TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-Term Review of the UN Environment/Global Environment Facility project "Project Title" and "GEF ID Number"

Section 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1.   Project General Information

Table 1. Project summary

UNEP Sub-programme:	Climate Change	UNEP Division/Branch:	Climate Change Adaptation Unit
Expected Accomplishment(s):		Programme of Work Output(s):	UNEP Programme of Work 2020-2021. Sub-programmes: - Climate change - Healthy and productive ecosystems

Project Title:	Addressing Urgent Coastal Adaptation Needs and Capacity Gaps in Angola

Executing Agency:	Ministry of Culture, Tourism and the Environment (former Ministry of Environment MINAMB)

Project partners:	Implementing Partners: - UNEP - UNDP Other Partners: - National Institute of Water Resources; - National Institute of Meteorology and Geophysics - Ministry of Interior (Civil Protection and Fire Brigade Service)

Geographical Scope:	National with specific interventions implemented in four provinces: - Cabinda - Benguela - Kwanza Sul - Namibe

Participating Countries:	Republic of Angola

Background information UNEP

GEF project ID:	5230	IMIS number*[1]:	S1-32LDL-000045
Focal Area(s):	Climate Change	GEF OP #:	
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	CCA-LDCF	GEF approval date*:	08 April 2016
UNEP approval date:	7 February 2017	Date of first disbursement*:	27 March, 2017
Actual start date[2]:	28 March 2017	Planned duration:	48 months

---

[1] Fields with an * sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer
[2] Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases were a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.

Intended completion date*:	31 March 2020	Actual or Expected completion date:	31 March 2021
Project Type:	FSP	GEF Allocation*:	Total $ 6,180,000 UNDP - $ 1,000,000 UNEP – $ 5,180,000
PPG GEF cost*:	$ 196,840	PPG co-financing*:	-
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	$ 12,161,467	Total Cost*:	18,341,467
Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):	February 2019	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	TBC
Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):	September-December 2020 (tbc)	No. of revisions*:	
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	04 June 2020	Date of last Revision*:	
Disbursement as of 31 December 2019*:	$ 487,099	Date of financial closure*:	N/A
Date of Completion[3]*:	N/A	Actual expenditures reported as of 31 December 2019[4]:	$418,767
Total co-financing realized as of 31 December 2019:	TBC	Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 31 December 2019*:	

Background information UNDP ($ 1,000,000 usd)

GEF project ID (PNUD):	5276	GEF CEO Endorsement letter	8 Apr 2016
UNDP HQ Delegation of Authority to UNDP Angola	10 Aug 2016	UNDP Angola CO signature of PRODOC	25 Oct 2016
GoA signature of PRODOC (Approval date)	05 Dec 2016	Funds available to UNDP CO Angola	As of 15 March 2017 (Confirmation email received 6 Apr 2017)
Actual start date[5]:	05 Dec 2016	Planned duration:	48 months
Intended completion date*:	05 Dec 2016	Actual or Expected completion date:	05 Dec 2020
Total Expenses until 30 June 2020	427,674.58 USD		

2.   Project rationale[6]

Angola's coastline is home to over 50% of the country's population, where the combination of rapid population growth and inadequate urban planning has resulted in diverse socio-economic and environmental challenges. Such challenges include inadequate access to water and electricity, poor sanitation, and exposure to natural disasters such as flooding. Approximately two thirds of coastal Angolan communities are reliant on livelihoods such as agriculture and fishing for subsistence and employment. The livelihoods of these communities are therefore underpinned by the goods and services generated by functional, intact ecosystems. Despite this important contribution of Angola's ecosystems to household income and national GDP, inappropriate management practices and sustained overexploitation has resulted in the widespread degradation of Angola's coastal ecosystems. Impoverished households that are reliant on natural resource-based livelihoods are consequently becoming increasingly vulnerable to the negative effects of ecosystem degradation.

The threats to the livelihoods and wellbeing of coastal communities will be further exacerbated by the current and future effects of climate change. These effects include: i) increased variability in rainfall and temperature; ii) increased frequency and severity of droughts and floods; and iii) rising sea level and increased frequency

---

[3] If there was a "Completion Revision" please use the date of the revision.
[4] Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager
[5] Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases were a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.
[6] Legend: Grey =Info to be added

of storm surges, which results in increased beach erosion. Consequently, climate change will result in multiple negative effects on the livelihoods and health of coastal households in Angola. For example, coastal infrastructure and households will be damaged by increased frequency and severity of floods, storm surges and beach erosion. Additionally, increases in temperature and flooding events will increase the incidence of water-and vector-borne diseases of both humans and livestock. Agricultural production will decrease as a result of drought, thereby exacerbating food insecurity amongst local communities in these coastal regions. Several economically important sectors – including fisheries, agriculture, water, energy and tourism – are also vulnerable to the negative effects of climate change.

To address these urgent adaptation needs, the proposed project will use Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF) investments to increase the capacity of Angola's government and coastal communities to adapt to climate change. In particular, the project will promote and demonstrate cost-effective, low-regret options for adaptation including i) climate-resilient practices such as Ecosystem based adaptation (EbA) and climate-resilient land management (including promotion of agricultural, waste management, sustainable harvesting practices, ecosystem health and sustainable livelihoods under climate change) and ii) the establishment of a pilot Early Warning System (EWS). The benefits of these approaches to climate change adaptation will be demonstrated to impoverished rural communities in coastal areas as well as stakeholders from important economic sectors such as fisheries, agriculture, transport, energy, water and tourism

3.   Project objectives and components

The objectives of the proposed project will be achieved through the following four outcomes representing complementary measures:

   i)   Enhanced scientific and technical capacity for adaptation in coastal zone areas.
   ii)   Local demonstrations and capacity building interventions on ecosystems rehabilitation and adaptation measures in coastal areas.
   iii)   Enhanced institutional coordination and capacity for proactive adaptation in Angola.
   iv)   Improved awareness about climate change impacts and adaptation among non-governmental stakeholders

The LDCF project will build on several on-going selected baseline projects, which include: i) INAMET Strategic Development Master Plan (SDMP) (2012–2018); ii) Support to the Fisheries Sector Project FSSP) (2012–2017); and iii) Angola Water Sector Institutional Project (PDISA) (2010–2019). The project will be executed by MINAMB of Angola. Components 1 and 2 will be implemented with support from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Components 3 and 4 will be implemented with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

4.   Executing Arrangements

The Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment (former Ministry of Environment) is the Executing Agency of the LDCF project. It provides overall leadership for the project in close collaboration with: i) INAMET; ii) INRH iii) the Ministry of Agriculture and Fishery); and iv) the local Governments of Cabinda, Benguela, Kwanza Sul and Namibe Provinces. The Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment (MCTE) designated the National Director of Environment and Climate Action as the National Project Director. His primary responsibility is to ensure that the LDCF project produces the results specified in the project document to the required standard of quality and within the specified time and cost constraints.

The day-to-day management of the LDCF project is the responsibility of the Project Management Unit (PMU) under the direct supervision of the National Project Director. The PMU is based in Luanda and comprise the following fulltime staff: i) National Project Manager/Coordinator; ii) Finance Manager; iii) Project Administrative Assistant, all hired by MCTE; and iv) a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) hired by UNDP on the explicit request by the GoA. The PMU will be further supported by an international Monitoring and Learning Specialist (Chief Technical Advisor) for the UNEP components.

UNEP GEF Climate Change Adaptation Unit, the Angolan UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit support and monitor the project's implementation and achievement of the project outcomes and outputs – and ensure the proper use of UNEP and UNDP GEF funds[7].

The Project Steering Committee is the group responsible for making management decisions by consensus when guidance is required by the National Project Manager.

Project implementation is supported by contractors, selected according to UNEP and UNDP procurement rules. The Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment can also contract other entities – defined as Responsible Parties – to undertake specific project tasks through a process of competitive bidding according to procurement rules and regulations of the GoA.

Several GEF and non-GEF projects that focus on adaption to climate change or ecosystem restoration are currently being implemented in Angola. These initiatives provide opportunities for synergies and knowledge exchange with the LDCF project. The project management team will coordinate efforts and establish linkages with similar projects

5.   Project Cost and Financing

The project has a budget of US$ $ 6,180,000 from the GEF LDCF: $ 5,180,000 is channeled through UNEP for the implementation of components 1 and 2 and $ 1,000,000 via UNDP for the implementation of components 3 and 4. Project co-financing amount to $ 12,161,467 coming from the three following initiatives:

-    INAMET Strategic development Master Plan funded by the Government of Angola ($6 261 467)
-    Support to the Fisheries Sector Project (FSSP) funded by African Development Bank ($3 000 000)
-    Angola Water Sector Institutional Project (PDISA) funded by International Development Association and Southern African Development Community ($3 000 000)

To date 418,767 US$ (Dec 2019) from GEF LDCF grant have been disbursed and reported upon on components 1 and 2 and 427,674.58 USD (June 2020) on components 3 and 4.

6.   Implementation Issues

The following challenges and delays have been witnessed over the first few years of project implementation and are further detailed in the Project Progress Reports:

-    Considerable delays were witnessed in the establishment of the management and governance structures during the first year of the project

---

[7] UNDP Angola Country Office supports the implementation of the project from Luanda under a National Implementation Modality (NIM/NEX) with external oversite from UNDP-GEF regional and HQ units. UNEP supports the implementation of the project from outside Angola under a Direct Implementation Modality (DIM/DEX).

- Administrative and institutional barriers delay procurement leading to slow delivery of results.

- Slow procurement processes delay implementation of key activities such as Early Warning System equipment procurement process.

- Government processes which prohibit the payment of international consultancies in foreign currency, requiring time-consuming procurement through UN systems (climate vulnerability assessment consultancy).

- EWS equipment can only be installed during the dry season (May – August), and this could further delay the implementation of the EWS activities

- New Government restructuring (March 2020 - July 2020) merging the Ministry of Culture, Turism and Environment, created some delays in implementation.

- Covid 19 pandemic and associated national and international travel restrictions is contributing to the delay of vulnerability assessment work as well as the implementation of component 4 supported by UNDP.

- During the first years of project implementation there was weak synergy between components 3 and 4 led by UNDP and the components 1 and 2 led by UNEP due to the delay of implementation especially for the first two components. Since beginning 2020, coordination has improved between the three institutions (GoA, UNEP and UNDP) and the different activities,

Section 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

7.   Key Review Principles

18.   Review findings and judgements should be based on **sound evidence and analysis**, clearly documented in the review report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

19.   As this is Review is being undertaken at the mid-point of project implementation, particular attention should be given to identifying implementation challenges and risks to achieving the expected project objectives and sustainability, which will support potential course correction. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of "*what*" the project performance was and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of "*why*" the performance was as it was. This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project and the recommendations that are derived from the review process

20.   The reviewers should consider the difference between *what has happened with, and what would have happened without, the project*. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions, trends and counterfactuals in relation to the intended project outcomes and potential impacts. It also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions, trends or counterfactuals is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the reviewers, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the reviewer to make informed judgements about project performance.

21.   A key aim of the review is to encourage reflection and learning by UN Environment staff and key project stakeholders. The consultant should consider how reflection and learning can be promoted, both through the review process and in the communication of review findings and key lessons. Clear and concise writing is required on all review deliverables. There may be several intended audiences, each with different interests and needs regarding the report. The Task Manager will plan with the consultant(s) which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key review findings and lessons to them. This may include some or all of the following; a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, the preparation of a review brief or interactive presentation. Draft and final versions of the Main Review Report will be shared with key stakeholders by the Task Manager and a copy of the final version will be submitted to the UN Environment Evaluation Office, who will provide an assessment of the quality of the Review Report.

8.   Objective of the Review

22.   In line with the UN Environment Evaluation Policy[8] and the UN Environment Programme Manual[9], the Mid-Term Review (MTR) is undertaken approximately half way through project implementation to analyze whether the project is on-track, what problems or challenges the project is encountering, and what corrective actions are required. The MTR will assess project performance to date (in terms of relevance, effectiveness

---

[8] http://www.unep.org/eou/StandardsPolicyandPractices/UNEPEvaluationPolicy/tabid/3050/language/en-US/Default.aspx
[9] http://www.unep.org/QAS/Documents/UNEP_Programme_Manual_May_2013.pdf . *This manual is under revision.*

and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of the project achieving its intended outcomes, including their sustainability.

9.   Key Strategic Questions

23.   In addition to the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 10 below, the review will address the **strategic questions** listed below (to be complemented during inception phase). These are questions of interest to UNEP, UNDP and the GoA and to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution:

- Based on the analysis of past implementation challenges, what are the main corrective actions proposed to keep project on track, accelerate implementation and ensure effective use of remaining resources?

- How relevant are the newly developed site-specific interventions plans (proposed adaptation options and implementation arrangements) to successfully address main vulnerabilities coming out of the climate vulnerability assessments?

- What are the key risks to successful implementation of the identified on-the-ground adaptation interventions coming out of those site-specific plans and key recommendations to mitigate them

- To what extent has the project been successful in establishing effective communication and building synergies with key stakeholders including co-financing initiatives and how can this be improved in the future?

- Will the project's current sustainability strategy be sufficient to ensure long-lasting impacts of project interventions?

- How the project could improve synergies and integration between components 1 and 2 supported by UNEP and components 3 and 4 supported by UNDP, taking into consideration that UNDP activities started earlier than UNEP activities?

10.   Evaluation Criteria

24.   All evaluation criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Sections A-I below, outline the scope of the criteria and a link to a table for recording the ratings is provided in Annex 1. A weightings table will be provided in excel format (link provided in Annex 1) to support the determination of an overall project rating.

A.   Strategic Relevance
25.   The review will assess, in line with the OECD/DAC definition of relevance, 'the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor'. The review will include an assessment of the project's relevance in relation to UN Environment's mandate and its alignment with UN Environment's policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Same situation for UNDP components. Under strategic relevance an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

   i.   *Alignment to the UN Environment Medium Term Strategy[10] (MTS) and Programme of Work (POW), the GEF Strategic Priorities, the UNDP country program document and UNDP overall global strategy and contribution to SDGs.*
The review should assess the project's alignment with the MTS and POW under which the project was approved and include reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant MTS and POW. GEF priorities are specified in published programming priorities and focal area strategies.

   ii.   *Relevance to National Environmental Priorities*
The review will assess the extent to which the intervention is suited, or responding to, the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries where it is being implemented. Examples may include: national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) plans or regional agreements etc.

---

[10] UN Environment's Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UN Environment's programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UN Environment's thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes.

B. _Effectiveness_

26.   The review will assess effectiveness across three dimensions: delivery of outputs, achievement of direct outcomes and, where appropriate and feasible, likelihood of impact. At the mid-point more emphasis is placed on performance at the output and outcome levels, but observations about likelihood of impact may be helpful for course correction or adjusting the emphasis of the project's efforts.

i.   Achievement of Outputs

The review will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs (products and services delivered by the project itself) and achieving targets and milestones as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any _formal_ modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. Where the project outputs are inappropriately or inaccurately stated in the ProDoc, a table should be provided showing the original formulation and the amended version for transparency. The achievement of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their usefulness and the timeliness of their delivery. The review will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.

ii.   Achievement of Direct Outcomes

The achievement of direct outcomes is assessed as performance against the direct outcomes defined in the Project Framework. These are the first-level outcomes expected to be achieved as an immediate result of project outputs, by the end of the project and with the total funds secured for the project's implementation. A table can be used where substantive amendments to the formulation of direct outcomes is necessary to make them consistent with OECD/DAC guidelines. Where possible, the review should report evidence of attribution between UNDP and UN Environment's intervention and the direct outcomes.

iii.   Likelihood of Impact

Based on the articulation of longer term effects as defined in project objective or stated intentions, the review will, where possible, assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality.

The review will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute, to unintended negative effects. Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards.11 The review will consider the extent to which the project is playing a catalytic role or is promoting longer-term scaling up and/or replication[12].

C. _Financial Management_

27.   Under financial management the Mid-Term Review will assess: a) whether the rate of spend is consistent with the project's length of implementation to-date, the agreed workplan and the delivery of outputs and b) whether financial reporting and/or auditing requirements are being met consistently and to adequate standards by all parties. Any financial management issues that are affecting the timely delivery   of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted.

D. _Efficiency_

28.   In keeping with the OECD/DAC definition of efficiency, the review will assess the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Focusing on the translation of inputs into outputs, cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The review will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches. The review will also assess ways in which potential project extensions can be avoided through stronger project management.

E. _Monitoring and Reporting_

29.   The review will assess monitoring and reporting across two sub-categories: monitoring design and implementation, and project reporting.

---

[11] Further information on Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards (ESES) can be found at http://www.unep.org/about/eses/
[12] _Scaling up_ refers to approaches being adopted on a much larger scale, but in a very similar context. Scaling up is often the longer term objective of pilot initiatives. _Replication_ refers to approaches being repeated or lessons being explicitly applied in new/different contexts e.g. other geographic areas, different target group etc. Effective replication typically requires some form of revision or adaptation to the new context. It is possible to replicate at either the same or a different scale.

i.   Monitoring Design and Implementation

Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART[13] indicators towards the achievement of the projects outputs and direct outcomes. The review will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan. The review will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. The review should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

ii.   Project Reporting

Projects funded by GEF have requirements with regard to verifying documentation and reporting (i.e. the Project Implementation Reviews, Tracking Tool and CEO Endorsement template[14]), which will be made available by the Task Manager. The review will assess the extent to which UN Environment, UNDP and GEF reporting commitments have been fulfilled. Where corrective action is indicated in the annual Project Implementation Review reports (e.g. as an identified risk), the Reviewer will record whether this action has been taken.

F. *Sustainability*

30.   Sustainability is understood as the probability of the project's direct outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The review will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved direct outcomes. Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. Where applicable an assessment of bio-physical factors that may affect the sustainability of direct outcomes may also be included.

31.   The review will ascertain that the project has put in place an appropriate exit strategy and measures to mitigate risks to sustainability. The review will consider: a) the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards, b) the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained and c) the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure.

I.   *Factors and Processes Affecting Project Performance*

32.   *These factors are rated in the ratings table, but are discussed as cross-cutting themes as appropriate under the other evaluation criteria, above.*

i.   Preparation and Readiness

This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project. The review will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular the review will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements.

ii.   Quality of Project Implementation and Execution

Specifically for GEF funded projects, this factor refers separately to the performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping and supervision provided by UN Environment and UNDP, as the implementing agencies.

The review will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including Steering Groups etc.); communication and collaboration with UN Environment, UNDP colleagues; risk management; use of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive project management should be highlighted.

iii.   Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation

---

[13] SMART refers to indicators that are specific, measurable, assignable, realistic and time-specific.
[14] The Consultant(s) should verify that the annual Project Implementation Reviews have been submitted, that the Tracking Tool is being kept up-to-date and that in the CEO Endorsement template Table A and Section E have been completed.

Here the term 'stakeholder' should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs and target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UN Environment and UNDP. The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning and expertise. The inclusion and participation of all differentiated groups, including gender groups, should be considered.

iv.   Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity
The review will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Within this human rights context the review will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UN Environment's Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment.

The report should present the extent to which the intervention, following an adequate gender analysis at design stage, has implemented the identified actions and/or applied adaptive management to ensure that Gender Equity and Human Rights are adequately taken into account. In particular, the review will consider to what extent project design (section B), the implementation that underpins effectiveness (section D), and monitoring (section G) have taken into consideration: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to and the control over natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

v.   Country Ownership and Driven-ness
The review will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies in the project. The review will consider the involvement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices at local/municipal, provincial and national level. This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long term impact to be realised. This ownership should adequately represent the needs and interests of all gender and marginalised groups.

vi.   Communication and Public Awareness
The review will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The review should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively, including meeting the differentiated needs of gender or marginalised groups, and whether any feedback channels were established. Where knowledge sharing platforms have been established under a project the review will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

vii.   *Inadequate and unavailability of reliable scientific and socioeconomic data in the country to conduct quality project assessments studies (such as: site specific climate change assessments and cost-benefit analysis of adaptation measures).*

There is little reliable climatic data for the whole of Angola from 1975 until the end of the civil war in 2002. There are also not reliable data for estimated cost of adaptation measures in the country. This hampers the production of accurate national climate change scenarios, country specific cost-benefit analisis of potential adaptation measures and subsequent adaptation planning in the country. This acts as a barrier to conduct quality and country specific impact asessments, as well as, the comprehensive and effective use of EWS in Angola and limits appropriate responses to climate change.

Section 3. REVIEW APPROACH, METHODS AND DELIVERABLES

33.   The Mid-Term Review will use a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the review process. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultant(s) maintains close communication with the project team and

promotes information exchange throughout the review implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the review findings.

34.   Where applicable, the consultant(s) should provide a geo-referenced map that demarcates the area covered by the project and, where possible, provide geo-reference photographs of key intervention sites (e.g. sites of habitat rehabilitation and protection, pollution treatment infrastructure, etc.)

35.   The findings of the review will be based on the following:

(a)   A **desk review** of:
- Relevant background documentation
- Project Document and Appendices
- Project design documents (including minutes of the project design review meeting at approval); Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, revisions to the project (Project Document Supplement), the logical framework and its budget;
- Project reports such as annual and six-monthly progress and financial reports, field mission reports, progress reports from collaborating partners, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence including the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool etc.;
- Deliverables of key project consultancies
- Evaluations/Reviews of similar projects.

(b)   **Interviews** (individual or in group) with:
- UNEP Task Manager (TM);
- UNDP Angola Country Office
- Project management team (Project Manager, Chief Technical Advisor, Finance Officer, Project Assistant)
- UNEP Fund Management Officer (FMO);
- If necessary and on case by case basis the project partners (INAMET, INRH and civil protection, local governments) and beneficiaries (communities) as well as the senior staff within the government supervising project implementation

(c)   **Field visits:** Field visit will not be needed or required for this Mid Term Review for two main reasons:
   - Under the current travel restrictions in Angola due to the COVID-19 crisis, it could be difficult if not impossible to organise and conduct site visits
   - Current on the ground activities have not started in the provinces

If the context allows and if useful, a travel to Luanda could be organised to hold in person meetings and interviews of key stakeholders but if not possible or required meetings will be organised online. Logistics will be supported by the project team.

(d)   **Other data collection tools**: If needed, to be decided at the inception phase

11.   Review Deliverables and Review Procedures

36.   The review team will prepare:

- **Inception note:** (see Annex 1 for links to all templates, tables and guidance notes) containing confirmation of the results framework and theory of change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, review framework and a tentative review schedule.

- **Draft Review Report for Components 3 and 4**

- **Draft Review Report for Components 1 and 2**

- **Final Review Report** (see links in Annex 1) containing an executive summary (in Portuguese) that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the review findings organised by review criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.

37.   **Review of the draft review reports**. The review team will submit a draft report to the UNEP Task Manager (for components 1 and 2) and UNDP (for components 3 and 4) and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. Once a draft of adequate quality has been peer-reviewed and accepted, the UNEP Task Manager and UNDP will share the cleared draft report with key project stakeholders for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the UNEP Task Manager (for components 1 and 2) and UNDP (for Components 3 and 4) for consolidation. The UNEP Task

Manager will provide all comments to the review team for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.

38.   At the end of the review process, the Task Manager will either circulate **Lessons Learned** or prepare a **Recommendations Implementation Plan** in the format of a table, to be completed and updated at regular intervals.

12.   The Consultants' Team

39.   For this review, the review team will consist of a Consultant who will work under the overall responsibility of the Task Manager [Eva Comba]. in consultation with the Head of Branch/Unit [Jessica Troni], Fund Management Officer, [Bwiza Wameyo-Odemba]. The consultant will liaise with the Task Manager on any procedural and methodological matters related to the review. It is, however, the consultants' individual responsibility to arrange for their travel, visa, obtain documentary evidence, plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The Task Manager and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultants to conduct the review as efficiently and independently as possible.

40.   The consultant will be hired for 33 days over a spread of 07 months period (TBC). He / She should have: an advanced university degree in environmental sciences, international development or other relevant political or social sciences area; a minimum of 05 years of technical / evaluation experience, including previous evaluation experience of climate change adaptation projects. Understanding of ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation and early warning systems is an asset. Working knowledge of the UN System is desirable. Fluency in written and oral English with strong writing and editing skills is required. Fluency in both Portuguese is also required.

41.   The consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with the Task Manager, for overall management of the review and timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Evaluation Deliverables, above. The consultant will ensure that all evaluation criteria and questions are adequately covered.

13.   Schedule of the Review

42.   The table below presents the tentative schedule for the review.

Table 3. Tentative schedule for the review

The MTR will be conducted into two phases that will be further described in the inception note. The first phase is the development of a draft mid-tern review report focused specifically on the project components 3 and 4 supported by UNDP. The final draft report reviewed by UNDP will need to be submitted mid-November 2020.
The next phase covering project components 1 and 2 supported by UNEP will start at a later date to be confirmed based on the finalization of the project baseline study and climate vulnerability work and progresses made on the EWS equipment procurement process.

Milestone	Indicative Timeframe
Inception Note	End of September
Development of final draft report for components 3 and 4 reviewed by UNDP through interviews, key project documentation review and online interviews of key stakeholders	October/November
Development of the final draft report for components 1 and 2 reviewed by UNEP	TBC (based on progresses with CVA and EWS work)
Draft Report shared with the wider group of stakeholders	TBC
Final Main Review Report	TBC
Final Main Review Report shared with all respondents	TBC

14.   Contractual Arrangements

43.   Review Consultants will be selected and recruited by the UNEP Task Manager under an individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) on a "fees only" basis (see below). By signing the service contract with UN Environment/UNON, the consultant(s) certify that they have not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards

project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project's executing or implementing units. All consultants are required to sigh the Code of Conduct Agreement Form.

44.	Fees will be paid on an instalment basis, paid on acceptance by the Task Manager of expected key deliverables. The schedule of payment is as follows:

45.	Schedule of Payment for the Consultant:

Deliverable	Percentage Payment
Approved Inception Note *(as per annex document 7)* and Draft Evaluation Report (components 3 and 4) *(as per annex document 13)*	40%
Approved Draft Evaluation Report (components 1 and 2)	30%
Approved Final Main Evaluation Report (component 1, 2, 3 and 4)	30%

46.	Fees only contracts: If a mission to Luanda is needed and approved by all parties (consultant, UNEP and project team), air tickets will be purchased by UNEP and 75% of the Daily Subsistence Allowance for each authorised travel mission will be paid up front. Local in-country travel will only be reimbursed where agreed in advance with the Task Manager and on the production of acceptable receipts. Terminal expenses and residual DSA entitlements (25%) will be paid after mission completion.

47.	The consultants may be provided with access to UNEP's Programme Information Management System (PIMS) and if such access is granted, the consultants agree not to disclose information from that system to third parties beyond information required for, and included in, the review report.

48.	In case the consultants are not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines, and in line with the expected quality standards by the Task Manager, payment may be withheld at the discretion of the Head of Branch/Unit until the consultants have improved the deliverables to meet UN Environment's quality standards.

49.	If the consultant(s) fail to submit a satisfactory final product to the Task Manager in a timely manner, i.e. before the end date of their contract, UN Environment reserves the right to employ additional human resources to finalize the report, and to reduce the consultants' fees by an amount equal to the additional costs borne by UN Environment to bring the report up to standard.

Annex 1 : Tools, Templates and Guidance Notes for use in the Review

The tools, templates and guidance notes listed in the table below are available from the Evaluation Office (janet.wildish@un.org) and are intended to help Task Managers and Review Consultants to produce review products that are consistent with each other and which contribute to UN Environment results reporting. (Three key templates are attached below). This suite of documents is also intended to make the review process as transparent as possible so that all those involved in the process can participate on an informed basis. It is recognised that the review needs of projects and portfolio vary and adjustments may be necessary so that the purpose of the review process (broadly, accountability and lesson learning), can be met. Such adjustments should be decided between the Task Manager and the Review Consultant in order to produce review reports that are both useful to project implementers and that produce credible findings.

Document Name
Evaluation Ratings Table
Weighting of Ratings
Matrix Describing Ratings by Criteria
Structure and Contents of the Inception Report
Guidance on Stakeholder Analysis
Use of Theory of Change in Project Evaluations
Possible Evaluation Questions
Structure and Contents of the Main Evaluation Report
Cover Page, Prelims and Style Sheet for Main Evaluation Report
Financial Tables
Template for the Assessment of the Quality of the Evaluation Report (this will be completed by the Evaluation Office and annexed to the Review Report)

Annex 2 : Evaluation Ratings Table

The review will provide individual ratings for the evaluation criteria described in the table below.

Most criteria will be rated on a six-point scale as follows: Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS);   Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability and Likelihood of Impact are rated from Highly Likely (HL) down to Highly Unlikely (HU) and Nature of External Context is rated from Highly Favourable (HF) to Highly Unfavourable (HU).

In the conclusions section of the review report, ratings will be presented together in a table, with a brief justification for each rating, cross-referenced to findings in the main body of the report.

Criterion *(section ratings A-I are formed by aggregating the ratings of their respective sub-categories, unless otherwise marked)*	Summary Assessment	Rating
A. Strategic Relevance		**HS → HU**
1. Alignment to MTS and POW and the GEF strategic priorities		HS → HU
2. Relevance to regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities		HS → HU
B. Effectiveness[15]		**HS → HU**
1. Delivery of outputs		HS → HU
2. Achievement of direct outcomes		HS → HU
3. Likelihood of impact, where appropriate/feasible		HL→ HU
C. Financial Management		**HS → HU**
1.Rate of spend		HS → HU
2.Quality and consistency of financial reporting		HS → HU
D. Efficiency		**HS → HU**
F. Monitoring and Reporting		**HS → HU**
1. Monitoring design and implementation		HS → HU
2.Project reporting		
F. Sustainability *(the overall rating for Sustainability will be the lowest rating among the three sub-categories)*		**HL → HU**
I. Factors Affecting Performance[16]		**HS → HU**
1. Preparation and readiness		HS → HU
2. Quality of project management and supervision[17]		HS → HU
3. Stakeholders participation and cooperation		HS → HU
4. Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity		HS → HU
5. Country ownership and driven-ness		HS → HU
6. Communication and public awareness		HS → HU
Overall project rating		**HS → HU**

---

[15] Where a project is rated, through the assessment of Project Design Quality template during the evaluation inception stage, as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, the overall rating for Effectiveness may be increased at the discretion of the Evaluation Consultant and Evaluation Manager together.

[16] While ratings are required for each of these factors individually, they should be discussed within the Main Evaluation Report as cross-cutting issues as they relate to other criteria. Note that catalytic role, replication and scaling up are expected to be discussed under effectiveness if they are a relevant part of the TOC.

[17] In some cases 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UN Environment to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping provided by UN Environment, as the implementing agency.

Annex 3 : Guidance on the Structure and Contents of the Inception Report

Section	Notes	Data Sources	Recommended no. pages
1. Introduction *(Note that the previous abbreviation of UNEP should now be written as UN Environment)*	*Summarise:* Purpose and scope of the review *(eg learning/accountability and the project boundaries the evaluation covers)* Project problem statement and justification for the intervention. Institutional context of the project *(MTS, POW, Division, umbrella etc)* Target audience for the review findings.	TOR and ProDoc	1
2. Project results framework *(or Theory of Change if the project has already developed one)*	Confirm the planned project outputs and expected outcomes and long-term intended impact that are being used for the Review, including source of the information. Discuss: a) Relevance of indicators and appropriateness of level of targets b) How planned outputs are expected to achieve outcomes (are any elements missing etc) c) Causal pathways by which the project expects to drive change (how will the project's activities lead to sustained change, what contributing conditions need to be present for the change to happen). Where the articulation of the project's results framework, especially outputs, outcomes needs adjustment to conform to OECD/DAC definitions, a table should be provided showing the original version and the revisions proposed for use in the review.	ProDoc, Revision documents, consultation with TM/PM	1 /2
3. Project design	Record any notable project design strengths and weaknesses within the body of the inception report. These may have already been noted by the Project Team or in regular project reports	Project document and revisions, MTE/MTR if any	½
4. Stakeholder analysis[18]	Identify key stakeholder groups and provide an analysis of the levels of influence and interest each stakeholder group has over the project outcomes. Give due attention to gender and under-represented/marginalised groups. *(guidance note available)*	Project document Project preparation phase. TM/PM	1
5. Review methods	Describe all review methods *(especially how sites/countries will be selected for field visits or case studies; how any surveys will be*	Review of all project documents.	1 page narrative. The evaluation framework as a

---

[18] Evaluation Office of UN Environment identifies stakeholders broadly as all those who are affected by, or who could affect (positively or negatively) the project's results. At a disaggregated level key groups should be identified, such as: implementing partners; government officials and duty bearers (eg national focal points, coordinators); civil society leaders (e.g. associations and networks) and beneficiaries (eg households, tradespeople, disadvantaged groups, members of civil society etc). UN Environment recognizes the nine major groups as defined in Agenda 21: Business and Industries, Children & Youth, Farmers, Indigenous People and their Communities, Local Authorities, NGO's, the Scientific & Technological Community, Women, Workers and Trade Unions.

	administered; how findings will be analysed etc)		matrix and draft data collection tools as annexes.
	Summarise date sources/groups of respondents and method of data collection to be used with each (e.g skype, survey, site visit etc)		
	Create a review framework that includes detailed review questions linked to data sources. Present this as a table/matrix in the annex (samples available)		
	Design draft data collection tools and present in the annex (eg interview schedules, questionnaires etc)		
6. Team roles and responsibilities (Remove if a single consultant is being hired)	Describe the roles and responsibilities among the review team, where appropriate		½
7. Evaluation schedule	Provide a revised timeline for the overall review (dates of travel and key review milestones) Tentative programme for site/country visits	Discussion with TM/PM on logistics	½ (table)
TOTAL NARRATIVE PAGES			**8-12 pages, plus annexes**
Annexes	A - Review Framework B - Draft data collection tools C - List of documents and individuals to be consulted during the main evaluation phase D - List of individuals and documents consulted for the inception report		

Annex 4 : Guidance on the Structure and Contents of the Main Review Report

NOTE: Review consultants are kindly advised to refer the reader to paragraphs in different parts of the report instead of repeating material.

Preliminaries *(Note that the previous abbreviation of UNEP should now be written as UN Environment)*	*Title page* – Name and ID number of the evaluated project, type of evaluation (mid-term or terminal), month/year evaluation report completed, UN Environment logo. Include an appropriate cover page image. *Disclaimer text*- 'This report has been prepared by independent consultant evaluators and is a product of the Evaluation Office of UN Environment. The findings and conclusions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of Member States or the UN Environment Senior Management' *Acknowledgements* – This is a maximum of two paragraphs. *Short biography of the consultant(s)* – giving relevant detail of experience and qualifications that make the consultant a suitable candidate for having undertaken the work. **(Max 1 paragraph)** *Contents page* – including chapters, tables and annexes *Abbreviations table* – only use abbreviations for an item that occurs more than 3 times within the report. Introduce each abbreviation on first use and ensure it is in the table. Where an abbreviation has not been used recently in the text, provide its full version again. The Executive Summary should be written with <u>no</u> abbreviations. *Paragraph numbering* – All paragraphs should be numbered, starting from the Executive Summary *Header/footer* – Name of evaluated project, type of evaluation and month/year evaluation report completed. Page numbers, header and footer do not appear on the title page
Project Identification Table	An updated version of the Project Identification Table (i.e. the table at the beginning of each Project Implementation Review Report).
Executive Summary *(Kindly avoid all abbreviations in the Executive Summary)* *Start numbering paragraphs from the Executive Summary.*	The summary should be able to stand alone as an accurate summary of the main review product. It should include a concise overview of the review object; clear summary of the review objectives and scope; overall evaluation rating of the project and key features of performance (strengths and weaknesses) against exceptional criteria (plus reference to where the evaluation ratings table can be found within the report); summary of the main findings of the exercise, including a synthesis of main conclusions (which include a summary response to key strategic evaluation questions) and selected lessons learned and recommendations. **(Max 4 pages)**
I Project Overview *(describe the Evaluand)*	
	Provide an overview of the project, covering, *inter alia*: - its institutional context within UN Environment (where managed from etc) - implementation structure (with diagram) - the problem/issue the project aims to address - project parameters for the review (start and end date; geographic reach; total budget etec) - project results framework - description of targeted groups/stakeholders and their relationship with the project - any major and agreed changes to the project (e.g. formal revisions, additional funding etc) - any external challenges faced by the project (eg conflict, natural disaster, political upheaval etc - financial tables ((a) budget at design and expenditure by components (b) planned and actual sources of funding/co-financing **(Max 2 pages)**
II. Review Methods	This section is the foundation for the review's credibility, which underpins the validity of all its findings.

	The section should include: a description of review methods and information sources used, including the number and type of respondents; justification for methods used (eg qualitative/quantitative; electronic/face-to-face); any selection criteria used to identify respondents, case studies or sites/countries visited; strategies used to increase stakeholder engagement and consultation; details of how data were verified (eg triangulation, review by stakeholders etc). The methods used to analyse data (eg. scoring; coding; thematic analysis etc) should be described.
	It should also address limitations to the review such as: low or imbalanced response rates across different groups; extent to which findings can be either generalised to wider review questions or constraints on aggregation/disaggregation; any potential or apparent biases; language barriers and ways they were overcome.
	Ethics and human rights issues should be highlighted including: how anonymity and confidentiality were protected and strategies used to include the views of marginalised or potentially disadvantaged groups and/or divergent views. **(Max 2 pages)**
III. Review Findings	
Refer to the TOR for descriptions of the nature and scope of each criterion	This chapter is organized according to the evaluation criteria presented in the TORs and reflected in the evaluation ratings table. The Review Findings section provides a summative analysis of all triangulated data relevant to the parameters of the criteria. Review findings should be objective, relate to the review objectives/questions, be easily identifiable and clearly stated and supported by sufficient evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and incorporates indicative evidence[19] as appropriate.
	"Factors Affecting Performance" should be discussed as appropriate in each of the evaluation criteria as cross-cutting issues. Ratings are provided at the end of the assessment of each evaluation criterion and the complete ratings table is included under the conclusions section, below.
	Evaluation Criteria:
	Strategic Relevance
	Effectiveness (includes delivery of outputs and achievement of outcomes)
	Financial Management
	Efficiency
	Monitoring and Reporting
	Sustainability
	(Max 15 pages)
I. Factors Affecting Performance	These factors are not discussed in stand-alone sections but are **integrated in criteria A-H as appropriate**. A rating is given for each of these factors in the Evaluation Ratings Table.
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	
A. Conclusions	This section should summarize the main conclusions of the review following a logical sequence from cause to effect. The conclusions should highlight the main strengths and weaknesses of the project, preferably starting with the positive achievements and a short explanation of how these were achieved, and then moving to the less successful aspects of the project and explanations as to why they occurred. Answers to the key strategic evaluation questions should be provided. All conclusions should be supported with evidence that has been presented in the evaluation report and can be cross-referenced to the main text using paragraph numbering. The conclusions section should end with the overall assessment of the project, followed by the ratings table.

---

[19] This may include brief quotations, anecdotal experiences, project events or descriptive statistics from surveys etc. The anonymity of all respondents should be protected.

	The conclusions section should not be a repeat of the Executive Summary, but focuses on the main findings in a compelling story line that provides both evidence and explanations of the project's results and impact. **(Max 2 pages)**
B. Lessons Learned	Lessons learned should be anchored in the conclusions of the review, with cross-referencing to appropriate paragraphs in the evaluation report where possible.
	Lessons learned are rooted in real project experiences, i.e. based on good practices and successes which could be replicated in similar contexts. Alternatively, they can be derived from problems encountered and mistakes made which should be avoided in the future. Lessons learned must have the potential for wider application and use and should briefly describe the context from which they are derived and those contexts in which they may be useful.
	Specific lessons on how human rights and gender equity issues have been successfully integrated into project delivery and/or how they could have could have been taken into consideration, should be highlighted.
C. Recommendations	As for the lessons learned, all recommendations should be anchored in the conclusions of the report, with paragraph cross-referencing where possible.
	Recommendations are proposals for specific actions to be taken by identified people/position-holders to resolve concrete problems affecting the project or the sustainability of its results. They should be feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available (including local capacities), specific in terms of who would do what and when, and set a measurable performance target in order that the project team/Head of Branch/Unit can monitor and assess compliance with the recommendations.
	It is suggested that a SMART[20] recommendation is stated first and is followed by a summary of the finding which supports it. In some cases, it might be useful to propose options, and briefly analyse the pros and cons of each option. Specific recommendations on actions that could be taken within the available time and resources to ensure the delivery of results relevant to human rights and gender equity should be highlighted.
Annexes	These may include additional material deemed relevant by the Reviewer(s) but must include: 1. Response to stakeholder comments received but not (fully) accepted by the reviewers, where appropriate. 2. Review TORs (without annexes). 3. Review itinerary, containing the names of locations visited and the names (or functions) and of people met/interviewed. *(A list of names and contact details of all respondents should be given to the Project Manager for dissemination of the report to stakeholders, but contact details should not appear in the report, which may be publicly disclosed on the UN Environment Evaluation Office website).* 4.Summary of co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity 5. Any communication and outreach tools used to disseminate results (e.g. power point presentations, charts, graphs, videos, case studies, etc.) 6. List of documents consulted 7. Brief CVs of the consultants 8. Quality Assessment of the Review Report will be added by the Project Manager as the final annex.

[20] SMART refers to indicators that are: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-oriented and Time-bound