



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE 'ECONOMY-WIDE INTEGRATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT TO REDUCE CLIMATE VULNERABILITY OF COMMUNITIES' (EWACC) IN SAMOA (NATIONAL CONSULTANT/TEAM EXPERT)

A. INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled ***'Economy-wide integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management to reduce climate vulnerability of communities (EWACC) in Samoa'*** (PIMS 5264) implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE). The project started on 7 November 2014 and is in its seventh year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ['Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'](#).

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION OR CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND:

The project was designed to address the predicted effects of climate change include; i) increased frequency and severity of extreme rainfall events; ii) increased frequency and duration of droughts; iii) rising sea levels; and iv) increased frequency of extreme wind events such as gusts and cyclones. The problem that the proposed LDCF project seeks to address is that climate change is expected to result in losses to lives, livelihoods and assets for local communities in Samoa. Cyclone Evan - which struck Samoa in December 2012- resulted in at least five deaths, displacement of 7,500 people and damage to over 2,000 houses. Losses to livelihoods (e.g. crops), damage to road infrastructure and disruption of water and electricity supplies also occurred. The Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) estimated the costs of reconstruction at US\$200 million with a further US\$70 million required for human capital.

The solution to the above-mentioned problem is to adopt an economy-wide approach to climate change adaptation in Samoa. This will allow for increased integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management into national development planning and programming across all sectors. In addition, the climate resilience of local communities - including their physical assets and livelihoods - must be strengthened. Barriers to climate change adaptation in Samoa include: i) fragmentation of efforts on climate change adaptation; ii) focus on "project-by-project" approaches rather than "programmatic" approaches; iii) limited capacity at the local level for climate change adaptation; iv) inherent vulnerabilities of communities, their assets and their livelihoods; and v) weak monitoring and evaluation of past and on-going projects.

The project has contributed to overcoming these barriers by: i) strengthening institutional capacity within the government; ii) enhancing inter-ministerial coordination of climate change adaptation; iii) promoting the inclusion of climate change concerns into development strategies across all sectors; iv) climate-proofing of communities' physical assets; v) introducing more climate-resilient livelihoods options; and vi) sharing lessons learned and best practice on climate change adaptation across the Pacific region.



The total GEF trust funds for this project is US\$ 12,322,936 with in-kind co-financing of 90,000,000 USD. The project was signed on 7 November 2014. The executing agency for this project is the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment. The responsible parties are the Ministry of Finance (MoF), Ministry of Women, Culture and Social Development (MWCSD) and Land Transport Authority (LTA). The project was granted an extension of 12 months to the 6 November 2021.

The TE will cover the full project and will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the Terminal Evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Samoa in COVID-19

A national state of emergency has been in place since 20 March 2020, restricting flights to and from the country and limiting public gatherings. As of 20 May 2021, Samoa does not have any confirmed cases of COVID-19. The Government of Samoa is focused on prevention of an outbreak, implementing strict point of entry arrangements. With this controls in place the project has experienced delays in project implementation with procurement and implementation of consultancies of feasibility studies, infrastructure works, postponed consultations and activities with communities.

Due to the travel restrictions, the Team Leader will be home-based and will work closely with the National Team expert in engaging stakeholders via virtual consultations via telephone or online meetings (Zoom, Skype, etc.). Field work will be conducted by the national Team expert with guidance from the team leader/lead evaluator and findings shared with the Team Leader. Furthermore, all stakeholder engagements will be strongly supported by the PMU and the UNDP MCO in Samoa. Consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability and willingness to be interviewed remotely and the constraints this may place on the Terminal Evaluation. These limitations must be reflected in the final Terminal Evaluation report. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

C. TE PURPOSE:

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE will cover the full project and will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’](#).

D. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.



The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to recipients and business owners of which 67 in Savaii and 75 in Upolu, *Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment (MNRE)-Water Resource Division, MNRE-Disaster Management Office (DMO), Ministry of Ministry of Women, Community Social Development (MWCSO), Land Transport Authority (LTA), Ministry of Finance (MoF), Adra, Samoa Fire Service Authority(SFESA);* executing agency -MNRE-GEF/Climate Change, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, legal drafting, project beneficiaries, academia, primary schools, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to *villages within Upolu and Savaii, including the following project sites), including the following project sites primary schools: Gautavai, Nene, St Mary's, Saleaulua, Lalomalava, Gataivai, Ah-Mu, Faleapuna, Vaiala, Samoa primary; villages equipped with planting materials and nurseries: in Upolu - Fagalii, Malololelei, Vailima, Afiamalu, Vaoala, in Savaii – Aopo, Vaipouli, Asau, Masamasa, and Falelima; CDCRM program: Saleaula, Safai, Falealupo, Tufutafoe, Neiafu, Falelima, Tiavea, Lotofaga, Poutasi and Lepuiai-Manono-tai; Village Disaster Management Plans developed: Asau, Aopo, Siumu Sisifo, Saanapu, Sataoa, Matautu-Lefaga, Samatau, Vaisala, Auala, Papa Sataua, Saleaula, Safai, Falealupo, Tufutafoe, Neiafu and Falelima; Flood Studies: Gasegase, Fuluasou and Apaula; Drainage improvement along Falealili Cross Island Road;*

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

E. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE:

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex N). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the ['Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'](#).

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Result

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*). Note that the TE team is expected to provide comments/recommendations to the project exit strategy and sustainability plan draft.
- Country ownership



- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Flexibility, Innovation and Adaptive management
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible, properly timed and targeted guidance directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. Ideally these recommendations should be linked to the project exit strategy and sustainability plan.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate innovation, gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Annex F: Evaluation Ratings Table for EWACC Project

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

F. TIMEFRAME:

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *26 working days* over a time period of *8 weeks* starting July 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
17 June 2021	Application closes
28 June 2021	Selection of TE team
5 July 2021 (1 day)	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
6 July 2021 (1 day)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
7 July 2021 (2 day)	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE field work
12 July – 23 July 2021 (10 days)	TE field work: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
26 July 2021 (1 day)	TE field work wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE field work
27 July – 9 August 2021 (6 days)	Preparation of draft TE report
August 2021 (13 day)	Submission of draft TE to UNDP & Circulation of draft TE report for comments to all Parties
16 August 2021 (3 days)	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
23 August 2021 (1 day)	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

G. TE DELIVERABLES:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Terminal Evaluation Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE; Options for site visits by the national consultant should be provided in the Inception Report.	Target date for signing contract & commencement of work is 28 June 2021. Inception report due no later than one week after contract signing 28 June 2021	Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and Project Management Unit
2	Presentation	Initial Findings (this includes a PPT that summarizes Initial findings and preliminary recommendations)	26 July 2021	Evaluation team presents to the Commissioning Unit and the Project Management Unit. Sent for information only to Commissioning Unit, RTA, Project Management Unit, GEF OFF
3	Draft Final Evaluation Report	Full report <i>(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)</i> with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the TE field work. 13 August 2021	Sent for review to the Commissioning Unit, RTA, Project Management Unit, GEF OFF
4	Final Evaluation Report+ Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report <i>(See template in ToR Annex H)</i>	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 23 August 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit (RTA, Project Management Unit, GEF OFF)

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.²

H. TE ARRANGEMENT:

² Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>



The principal responsibility for managing this Terminal Evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for the National Consultant of this Terminal Evaluation is the UNDP Multi-country office for Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa (UNDP Samoa MCO).

The UNDP Multi-country office for Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa and Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MNRE) EWACC- Project Management Unit (PMU) will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits for the National Consultant, etc.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Management Unit will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

I. TE TEAM COMPOSITION:

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – One Team Leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and One **National Team Expert**, usually from the country of the project.

The team leader will be responsible for;

- Completion of the inception report in coordination with the National Team Expert
- Conduct TE interviews with coordination with the National Team expert and PMU
- The overall design, writing and completion of the TE report inclusive of audit trail and including all comments from project partners and stakeholders
- Overall TE report quality assurance and adherence to the ['Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'](#).

The national team expert will;

- Work closely with the Team Leader and the PMU;
 - Contribute to the inception report including a detailed plan for interview and project site visits
 - Develop and confirm TE interview schedule in coordination with the PMU and the Team Leader
 - Translate questionnaires if needed and share list of questions with interviewees in preparation for the TE interviews
 - Facilitate virtual (and translate if needed) interviews for the TE and conduct interviews where virtual means are unavailable
 - Conduct data collection for the TE
 - Conduct field visits to verify impact of project interventions at project sites in coordination with the Team Leader and PMU
 - Work with PMU to confirm co-financing for the project
- Contribute to the TE report



- Conduct and confirm any follow up data/information requirements to complete the Terminal evaluation report including audit trail.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of **National Team Expert** will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education:

- A bachelor's degree in Environmental Management, Climate science or other closely related field (10 points);

Experience:

- Minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in providing management or consultancy services to the multi focal area projects; in developing national and regional capacities and enabling conditions for global environmental protection and sustainable development (20 points);
- Extensive demonstrated experience in the Samoa Environment Sector and cross-cutting climate change and disaster risk management in other areas of the Strategy for the Development of Samoa, with well-established knowledge of and networks amongst government, tourism, NGO and community organisations (25 points).
- 3 years' experience in project evaluations, results-based management, and/or evaluation methodologies (10 points);
- Technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Climate Change (20 points)
- Experience working in climate change adaptation and disaster risk management elsewhere in the Pacific region or SIDS (5 points)
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement, with excellent written and presentation skills (10 points)

J. EVALUATOR ETHICS:

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

K. DUTY STATION:

Home-based. It is expected that the consultant/team leader will conduct remote stakeholder interviews and site visit via virtual means (Zoom, skype etc.) in lieu of international consultant's mission in Samoa due to COVID19 travel restrictions

L. SCOPE OF BID PRICE & SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS:

DELIVERABLES	DUE DATE (%)	AMOUNT IN USD TO BE PAID AFTER CERTIFICATION BY UNDP OF SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF DELIVERABLES
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit of the TE Inception Report	5 July 2021 (20%) (6 days after contract signing)	\$xxx
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit of the draft Terminal Evaluation report	27 July 2021 (40%)	\$xxx
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA of the final Terminal Evaluation report and completed Audit Trail	20 August 2021 (40%)	\$xxx
TOTAL	26 working days	\$xxx

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%³:

³The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details: https://poppp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default



APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

Complete proposals must be submitted by **17 June 2021** electronically via email the Jobs link below. Only applications through this link will be accepted, email proposals will not be accepted.

https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=99555

Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- Annex I Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability
- Annex II P11 form (or CV)
- Annex III Financial proposal specifying the daily rate in US Dollars and other expenses, if any, that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached
- **Statement of capabilities addressing the evaluation criteria** of why you consider yourself the most suitable for the assignment,
- **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (2 pages maximum),

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit
procurement.ws@undp.org

M. Criteria for Selection of Best Offer

- Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Incomplete applications will not be considered;
- Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria (section H.) will be weighted at 70% and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%;
- Only the top 3 candidates that have achieved a minimum of 70 points (70% of 100 points) from the review of education, experience and language will be deemed technically compliant and considered for the financial evaluation;
- The financial proposal shall specify an all-inclusive lump sum fee. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal must additionally include a breakdown of this daily fee (including all foreseeable expenses to carry out the assignment);
- Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

⁴Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁵<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁶http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc



: Project Results Framework

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Outcome 3.1.1: National capacities and institutional mechanisms strengthened for effective disaster response; plans in place capturing community and CSO participation					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: <i>Strengthening Gender Responsive Disaster Risk Reduction and Mitigation Programmes in Communities and Amongst Civil Societies.</i>					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: <i>3. Promote climate change adaptation.</i>					
LDCF Strategic Objective and Program: LDCF Climate Change Adaptation					
CCA-1: <i>Reducing Vulnerability: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.</i>					
CCA-2: <i>Increasing Adaptive Capacity: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.</i>					
CCA-3: <i>Adaptation Technology Transfer: Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology.</i>					
LDCF Expected Outcomes:					
Outcome 1.1: <i>Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas.</i>					
Outcome 1.2: <i>Reduced vulnerability in development sectors.</i>					
Outcome 2.2: <i>Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses.</i>					
Outcome 3.1: <i>Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas.</i>					
LDCF Outcome Indicators (AMAT):					
Indicator 1.1.1: <i>Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks.</i>					
Indicator 1.2.15: <i>% of targeted population benefitting from improved flood management through implementation of hard and soft measures for protection of community assets.</i>					
Indicator 2.2.1: <i>No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability.</i>					
Indicator 3.1.1: <i>% of targeted groups adopting adaptation technologies by technology type (% disaggregated by gender).</i>					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective ⁷ : Establishment of an economy-wide approach to climate change adaptation in Samoa, aimed for	1. Increased capacity within GoS for coordination of cross-sectoral actions for climate change adaptation, including	1. Capacity for national coordination of climate change adaptation and DRM is presently limited	1. By the end of the project, GoS will have sufficient capacity for effective coordination of cross-sectoral actions for climate change adaptation (Level 5: Fully developed capacity).	1. Capacity scorecard assessment of officials within the MoF-CRICU and MNRE-Climate	Risk: Competing mandates and poor coordination between government agencies/line ministries disrupt project activities. Assumption: Proper coordination between government agencies enhances

⁷ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR



<p>efficient integration and management of adaptation and DRM into national development planning and programming and enhancing the resilience of communities' physical assets and livelihoods across Samoa, to climate change and natural disasters.</p>	<p>planning, budgeting, implementing and monitoring and evaluating. 2. Integration of climate change adaptation and DRM into the Strategy for the Development of Samoa 2017–2021.</p>	<p>(Level 3: Partially developed capacity).</p> <p>2. Integration of climate change adaptation and DRM in the Strategy for the Development of Samoa 2012–2016 is limited.</p>	<p>2. The Strategy for the Development of Samoa 2017–2021 will include key performance indicators for climate change adaptation for outcomes relating to agriculture, community development, water and sanitation, transport and climate and disaster resilience.</p>	<p>Change Unit at MTR and FTE.</p> <p>2. Endorsed Strategy for the Development of Samoa 2017–2021 that includes climate change adaptation/DRM.</p>	<p>and sustains project progress that is aligned with sectoral adaptation priorities. MNRE Climate Change Unit and MoF-CRICU will ensure a programmatic approach and coordination of adaptation work.</p> <p><u>Risk</u>: Limited human resources in government ministries and agencies delay project activities. <u>Assumption</u>: Human resources in government ministries and agencies will be sufficient to ensure successful implementation of project activities.</p> <p><u>Risk</u>: High staff turnover affects project implementation. <u>Assumption</u>: Low rates of staff turnover and proper handover procedures ensure continuity. Mechanisms for recruiting new staff quickly will minimise delays.</p> <p><u>Risk</u>: Insufficient political and financial support from line ministries and other government departments/agencies. <u>Assumption</u>: Strong political will and financial support will contribute to successful implementation of project interventions.</p>
--	---	---	---	--	--



<p>Outcome 1.1⁸ (equivalent to activity in ATLAS): <u>Policy Strategies/Institutional Strengthening</u>: Climate change adaptation and DRM mainstreamed in relevant policies, sectoral strategies, sub-national strategies⁹ and budgeting processes through enhanced coordination of government institutions.</p>	<p>1.1.1. Sector plans that include specific budgets for adaptation actions [adapted from AMAT 1.1.1]</p> <p>1.1.2. Formulation and endorsement of National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy.</p>	<p>1.1.1. At present, 4 sector plans do not include climate change adaptation.</p> <p>1.1.2. There is presently no National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy.</p>	<p>1.1.1. All 15 sector plans are formulated to include climate change adaptation and are approved by the end of the project.</p> <p>1.1.2. A National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy is formulated and endorsed by the end of the project.</p>	<p>1.1.1. Updated and approved sector plans.</p> <p>1.1.2. Formulated and endorsed National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy.</p>	<p><u>Risk</u>: Competing mandates and poor coordination between government agencies/line ministries disrupt project activities. <u>Assumption</u>: Proper coordination between government agencies enhances and sustains project progress that is aligned with sectoral adaptation priorities. MNRE Climate Change Unit and MoF-CRICU will ensure a programmatic approach and coordination of adaptation work.</p> <p><u>Risk</u>: Limited human resources in government ministries and agencies delay project activities. <u>Assumption</u>: Human resources in government ministries and agencies will be sufficient to ensure successful implementation of project activities.</p> <p><u>Risk</u>: Insufficient political and financial support from line ministries and other government departments/agencies. <u>Assumption</u>: Strong political will and financial support will contribute to successful implementation of project interventions.</p>
---	---	---	---	---	---

⁸ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

⁹ Sub-national strategies include district/village strategies and a strategy for Apia



<p>Outcome 1.2 (equivalent to activity in ATLAS): <u>Public finance management at the national and village level</u>: Capacity to access, manage, implement and monitor use of climate change funds is enhanced at the national and village level.</p>	<p>1.2.1. Increase in number of community-managed projects for adaptation to climate risks.</p> <p>1.2.2. Improved monitoring of government expenditure on climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>1.2.1. Few community-managed projects for adaptation to climate risks.</p> <p>1.2.2. No monitoring of public expenditure on climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>1.2.1. At least 20 community-managed projects for adaptation to climate risks.</p> <p>1.2.2. MoF-CRICU and MNRE-CCU have improved capacity to monitor expenditure on climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>1.2.1. Review of successful implementation of community-managed projects funded by CSSP and other initiatives.</p> <p>1.2.2. Review of CPEIR-style reports of public expenditure on climate change adaptation. Capacity assessments of MoF-CRICU and MNRE-CCU on monitoring of expenditure on climate change adaptation.</p>	<p><u>Risk</u>: Community participation decreases as benefits of adaptation measures and project interventions are not immediately evident. <u>Assumption</u>: Constant communication and management of expectations ensures continuous community involvement throughout planning and implementation.</p> <p><u>Risk</u>: Communities and governmental stakeholders don't distinguish resilience to climate change from baseline weaknesses. <u>Assumption</u>: Awareness-raising of communities allows them to perceive adaptation benefits of project interventions.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.1 (equivalent to activity in ATLAS): <u>Protection of communities' physical assets and livelihoods</u>: Increased resilience, and decreased exposure and susceptibility of communities to climate change and natural disasters by protection of household and</p>	<p>2.1.1. Number of people benefitting from improved flood management through implementation of hard and soft measures for protection of community assets. [AMAT 1.2.15].</p> <p>2.1.2. Number of people with increased</p>	<p>2.1.1. No people benefit from improved flood management from climate-resilient flood protection measures introduced in Vaisigano River catchment for protection of community assets.</p> <p>2.1.2. No difference in income between targeted and control</p>	<p>2.1.1. At least 12,000 people benefit from improved flood management from climate-resilient flood protection measures introduced in Vaisigano River catchment for protection of community assets (6,000 male and 6,000 female).</p> <p>2.1.2. At least 600 beneficiaries adopting diversified livelihoods have demonstrable increases in income</p>	<p>2.1.1. Review of infrastructure design to verify climate resilience. Site visits to verify implementation of climate-resilient flood protection measures.</p> <p>2.1.2. Household surveys conducted at baseline (prior to implementation of</p>	<p><u>Risk</u>: Poor coordination with AF and PPCR projects reduces opportunities for collaboration and alignment with interventions under LDCF project. <u>Assumption</u>: Proper coordination between government agencies enhances and sustains project progress that is aligned with sectoral adaptation priorities.</p> <p><u>Risk</u>: Delays in progress of baseline projects prevent implementation of interventions under LDCF.</p>



community assets and promoting resilient livelihoods.	<p>income – compared to the control group – as a result of diversified livelihood practices and more secure access to livelihood assets, disaggregated by age and gender</p> <p>2.1.3. Number of people adopting household-level processing facilities transferred to targeted groups – disaggregated by age and gender [adapted from AMAT 3.1.1]</p>	<p>groups owing to diversified livelihoods and secure access to livelihood assets.</p> <p>2.1.3. No people have adopted and utilised household-level processing facilities to support diversified livelihoods</p>	<p>compared to the control group owing to more secure access to livelihood assets (at least 400 women irrespective of age and 200 youth irrespective of gender).</p> <p>2.1.3. At least 600 beneficiaries participating in project interventions adopt and utilise household-level processing facilities to support diversified livelihoods (at least 400 women irrespective of age and at least 200 youth irrespective of gender).</p>	<p>interventions), MTR and TE/endline.</p> <p>2.1.3. Household surveys conducted at baseline (prior to implementation of interventions), MTR and FTE/endline.</p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> Constant coordination with baseline projects ensures that LDCF project can build on on-going initiatives.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Community participation decreases as benefits of adaptation measures and project interventions are not immediately evident.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Constant communication and management of expectations ensures continuous community involvement throughout planning and implementation.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Disaster events/ hazards destroy or delay project interventions.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Adequate monitoring of potential risks ensures that impacts of these risks are mitigated.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Land disputes amongst community members hamper implementation of adaptation interventions.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Socially sensitive approaches to project activities that are in line with approved national practices will prevent land disputes from arising.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Project interventions are not implemented in a gender- and culturally-sensitive manner.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Involvement of women committees and traditional authority structures will ensure gender and</p>
---	---	---	---	---	---



					<p>cultural sensitivity of project interventions.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Communities and governmental stakeholders don't distinguish resilience to climate change from baseline weaknesses.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Awareness-raising of communities allows them to perceive adaptation benefits of project interventions.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Implemented interventions are not climate resilient.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Proper design and planning of project interventions will ensure climate-resilience.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Unanticipated social and/or environmental impacts are caused by project activities.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Proper design and planning of project interventions will mitigate social and environmental impacts.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.2 (equivalent to activity in ATLAS):</p> <p><u>CCA/DRM plans and implementation:</u></p> <p>Increased adaptive capacity of communities for implementation of effective risk</p>	<p>2.2.1. Number of villages covered by Village Disaster Risk Management plans to reduce risks of and respond to climate variability [adapted from AMAT 2.2.1]</p>	<p>2.2.1. No Village Disaster Risk Management Plans implemented by the project.</p>	<p>2.2.1. At least 100 Village Disaster Risk Management Plans implemented by the project.</p>	<p>2.2.1. Consultations with community members in villages covered by Village Disaster Risk Management Plans.</p>	<p><u>Risk:</u> Community participation decreases as benefits of adaptation measures and project interventions are not immediately evident.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Constant communication and management of expectations ensures continuous community involvement throughout planning and implementation.</p>



management and protection of household and community assets.					<p><u>Risk:</u> Communities and governmental stakeholders don't distinguish resilience to climate change from baseline weaknesses.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Awareness-raising of communities allows them to perceive adaptation benefits of project interventions.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Project interventions are not implemented in a gender- and culturally-sensitive manner.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Involvement of women committees and traditional authority structures will ensure gender and cultural sensitivity of project interventions.</p>
Outcome 3.1 (equivalent to activity in ATLAS): Knowledge about CCA and DRM is captured and shared at the regional and global level.	3.1.1. Increased capacity of government staff to access information on climate and disaster risks as well as M&E on climate change adaptation.	3.1.1. Low capacity of government staff to access information on climate and disaster risks as well as M&E on climate change adaptation.	3.1.1. By the end of the project, key officials from MNRE-CCU and MoF-CRICU will have sufficient capacity for accessing information on climate and disaster risks as well as M&E on climate change adaptation (Level 5: Fully developed capacity).	3.1.1. Consultations with government officials on use of national climate database and M&E framework on climate change adaptation. Capacity scorecard assessment of officials within the MoF-CRICU and MNRE-Climate Change Unit	<p><u>Risk:</u> Communities and governmental stakeholders don't distinguish resilience to climate change from baseline weaknesses.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Awareness-raising of communities allows them to perceive adaptation benefits of project interventions.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Insufficient political and financial support from line ministries and other government departments/agencies.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> Strong political will and financial support will contribute to successful implementation of project interventions.</p>



**ToR ANNEX B: Information Package to be reviewed by the Terminal Evaluation Team**

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)



25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
<i>Additional documents, as required</i>	

ToR ANNEX C: Content of the TE Report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - 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
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change



4. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating¹⁰)

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

4.1 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

4.2 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

6. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed

¹⁰ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR ANNEX D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

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 level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
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, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			



<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>				
ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).				

Evaluators/Consultants:

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

ToR ANNEX F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance

- 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings
 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings
 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings

Sustainability ratings:

- 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability
 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability
 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability
 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability



3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability
--	--

ToR ANNEX G: Terminal Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report for Economy-wide integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management to reduce climate vulnerability of communities (EWACC) in Samoa (PIMS 5264)

Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commission Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

To the comments received on *(date)* from the Terminal Evaluation of 'Economy-wide integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management to reduce climate vulnerability of communities (EWACC) in Samoa' (PIMS 5264)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken


