changes to the soil’s organic matter, decrease of farmers’ revenue and the risk of revenue-generating crops to become unfeasible due to the rainfall reduction. Despite the recurrent rainfalls, the country has been experiencing longer periods of drought, which constitutes a constraint to food production, predominantly in the north. In Sao Tome and Principe, agriculture, particularly the cocoa production, remains the main economic activity and the main source of revenue for rural households. It generates 70% of rural employment and about 80% of exports revenues, according to project’s documents data. But despite its importance for the economy and communities, STP agriculture is characterized by a very low productivity mainly due to the lack of good farming practices, the bad state of agricultural support infrastructures (irrigation schemes, rural markets, rural roads), the absence of efficient advisory support, and the failures of the agricultural inputs and product markets.

This agricultural framework has been progressively deteriorating due to the climate change effects. The climate vulnerability across country regions and the climate change adaptation needs and priorities are described and detailed in documents such as the Vulnerability Map and the National Adaptation Plan of Action on Climate Change. STP has completed and submitted its NAPA to the

UNFCCC in December 2006. The NAPA has identified 22 urgent climate change adaptation priorities concerning the fisheries, infrastructure, health, water, agriculture/livestock/forestry and energy sectors and the project respond to these priorities. The most critical climate change phenomena in STP were also identified:

- Decrease in rainfall;
- Increase in the length of the dry season;
- Increases in temperature;
- Rise of the sea level;
- Floods and consequent contamination of water;
- Coastal erosion

The priority actions outlined were the following: i) construction of dikes; ii) construction of reservoirs of drinking water; iii) rehabilitation of overhead irrigation; iv) rational exploitation of forest resources; v) reinforcement and diversification of the agricultural and animal production; vi) relocation of some communities in risk or part of them; vii) Improvement of management of the country water resources.

In the same document, the main climate change impacts, in the different regions of the country, and respective adaptation measures proposed, were identified:

Vulnerability Factors	Priority Areas	Impacts	Adaptation Measure	Monitorization indicators and Evaluation of Options
Drought	Porto Alegre, Malanza, Plancas I, Praia das Conchas, Mato Cana, Bernardo Faro, Cadão, Abade, Belo Monte, Porto Real	Fall of animal and plants production. Vegetation degradation and reduction of the biodiversity (decrease of fauna and flowers resources)	To rehabilitate the overhead irrigations. Intensive plantations of trees (reforestation campaign) To rehabilitate the shadow of cocoa and coffee plantation. To build reservoirs of water for animals. To eliminate arbitrary trees cuts.	Number of trees planted annually by unit of area. Number of water reservoirs of capacity built in each affected area. Reduction to 70% of arbitrary tree cuts.
Land Destruction	Bernardo Faro, Santa Catarina	In viability of the access roads in the rural areas. Loss of animal and plant resources.	To plan trees to protect the hillsides. To create civil protection service. To prohibit severely cut of trees in the hillsides.	Amount of tree planted annually by unit area. Number of units of protection service in the affected area.

Floods and marine invasion	Malanza, Praia Pesqueira, Santa Catarina, Abade.	Mortality in the animals. Loss of some fruit trees and forest formation	To build dikes. Plantation of adaptable arboreal species to the vulnerability factors	Number of dikes built in the affected areas. Amount of planted trees
Whirl	Porto Alegre	Vegetation destruction, including forest formation	Construction of barriers with resistant trees to strong winds	Number of constructed barriers in the priority areas
Tempest line	Cadão	Destruction of cultures and forest formation	Construction of barriers with resistant trees to strong winds	Number of barriers constructed in the priority areas.

Within the scope of São Tomé and Príncipe's Second National Communication for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, were also reported the potential effects of climate change on agriculture and fisheries in the country: i) reduction of agricultural extension zones and crops productivity; ii) increase of outbreaks of pests and diseases; iii) alteration of soil organic matter; iv) reduction of farmers' income; v) reduction of watercourses; vi) reduction of 50% in artisanal fishing; vii) risk of viability of cocoa production in certain areas due to reduced rainfall. Recently, for São Tomé and Príncipe's Third National Communication for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, several studies were carried out and one was concerned with vulnerability and adaptation. The evaluation of the climate change impacts on crops was carried out through the Culture Risk Index (IRC), constructed from the combination of indicators that estimate the stress in the crop due to air temperature, water stress, susceptibility to diseases and potential of crops. This study analyzed different scenarios for the cultivation of taro, corn, cocoa and pepper and identifies for each scenario the impacts in different areas of the country. The National Plan and Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation 2015-2020 refers to the climate change impact to agricultural production systems, mentioning the increase of rainfalls intensity, reduction of rain predictability, deforestation and soil erosion and impoverishment, which demonstrates the impact of climate change in the communities. They also refer the impacts of temperature raise on animal production. The increase of rainfall intensity and longer drought periods are outlined in these documents as it can impede cocoa production in some agricultural zones, which is the main income source for most households. Therefore, it is essential to develop climate change adaptation strategies promoting a higher resilience capacity for the communities. Thereby, the project displays a coherent objective with the national priorities to climate change adaptation and identifies the need to act out at different levels: institutional capacities strengthening, direct support to the communities and the need to define decentralized strategies for adaptation through the mobilization of different agents.

In this context, the overall objective of the project "Enhancing capacities of rural communities to pursue climate resilient livelihood options in the Sao Tome and Principe districts of Caué, Me-Zochi, Principe, Lemba, Cantagalo and Lobata" was to strengthen the resilience of rural community livelihood options against climate change impacts in the mentioned intervention districts. To achieve its objective, the project delivered the following three main outcomes: i) Strengthen the capacity of the Center for Agro-Pastoral Development (CATAP), and the Agronomical Research

Institute (CIAT), District Governments and Assemblies, District Councils, Civil Society Organizations and Community Based Organizations to support the enhancement of climate resilience or rural community livelihoods; ii) Reduce the vulnerability of rural livelihoods to climate risks through climate risks management infrastructures and mechanisms; iii) Design and transfer adaptation strategies to strengthen communities' climate resilience in the 30 most vulnerable villages of the 6 districts of CMPLCL of Sao Tome and Principe.

The current project implementation state for each community is as follows:

Caué

Malanza	Fish Processing Center/ Reforestation actions
Ponta Baleia	Solar Freeze
Iô Grande	Solar Freeze
Praia Pesqueira	Solar Freeze
Soledade	Greenhouse

Cantagalo

Colónia Açoriana	Built Pigsty
Mendes da Silva	Solar Freeze
Monte Belo	Solar Freeze
Quimpo	N/A
Uba Budo	Built Greenhouse and Pigsty

Mé-Zochi

Rio Lima	Irrigation System Rehabilitated
Agua das Belas	Built Pigsty
Bom Sucesso	Irrigation System Rehabilitated, Greenhouse
Saudade	Built Greenhouse
Bemposta	Built Greenhouse

Lobata

Plancas I	N/A
Plancas II	N/A
Santa Luzia	Irrigation System Rehabilitation
Canavial	Built Greenhouse
Fernão Dias	Built Greenhouse

Lembá

Roça Lembá / São João	Built Greenhouse and Pigsty
Paga Fogo	Solar freezer and rural track rehabilitated
Ponta Figo	N/A
Generosa	N/A
Ribeira Funda	Expected support at terracing level for erosion control and river disassembly

Príncipe

Santa Rita / Praia Campanha	Built Greenhouse / Pigsty
Azeitona	Support for poultry farming
Ponta do Sol	Support provided at the matabala crop level
Abade	N/A
Nova Estrela	Built Greenhouse

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The project evaluation will assess the performance of the project in achieving its results and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. It should be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

- **EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

The evaluation must address the entire project from inception to completion and should embody a strong results-based orientation.

Based on a desk review of all documents produced by the project and other relevant knowledge products, interviews, focus groups, site visits and other research conducted, the Evaluator will produce an evaluation that will:

- Identify outputs produced by the project
- Elaborate on how outputs have or have not contributed to outcomes, and
- Identify results and transformation changes, if any, that have been produced by the project
- Give recommendations regarding changes to be made, if any

The evaluation should assess:

- Whether stated outputs were achieved
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving outputs:
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project, the added value of the consultative/multi-stakeholder process and synergies with other projects/programs.
- The effectiveness of the partnership strategy
- The sustainability of the project impact/s
- How effective equality and gender mainstreaming have been incorporated in the design and execution

- **DELIVERABLES**

The Evaluator will produce for approval by UNDP:

- An evaluation inception report
- A draft evaluation report, and
- A final evaluation report with lessons learned and recommendations

The Evaluator will also produce an evaluation brief and facilitate at least one briefing event for UNDP and relevant stakeholders. The logistic expenses of this event will be on the account of UNDP.

• EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method³ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*All in Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular 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 São Tomé and Príncipe to visit the following sites of the project:

- Distrito de Caué: Malanza, Ponta Baleia, Praia Pesqueira, Praia de Yô Grande, Soledade
- Distrito de Cantagalo: Colónia Açoriana, Mendes da Silva, Monte Belo, Quimpo, Uba Budo Sede
- Distrito de Mézochi: Rio Lima, Água das Belas, Bom Sucesso, Saudade, Bemposta
- Distrito de Lembá: Lembá, Paga Fogo, Ponta Figo, Generosa, Ribeira Funda
- Distrito de Lobata: Plancas I, Plancas II, Santa Luzia, Canavial, Fernão Dias,
- RAP: Nova Estrela, Praia Campanha, Abade,, Santa Rita, Azeitona, Ponta do sol

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

- DADR - Agriculture and Rural Development Directorate
- CATAP - Center for Technical and Livestock Improvement
- CADR - Rural Development Support Center
- CIAT - Rural Development Support Center (CADR)

³ For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

- Observatory / General Directorate of Environment
- District Authorities
- Regional Agriculture Directorate

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 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.⁴

• **CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS**

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

• **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in São Tome and Principe. 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

⁴ A 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](#)

be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

- EVALUATION TIMEFRAME**

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

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days (<i>recommended: 2-4</i>)	Middle of October
Evaluation Mission	15 days (<i>r. 7-15</i>)	End of October
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days (<i>r. 5-10</i>)	Beginning of November
Final Report	2 days (<i>r. 1-2</i>)	Middle of November

- EVALUATION OF DELIVERABLES**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	Middle of October	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Briefing to UNDP and stakeholders	Validate Initial Findings with Stakeholders	End of October	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Beginning of November	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Validation workshop	Validation of final report with stakeholders	Middle of November	Evaluator present the evaluation result to the UNDP CO and Stakeholders
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.

16. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international consultant and 1 national consultant*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. *The international evaluator will be designated as the team*

leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. This recruitment process is only related to the international consultant.

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.

17. RECRUITMENT CRITERIA (Team Leader)

Highest Combined Score (based on the 70% technical offer and 30% price weight distribution)

Technical Proposal (70%)

Education:	Advanced degree, preferably in environmental sciences, agriculture, business management, climate change, public policy, rural development or other closely related field.	10 Pts
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimum 5 years demonstrated professional experience fields related to Adaptation on climate change context. ▪ Experience in results-based project monitoring and evaluation methodologies, being GEF/UNDP project evaluation an asset ▪ Experience working in Africa or in similar island contexts 	25Pts 25Pts 10Pts
Mandatory language Requirements:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The working language is Portuguese or Spanish. ▪ Demonstrated proficiency in written and spoken English. Selected candidates will be requested to submit evidence of writing skills 	

Financial Proposal (30%)

To be computed as a ratio of the Proposal's offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.

18. 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'

19. 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
20%	Upon submission and approval of the Inception Report and workplan
40%	Upon submission and approval of the draft final evaluation report

40%	Upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final evaluation report
-----	--

20. SUBMISSIONS

Interested applicants (Team Consultancy) are required to submit:

- Evidence of qualifications including resumes and references
- A technical proposal explaining the methodology for conducting the evaluation and containing a detailed work-plan with timelines
- A separate financial proposal including all costs for conducting the evaluation and producing the deliverables (including daily fee, daily sustainable and travel costs).

Applicants are requested to apply through email: rfp3.2019@undp.org by 16/09/2019

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account 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

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programs Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:

By 2016, the Government and districts, as well as the population, adopt techniques and behaviors that promote a sustainable environment and ensure better prevention and management of risks and natural disasters

Country Programs Outcome Indicators:

Number of monitoring systems in place for pollution and disaster risk management

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Promote climate change adaptation

Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program: Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program: Objective 2 "Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level"

Applicable SOF (e.g. 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" and Outcome 2.2 "Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses"

Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Outcome Indicators:

2.2.1 N^o and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability

1.3.1. Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets (Score) – Disaggregated by gender

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective ⁵ <i>To strengthen the resilience of rural</i>	Percentage change in vulnerability of local	The PIF and local level assessments at demonstration sites during PPG	At mid-term 25% increase of VRA	Gender sensitive field survey	Risk: Insufficient institutional support and political commitments and lack

⁵ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

<p>community livelihood options against climate change impacts in the São Tomé districts of Caué, Me-Zochi, Príncipe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata (CMPLCL).</p>	<p>community to climate risks via perception based survey (VRA)</p>	<p>consultation process indicates high vulnerability of the selected sites.</p>	<p>score; at end-of-project 50% of VRA score.</p>	<p>based experimental design principles / VRA and/or local level assessments at demonstration sites (Questionnaire based appraisal - QBA) APRs/PIR</p>	<p>of coordination of the various key stakeholders.</p> <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government is committed to support the implementation of the adaptation measures in the selected vulnerable villages of the Caué, Me-Zochi, Príncipe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata (CMPLCL) districts; • Stakeholders and local communities are committed to implement the project interventions and provide the necessary support and collaboration.
<p>Outcome 1⁶ The capacity of the CATAP, CIAT, district governments and assemblies, district councils, CSOs and CBOs strengthened to support the enhancement of climate resilience of rural community livelihoods.</p>	<p>1.1 Capacity perception index in CATAP, CIAT, CSE, CSOs, CBOs and districts councils.</p>	<p>1.1 VRA to be undertaken at the project onset.</p>	<p>1.1 By year 4 of the project Target ≥ 3</p>	<p>1.1 Gender sensitive field survey based experimental design principles /VRA Field survey and APRs/PIR</p>	<p><i>Risk: Weak institutional capacity at District level to oversee, support and guide the process of establishment of districts and villages CC Platforms (CC-DAVIP)</i></p> <p>Assumptions:</p>

⁶ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

	<p>1.2 Number of Agricultural Extension staff (including on-the job trainings scheme) trained on adaptation strategies to support village climate change platforms.</p>	<p>1.2 Currently The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Rural Development (MAPDR) has only two Agricultural Extension staff in each of the six CADR Extension delegations at district and village level.</p>	<p>1.2 By the end of the project at least 60 Agricultural Extension staff (including on-the job trainings scheme) have been trained on adaptation strategies to support village climate change platforms.</p>	<p>1.2 Gender sensitive field survey based experimental design principles /Project monitoring and APRs/PIR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project activities will develop capacity building to help mitigate the risk associated with the weakness of institutional capacities. • CIAT, CATAP and CADR will have the technical capacity and political will to develop capacity building to carry out training and capacitance of new agriculture extension officers.
<p>Outcome 2 <i>Vulnerability of rural livelihoods reduced through climate risks supportive infrastructures and mechanisms.</i></p>	<p>2.1 Number of small-scale rainfall harvesting, number of water storage structures and/or small sale irrigation networks established at community level.</p>	<p>2.1 Currently no rainfall harvesting, no sizeable water storage structures and/or irrigation networks have been established at community level in the selected pilot sites.</p>	<p>2.1 By the end of the project at least 1(one) rainfall harvesting, and/or 1(one) sizeable water storage structures and/or 1(one) irrigation</p>	<p>2.1 Gender sensitive field survey based experimental design principles /Project monitoring and technical assessment reports APRs/PIR.</p>	<p>Risk: Poor coordination, weak capacity of relevant stakeholders and lack of willingness of community villagers to support implementation of climate change adaptation measures in target selected vulnerable village.</p> <p>Assumptions:</p>

			network has been established at community level in the selected pilot sites particularly in drought prone areas.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The climate change adaptation measures correspond to the urgent needs expressed by the primary proponents, particularly the community villagers which will reduce the risk of lack of support from the communities. • There will be a clear project management arrangements and regular interactions between the stakeholders.
	2.2 Number of ha that has benefited from any forms of erosion control as well as dykes and bunds to protect fields against flooding.	2.2 In the baseline no erosion control measures are being developed in the selected vulnerable locations.	2.2 By the end of the project at least 30 (thirty) % of the identified eroded areas is benefited by any forms of erosion control as well as dykes and bunds to protect fields against flooding.	2.2 Gender sensitive field survey based experimental design principles /Project monitoring and technical assessment reports (PIR).	
Outcome 3 <i>Adaptation strategies are designed and</i>	3.1 Number of CCA measures successfully implemented	3.1 Currently there is no GovSTP or Private assistance scheme operating in the selected vulnerable	3.1 By the end of the project, at least two CCA	3.1 Gender sensitive field survey based	Risks: Microfinance Institutions (MFIs) ability to develop innovative products to

transferred to strengthen communities' climate resilience in the 30 most vulnerable villages of the 6 districts of CMPLCL of São Tomé and Príncipe.

(equivalent to activity in ATLAS)

by the community members as a result of Project assistance.

villages supporting implemented CCA measures by the community members and there is no CCA measures successfully implemented by the community members.

measures have been implemented by the community members as a result of project assistance.

experimental design principles /Project evaluation reports (PIR) and technical assessment reports APRs/PIR.

finance adaptation can be affected by the communities' engagement, as they can be deterred from incurring upfront expenses and rigid repayment schemes even when the overall balance of costs and benefits is positive.

Assumptions:

- Micro-finance institutions will adopt a wholesale approach with flexible repayment installments, yearly or seasonal will be tested to consider the seasonal or inter-annual climate variability.

3.2 Number of Integrated Adaptation Measures (IAMs) included in the annual and multiyear adaptation plans (CC-VAAP) that were successfully demonstrated and scaled up at community level.

3.2 Currently, no annual and multiyear adaptation plans or policies that explicitly integrate climate change adaptation measures.

3.2 By the end of the project at least 50% of Integrated Adaptation Measures (IAMs) included in the annual and multiyear adaptation plans (CC-VAAP) have been successfully demonstrated and scaled up at

3.2 Gender sensitive field survey based experimental design principles /Project evaluation reports (PIR. Integrated Adaptation Measures & Annual and Multiyear Adaptation Plans developed.

Risks: Lack of capacity of communities to develop Integrated Adaptation Measures (IAMs) included in the annual and multiyear adaptation plans (CC-VAAP) and not enough Extension Workers able to support rural areas and implementation of village annual and multiyear adaptation plans (CC-VAAP).

			<p>community level in the target vulnerable villages.</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project will train at least 90 Agricultural Extension staff (including on-the-job trainings scheme) on adaptation strategies to support village climate change platform and vulnerable communities. Communities will be trained and provided with the mean to identify their own adaptation needs, prioritize, coordinate and plan.
--	--	--	---	---

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

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

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the *Project* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
17. Project site location maps

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><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></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><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></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><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></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 Form⁷

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: _____

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁹)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹⁰)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

⁸The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹⁰ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3 Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
5. Annexes
- TOR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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: _____