Annex 1. Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

PROJECT EVALUATION SERIES

Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation of

"Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAP-Ag)"

UNFA/GLO/616/UND
UNDP PIMS 5246

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
OFFICE OF EVALUATION**

21 January 2020

CONTENTS

Acronyms and abbreviations

BH	Budget holder
BMU	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (Germany)
BTOR	Back-to-Office Report
CBA	Cost-Benefit Analysis
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCAFS	Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CGIAR programme)
COP	Conference of Parties (UNFCCC)
CPF	Country Programming Framework
EM	Evaluation Manager
EOI	Expression of Interest
ET	Evaluation team
ETL	Evaluation team leader
ETM	Evaluation team member
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FPMIS	Field Project Management Information System (FAO)
GoK	Government of Kenya
IKI	International Climate Initiative
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
INDC	Intended Nationally-Determined Contribution
LDC	Least Developed Countries
LNG	UNFCCC LEG NAP Technical Guidelines
LTO	Lead technical officer
LTU	Lead technical unit
MR	Management Response
MTR	Mid-term review
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NAP-Ag	Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (programme)
NDC	Nationally-Determined Contribution
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation
PC	Programme Committee
PEC	Project Evaluation Coordinator
PTF	Programme Task Force.
RO	Regional office
SO	FAO Strategic Objective
SRO	Sub-regional office
DPI	FAO Investment Centre
PSR	Donor Liaison and Resource Mobilization Team
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNDP   United Nations Development Programme
WB   World Bank
WFP   World Food Programme

1   Introduction

1. These Terms of Reference (ToR) have been developed to guide the final evaluation of FAO's contribution to the BMU/UNDP programme entitled "Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors in National Adaptation Plans" (UNFA/GLO/616/UND, UNDP PIMS 5246). The programme, implemented by UNDP and FAO started on the 8th April 2015 and it is expected to end on September 30, 2020.

2. The evaluation will take place between November 2019 and June 2020. It is managed by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) and will be conducted by an independent evaluation team. It represents an important opportunity to draw lessons from this experience that could later be used by BMU, FAO, UNDP at global level, to inform future decisions regarding the development of similar initiatives, and for the countries involved, to inform the sustainability of the Programme's results.

3. These TOR have been prepared by OED on the basis of preliminary documentation review and consultations conducted with the Programme Task Force (PTF) as well as key project stakeholders.

2   Background and Context of the Programme[1]

4. Developing countries, and especially least developed countries (LDC), are facing disproportionate impacts from climate change. Projected increases in temperatures, variability in precipitation and weather patterns, and the growing frequency of extreme events are and will be increasingly felt more in countries with strong dependence on the agriculture sectors for their economic development and livelihood options.

5. In response to the stronger need to consider medium- to long-term planning for climate change adaptation within the framework of national development priorities, the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process was established under the Cancun Adaptation Framework to promote political and financial support at national level for countries to mainstream climate change into development planning and budgeting. At the UNFCCC 17th Conference of the Parties (COP-17) in Durban, Parties adopted initial guidelines and principles for the NAP process. In addition, relevant organizations were requested to submit information on their support of the NAP process and to consider the establishment of NAP support programmes according to their respective mandates.

6. In this framework, FAO and UNDP, with the financial support of the International Climate Initiative (ICI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB, now BMU), launched the Programme "Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors in National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) UNFA/GLO/616/UND" (or "NAP-Ag"). The NAP-Ag programme started in 2015 and it is expected to end on September 30, 2020.

7. The Trust Fund agreement between BMUB and UNDP was signed on 5 December 2014 with a budget of EUR 10,000,000 and was then amended on 8 December 2015 with an additional contribution of EUR 5,000,000, bringing the total budget to EUR 15,000,000. FAO and UNDP signed a UN-to-UN Contribution Agreement in August 2015, which

---

[1] This section was elaborated based on the Programme Document (ProDoc)

was then amended in December 2016, to define the terms of collaboration between the two agencies.

8. The programme aimed to advance in the integration of climate change-related risks and opportunities into associated national and sectoral planning and budgeting processes, by enabling national decision makers such as national climate change focal points, Ministries of Agriculture, Planning and Finance and relevant line ministries (e.g. Water, Public Works, Energy Environment, Health, Women's Affairs and Forestry) to strengthen their capacities on climate change adaptation and agricultural issues.

9. The NAP-Ag programme has been providing support to eleven countries – seven developing countries (Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, and Uruguay) and four Least Developed Countries (Gambia, Nepal, Uganda and Zambia) - in building technical capacities to integrate key adaptation requirements for the agriculture sectors into sectoral and cross-sectoral planning and budgeting processes.

10. Ultimately, the programme was designed to contribute to i) setting the national adaptation agenda based on priorities related to the agricultural sectors in particular, ii) enhancing regional and global dialogue and cooperation on scaling up adaptation actions that have a bearing on food security and livelihoods; iii) integrating concerns and priorities into relevant national and sectoral planning and budgeting processes iv) accessing international climate finance; and v) creating synergies with ongoing projects, including ICI projects on eco-system based adaptation and unlocking innovative sources of climate finance that can support adaptation in the agriculture sectors.

11. The **overall objective** of the programme is "to integrate climate change concerns as they affect agricultural sector-based livelihoods into associated national and sectoral planning and budgeting processes".

12. **Outcome 1: Technical capacity and institution-building on NAPs strengthened.** Outcome 1 aimed to build the technical and institutional capacity of key Ministries such as Agriculture, Environment and Planning, Finance and disaster management agencies to assess and build on existing and mainstreaming adaptation priorities into their respective planning and budgeting processes. Establishing core curriculum and training programmes with a significant climate change adaptation component was one of the key-strategies.

13. **Outcome 2: Integrated roadmaps for NAPs developed**. The Outcome 2 focus was to lay the groundwork for countries to begin integrating climate change adaptation into development policies and strategies at the national and sub-national level, starting with agriculture as the key sector. Activities were planned to build on those of the UNDP/UNEP-led NAP-Global Support Program which has established a process to support LDCs and DCs on starting their respective NAP processes. This was done through training workshops, in-country consultations, and connecting country adaptation projects to international sources of climate finance. This intervention was based on the principle of building on existing tools and strategies and avoiding parallel processes.

14. **Outcome 3: Evidence-based results for NAPs improved.** The purpose of Outcome 3 activities is to enable Ministries of Agriculture to systematically learn about the

effectiveness of adaptation options that they implement. They included the development of an impact assessment framework and the conducting of sectoral and programme specific cost-benefit analyses of adaptation options in the agriculture sectors. Activities will draw on good practices including that of ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) experiences and case studies that are relevant to supporting resilient livelihoods for farmers and smallholders.

15. **Outcome 4: Advocacy and knowledge-sharing on NAPs promoted.** This outcome contributes to the consolidation of a knowledge-base on National Adaptation Planning by promoting the sharing of lessons learnt and best practices from activities under Outcome 1. Creation of knowledge products and outreach tools to disseminate lessons learnt and to facilitate sharing between target countries were part of the strategy, which also included annual global meetings for the sharing of countries' experiences and pilot projects testing adaptation options as a knowledge-base of how to assess these options.

16. Programme implementation is under the direction of a FAO-UNDP Global Programme Management Unit composed of staff from FAO Headquarters and UNDP – Global Environment Finance in Bangkok Regional Hub (BRH). In addition, a Programme Board has been established with representatives from BMU-ICI, UNDP and FAO to provide overall guidance and direction to the programme, and also be responsible for making decisions when high level strategic guidance is required. Programme implementation at country level is ensured through National Programme Coordinators hired by FAO and UNDP technical specialists.

2.1 Implementation status and results achieved to date

17. According to NAP-Ag's progress reports, key- achievements of the programme to date include:
    a. The programme has fostered the seeds of climate change adaptation-informed planning and budgeting in the agriculture sectors in 11 countries across Africa, Asia and Latin America;
    b. Partner countries have been support to formulate and adopt key national strategic frameworks on climate change, agriculture and development;
    c. Capacity development opportunities have been provided to over 2000 participants on gender, economics of climate change, monitoring and evaluation, etc.;
    d. Additional climate finance has been leveraged to further support development or implementation of climate change adaptation actions in countries;
    e. Several knowledge products, guidance and tools have been developed on climate change adaptation in agriculture sectors.

18. The RF updated with the latest information available on the progress on outputs is available on Appendix I.

19. Since mid-2019, closing workshops have been held in partner countries, with the main objectives of:

- Presenting and discussing in a participatory fashion the overall programme progress as well as the assessment of the achievements and programme outcomes and outputs.
- Reviewing and sharing of experiences and lessons learned (good practices and challenges faced). Discussing elements of success, and response strategies to cope with challenges and potential alternative approaches.
- Presenting and elaborating on exit strategies of the programme to ensure generated knowledge and capacity sustainably benefits the ongoing agriculture sectors adaptation processes.

20. Viet Nam, Uganda, Nepal, Zambia, Uruguay, Thailand and Kenya have already conducted workshops. Philippines will hold its final workshop in mid-December 2019, and The Gambia, Colombia and Guatemala's workshops are envisioned to happen in the following months. A terminal report is being elaborated for each country highlighting progresses and lessons learned, among other topics.

21. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) conducted by an independent consultant and managed by the FAO-UNDP Programme Task Force (PTF) between June and November 2017 concluded:
- The NAP-Ag is highly relevant, considering the CC risks to the agricultural sectors (and challenges at UNFCC to the NAP process recognize the need to better include these sectors) and the lack of other resources to supporting the incorporation of agriculture in the NAP process or for sectoral CCA planning in the country level. The NAP-Ag timing has been appropriate. However, considering the limited resources at country level (USD 700,000) the programme's goals are somewhat overambitious.
- The flexible design has respected countries' contexts, but some countries felt that there could have been greater tailoring of the global framework to the country's contexts and needs.
- Multiple agricultural sectors have been engaged in the NAP-Ag, but design might have adopted a framework for wider engagement and greater intersectoral dialogue for more comprehensive and representative NAPs and sectoral CCA plans. Clearer guidance on what the NAP "process" is could have helped ministries to better understand needed interministerial coordination arrangements.
- The mirroring the UNFCCC LEG NAP Technical Guidelines (LNG) approach worked well in Asian countries and could benefit LDCs in Africa; the identification of successful CCA practices also worked well and could benefit other countries.
- Most countries are undertaking gender sensitive initiatives and including other vulnerable groups in the framework
- Some indicators are difficult to gather data on, and M&E has not been easy for the team. A revised ToC could capture more accurately the actual and potential NAP-Ag achievements.
- Several notable achievements have been made, but delays out of control of the programme and date of implementation start at country level resulted in gap in terms of the desired outcomes achieved at country level. There was progress towards all the outcomes, in particular:
- Outcome 1: highly informative assessments of ministries' CCA planning knowledge and capacities conducted in the eight countries, workshops on gender mainstreaming and on CCA planning for agriculture organized and well received;

- Outcome 2: NAP-Ag helped countries to advance their agricultural sector CCA planning processes, by contributing to the formulation or revision of agricultural CCA strategies, in particular in Kenya, Philippines, Uganda, and Thailand
- Outcome 3: high quality training on Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) and Impact Evaluation were provided to assist countries in assessing adaptation options, though a challenge is that in many countries decision-making is frequently on political grounds, rather than on the evidence of benefits, which increases need to further training to obtain more funding.
- Outcome 4: At the global and regional levels, *organization of a* large number of communications and knowledge events, and the participation of NAP-AG in various CC fora exposed NAP-Ag to key audiences, and highlighted the importance of agricultural issues in UNFCCC and global climate adaptation discussions. Publications featuring NAP-Ag approaches, tools and lessons were also produced.
- There is good coordination and capacity between FAO and UNDP both at country and global level, but the UNDP institutional strengths could be more explored for increased inter-sectoral buy-in and collaboration on national level
- While it was still early to evaluate sustainability, it was possible to anticipate the following challenges and risks: political and institutional reforms and the gap countries face in resources for CCA in agriculture; actual implementation of policies and plans will be implemented in a truly participatory, multi-institutional arrangements will be truly participatory; lack of sufficient funding to continued CCA / NAP planning and implementation.

22. The MTR also offered the following (summarized) recommendations:
    - **R. 1 and 2.** Support/ guide agricultural ministries and relevant departments: (i) to outline the process for the submission and consolidation of UNFCCC LEG NAP Technical Guidelines (LNG) inputs for improved coordination among ministries and enhanced participation in the NAP process; (ii) on how the various data for the sub-sectors and data suggested in the LNG should eventually be linked and synthesized in the future to develop coherent, quality and uniform CCA plans (include the NAP entity);
    - **R. 3.** Actively engage private sector, NGOs and research institutions and the private sector into discussions on the NAP or sector plan process;
    - **R. 4.** Offer to support the NAP-formulating entity in facilitating discussions among the agricultural sectors to identify potential solutions and conflicts to be addressed for more effective and necessary cross-sectoral CCA solutions
    - **R. 5**. Ensure that funding proposals for resource mobilization for NAP and CCA planning include measures to address gaps identified
    - **R. 6.** Fully draw fully on UNDP's institutional comparative advantage to gain greater buy-in of the NAP-Ag and future resources for CCA; support Uganda and Zambia regarding CCA budgeting
    - **R. 7.** Continue to explore and introduce tailored tools
    - **R. 8.** In the development of M&E systems, adopt a new paradigm of adaptive M&E taking CC challenges into account
    - **R. 9.** Identify and take stock (along with multi-sector actors in different levels) of tested CCA good practice in the agricultural sector
    - **R.10.** For future programming, address the CC impacts on food security and the linkage of the latter with agriculture.

- **R. 11** For Colombia, Guatemala and the Gambia, review work plans offering the logical approach used in Asian countries
- **R. 12.** Ensure that gender is integrated right from the start and in all stages of planning by all involved in the NAP-Ag; emphasize women as agents of change;
- **R. 13.** Improve the peer to peer learning exchange tailoring its approach and configuration for the participants, theme and occasion.
- **R. 14**. Obtain a no-cost extension to guarantee full implementation (considering actual starting date)
- **R. 15**. Increase the integration between regional, country level and global teams for improved understanding and strategizing
- **R. 16.** Adopt a revised set of indicators for NAP-Ag programme M&E (suggestions were offered)
- **R. 17.** For future collaborative initiatives between FAO and UNDP, focus on improving efficiency in implementation, and ensure that the comparative advantage of each entity is truly used.

23. The Programme Team accepted or partially accepted the recommendations and established an action plan to implement those. The Management response can be consulted in Appendix 5.

3   Evaluation purpose

24. The FAO Governing Bodies have stressed the importance of the systematic evaluation of extra-budgetary work of the Organization. Since 2007, it has been a requirement that all projects with a budget above 4 Million USD must include a dedicated independent evaluation led by OED. NAP-Ag's total budget of over 15 million USD implies that an independent dedicated evaluation should be done.

25. On the one hand, the TE will have an accountability purpose and will provide evidence on how the resources have been used and what have been the main results achieved.

26. The TE will also document important lessons to guide future actions and serve as an input to improve formulation and implementation of initiatives that want to use similar approaches. Likewise, it will present strategic recommendations in order to maximize the institutionalization and ownership of the project's results by stakeholders and to disseminate information to authorities that could benefit from it.

27. The *primary intended users* of the evaluation are:

   – FAO, Programme Team, members of Project Task Force (PTF) in the FAO Headquarters and regional offices and technical divisions, that will use the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation to finalize project activities; plan for sustainability of results achieved; improve formulation and implementation of similar projects at national and global levels.
   – UNDP, Programme Team, Climate Change Adaptation Team in regional offices and other BMU-IKI funded programmes, that will also use the findings and recommendations to finalize project activities; plan for the sustainability of results achieved: improve formulation and implementation of similar projects at national and global levels.

- The BMU, NAP-Ag's main donor, which will use the evaluation results for accountability, as well as could draw on lessons from this programme to orient their funding and implementation decisions of future similar initiatives.
- The Governments of the recipient countries, their line Ministries and Decentralised entities involved in the formulation and implementation of National Agricultural Strategies and Policies
- Other partners, development partners, Non-governmental Organizations and civil society involved in the sector.

4 Evaluation scope and objectives

28. The evaluation will cover the whole period of NAP-Ag implementation (from August 2015 to September 2020) and will cover all the countries where NAP-Ag was implemented.

29. The Final Evaluation will look at the alignment of the intervention to overarching global objectives, to the strategic objectives of the implementing organizations and to those of the recipient governments; assess its relevance, the achievement and sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results (progress to impact). This evaluation also should identify lessons learned and provide recommendations to its users and potential audience (above-described).

30. The TE will assess whether the efforts were efficient to achieve planned outputs and the four planned outcomes.

31. Achievement of results, in the case of NAP-Ag, quite extensively depends on the targeted countries' conditions and capacity to implement the activities and move forward with political articulations and negotiations necessary to elaborate policies and plans. Taking this into account, particular emphasis will be put in understanding contextual issues (out of control of implementation team) which may have contributed to or hindered NAP-Ag's implementation.

32. Particular attention also will be put in identifying unexpected institutional outcomes or milestones along the planned NAP-Ag's change pathway. By institutional outcomes or milestones we understand "significant (within context) and observable change in norms, policies, plans, agendas, which were actively and voluntarily done by a country's institutions". More details can be consulted in the methodology section of these ToR.

33. Following the principle that evaluations should be useful, and as requested by the FAO Programme Team, in particular, the evaluation will focus on the following topics:

- The added value of the NAP-Ag design as a global programme
- The contribution of NAP-Ag to the recognition of the importance of integrating agriculture in the climate change adaptation planning agenda and of adaptation planning in agriculture
- The relevance / adequacy of FAO's support, taking into account the support that FAO can provide, the support that FAO has provided in the NAP-Ag. The identification of new services which should be provided by FAO.

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation Questions
1 Alignment and Relevance	**1. Was the NAP-Ag design appropriate for delivering the ultimate objective of "Climate change concerns as they affect agricultural sector-based livelihoods are integrated in associated national and sectoral planning and budgeting processes" and the planned outcomes?** **1.1.** What is the added value of the NAP-Ag design as a global programme? **1.2**. To what extent FAO and UNDP's support to targeted countries has been relevant? (How) did the programme design respond to the needs, priorities and capacities of the programme's main counterparts at national level? (e.g. Ministries of Agriculture and Environment, UNFCCC country focal points, etc.) **1.3** (How) did the programme design respond to the needs and priorities of the programme's main counterparts at global level (e.g. UNFCCC)? **1.4** To what extent was the technical support provided by FAO relevant to the countries? **1.5** To what extent were UNDP and FAO's comparative advantages and existing complementarities with other partners taken into account in the project design? **1.6** To what extent were gender equality considerations and Human Rights reflected in programme design? **1.7** To what extent was the geographical targeting of the NAP-Ag pertinent? **1.8** To what extent is the programme's results framework/log-frame (i.e. theory of change, intervention logic, indicators, etc.) appropriate to reach the programme's goal and objectives?
3 Effectiveness	**2. To what extent (and how) has the programme contributed to the integration of agriculture in national adaptation plans and sectoral planning and budgeting processes?** 2.1 Outcome 1. To what extent did the programme contribute to strengthen countries' capacities and institutional environment to advance the NAP process and to scale up adaptation, in particular with regards to the agriculture sectors? 2.2. Outcome 2. How effective has the programme been in integrating or paving the way to integrate climate change adaptation into development policies and strategies at the national and sub-national level, starting with agriculture as the key sector? 2.3. Outcome 3. To what extent was the programme able to support the countries in improving the **evidence base** to enable countries to

	systematically learn about the effectiveness of adaptation options that they implement, in particular in the agriculture sector? 2.4. Outcome 4. To what extent was the programme able to support the consolidation of a knowledge-base on National Adaptation Planning by promoting the sharing of lessons learnt and best practices? 2.5 To what extent were gender equality issues and Human Rights mainstreamed and addressed in the programme implementation? To what extent has the programme contributed to increased likelihood in the planning for and uptake of gender-responsive adaptation options? 2.6 Applicable to all the effectiveness questions: To what extent was the programme able to build on existing/ongoing countries' conditions (resources, plans, capacities, norms, processes) to achieve the outcomes? 2.7. Applicable to all the effectiveness questions: Which and to what extent other factors, actors or initiatives have contributed or hindered the achievement of the Programme's results?
	3. How and to what extent did the programme contribute to supporting climate change adaptation planning efforts at national, regional and global (UNFCCC) processes level? 3.1 To what extent did the programme contribute to supporting countries to translate UNFCCCC NAP related objectives to the country level, in particular with regards to integrating agriculture? 3.2. To what extent did the programme contribute to facilitating country experience sharing at the global level in UNFCCC processes? 3.3. Applicable to all the effectiveness questions: Which and to what extent other factors, actors or initiatives have contributed or hindered the achievement of the Programme's results? 3.4 To what extent did the programme results link to relevant SDG indicators/targets?
4. Efficiency and Coordination	**4. To what extent management arrangements were appropriate to deliver efficiently the programme?** 4.1. To what extent were the management arrangements and governance structure of the project adapted to deliver the attended results in an efficient manner? 4.2. How/how much have the partnerships built contributed to the results? 4.3. To what extent has the management been able to adapt to changing conditions to improve project implementation? 4.4. Were the project monitoring and the MTR used / useful to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation?

5 Sustainability	**5. To what extent are the results achieved by the programme sustainable?** 5.1 What are the prospects for the country -partners, to sustain the results achieved after the completion when the BMU support and Nap-Ag ends? 5.2 Which, how and to what extent contextual factors/actors could threaten the sustainability of the project's results and the further development of such results? (taking into consideration the cross-cutting programming principles of: capacity development, gender equality, environmental and economic sustainability, and inter-institutional ministries coordination) 5.3 To what extent have national and global stakeholders owned NAP-Ag's processes and progresses? Which factors have contributed to or hindered the countries' capacity to own the NAP-Ag process?
6 Progress towards Impact	**6 To what extent has NAP-Ag project contributed to the overall goal of "Climate change concerns as they affect agricultural sector-based livelihoods are integrated in associated national and sectoral planning and budgeting processes**?
7. Lessons learned (cross cutting)	**7. Which lessons can be learned from the design and implementation of the NAP-Ag programme, taking into account its specific design, which could inform similar initiatives?**

6   Methodology

34. The evaluation will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards[2] and will be in line with the OED Manual and methodological guidelines and practices. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the process.

35. The evaluation will also follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The evaluation team members are responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation cycle (preparation and design, data collection, data analysis, reporting).

36. These ToR suggest an overall methodological approach that could be adopted to address the main evaluation questions. The evaluation matrix, which will be developed by the ET in consultation with the Evaluation Manager (EM), will present the sub-questions to be addressed by the evaluation and refine the methodology as well as the methods and tools selected to collect data/evidence to answer them[3]. The evaluation will be results-focused, and triangulation of evidence and information gathered will

---

[2] http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21

[3] The inception report, which will include the evaluation matrix, will be the first product to be delivered by the ET.

underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

6.1 Evaluation approach:

37. Taking into account that the field activities in the country level will likely have been finalized in late 2019, but that the Global Programme persists until December 2020, the evaluation will adopt a phased approach.

38. OED will attend the closing workshops in the Philippines and also potentially in The Gambia, Colombia and/or Guatemala), in order to take advantage of the reunion of partners; whenever possible, a data-collection workshop will be organized.

39. Additional field work plus the global level analysis will be carried on in 2020 along with the Evaluation Team to be recruited.

40. A potential limitation to this evaluation's results is the (lack of) availability of country teams in countries where field activities have already been closed Viet Nam, Uganda, Nepal, Zambia, Uruguay, Thailand and Kenya). While this will be taken into account when planning for the country-visits, however, it should not limit the Evaluation Team's efforts to interview key-stakeholders, with the support of UNDP and FAO country offices, in order to have the most comprehensive sample possible.

41. This evaluation will adopt a qualitative approach. Qualitative data-collection methods and content analysis will be used to identify, analyse and interpret evaluation findings. In particular, there should be attention to the following topics which will require specific tools and frameworks:

42. **Evaluation of policy influence:** Specific tools and frameworks will be used to identify and describe outcomes and milestones in all the countries where NAP-Ag was implemented. These can include Outcome Harvesting, RAPID Outcome Assessment and analytical frameworks specifically designed to evaluate initiatives that, like NAP-Ag, aim to build capacity and influence institutional / policy change.

43. The evaluation will primarily focus on identifying expected/planned and unexpected/unplanned outcomes and the key-contributions of NAP-Ag to those. It will also take into account the existence and influence of other "players" in the field (seeking to influence the same actors in the same or related topics).

44. Whether and how contextual dynamics and factors have contributed or hindered the achievement of project results will also be assessed.

45. The aspects above will help evaluation team to, in particular, analyze NAP-Ags ToC, seeking to understand which aspects of it were confirmed or challenged by the circumstances, resources, capacities etc found along the implementation, in particular its assumptions.

46. **Evaluating Gender:** The evaluation team will assess how gender has been taken into account in the design and during the implementation of the project. FAO's Policy on Gender Equality http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf will constitute an important base for the evaluation. In addition, the Guidelines for assessing gender mainstreaming http://www.fao.org/3/a-bd714e.pdf developed by OED will be used by the team. Particular attention will be devoted to four FAO's Gender Equality Objectives:

i) Equal decision-making; ii) Equal access to productive resources; iii) Equal access to goods and services for agricultural development, and markets; iv) Reduction of women's work burden. The evaluation should also take into account the NAP Global Network Gender Criteria4

47. **Evaluating Capacity Development:** Given the nature of the project that places a strong emphasis on capacity development, FAO's OED Capacity Development Evaluation Framework will also constitute an important framework for analysis.

6.2. Data-collection methods

48. **Desk-review:** an extensive review of documents produced by the programme and the partner-countries will be a key-source of information to the inception phase and, ultimately, to answer to **all the evaluation questions**. It will include, for example:

- programme document
- progress and interim reports,
- NAP-Ag national terminal reports,
- BTO reports,
- conference documents,
- briefing notes,
- technical analyses such as CBA, Vulnerability Assessment, MOSAICC etc,
- policy/planning/roadmap documents,
- NAP-Ag case studies,
- national lessons learnt reports,
- closing workshop presentations and reports;
- communication and outreach materials.

49. **Semi-structured interviews (SSI) and Focus Group discussions** with key stakeholders and other informants that were involved in the project design and/or implementation will serve to collect primary data to develop the inception report and to answer to **all the evaluation questions.** Interviews will be supported by checklists and/or interview protocols to be developed by the ET at the beginning of the evaluation. They will be conducted in person (during country-visits) or over Skype.

50. **Workshops/writeshops** will gather country staff and close partners actively involved in the programme implementation to identify and describe key-outcomes or milestones achieved in selected- countries.

51. **An online questionnaire** will be distributed to key-stakeholders of targeted countries which will not be visited.

52. A detailed list of stakeholders to participate of the evaluation as informants will be elaborated by the ET. At minimum, representatives of the following stakeholders will be included:

---

4   http://napglobalnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/napgn-en-2017-a-framework-for-gender-responsive-nap-processes.pdf

Targeted Countries	- Ministry of Agriculture or the lead-national institution implementing the NAP-Ag programme - Other Ministries and government institutions involved at national level (e.g. national agencies and authorities, research institutes, climate change committee) - NGOs / CSOs - Universities
FAO	- FAO-UNDP Global Programme Management Unit (NAP-Ag team at FAO-HQ) - NAP-Ag country teams and consultants involved in the programme implementation - FAO Regional offices representatives involved in the NAP-Ag
UNDP	- FAO-UNDP Global Programme Management Unit - UNDP Regional Hub officers involved with NAP-Ag - UNDP NAP-Ag country teams - UNDP country officers involved with NAP-Ag
BMU and IKI	Project Managers
International organizations, initiatives committees and funds/donors (including UN agencies)	e.g. GiZ, UNEP, UNFCCC, UNITAR, Adaptation committee

53. **Country visits** will be done to technically assess and analyse project implementation and outcomes, using data-collection techniques such as **stakeholder workshops, SSI** and **online questionnaires**. Purposeful sampling strategies will be applied to identify and select 3 - 4 countries to answer the evaluation questions related to **relevance, results, impact, sustainability, gender and capacity development**, **efficiency and coordination and lessons learned.**

54. The criteria for the selection of countries will be further jointly defined by the ET and the project team and detailed in the inception report. Given the broad coverage of the programme and the available budget, as well as different implementation processes, the ET will focus on NAP-Ag's results at global level and conduct in-country case studies in 3-4 targeted-countries drawn from all the regions covered and to be confirmed in the early stage of the evaluation.

55. The criteria for the choice of countries are: i) Mix of LDCs and developing countries ii) regional balance (iii) progress of the NAP process in the country; (iV) availability of country teams and partners (v) other data availability.

56. The evaluation will take into account contextual challenges and other limitations out of control of the Project team, in particular to assess **results, progress to impact and sustainability, efficiency and coordination and lessons learned.**

57. The evaluation approach and methodology, including rational and description for the data collection and analysis will be fully developed by the Evaluation Team and presented under a dedicated section in the inception report.

The inception report will also entail:
- A **stakeholder analysis**,
- The **Evaluation Matrix** – listing evaluation questions, subquestions, indicators, methods and information sources
- The **site mapping and sampling**: information about how sites have been selected for field visits
- **Limitations and risks**, **timeline** and **deliverables**

7   Roles and responsibilities

This section describes the different roles that key stakeholders play in the design and implementation of the evaluation in the case of OED-led evaluation and in the case of decentralised evaluations.

1. The **Office of Evaluation (OED)**, in particular the Evaluation Manager (EM) has developed this ToR from documentation review and from discussions held with the Programme Task Force (PTF). This ToR will be reviewed and will benefit from inputs by the BH, the FAO-UNDP Programme Task Force, and the UNDP Evaluation Office.

2. In addition, the BH and LTO will assist the EM, in the identification of the consultants and the organization of the mission. EM is responsible for the finalization of the ToR and of the identification of the evaluation team members. EM shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations in the evaluation report.

3. OED also has a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the MR.

4. The **FAO-UNDP Programme Task Force (PTF),** which includes the FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO), and the UNDP Lead Technical Specialist on NAPs responsible for programme management, are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the first version of the Terms of Reference, especially the description of the background and context chapter, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, as necessary, make available information and documentation, and comment on the terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the PTF will depend on respective roles and participation in the project. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO and others members of the PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.

5. The **Evaluation Team (ET)** is responsible for further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation, and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Evaluation Team Leader (ETL), will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process,

based on the template provided by OED. The ET will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the EM, consults the BH and PTF where necessary. The ET is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Governments involved or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

6. The ETL guides and coordinates the ET members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.

7. The tasks of the ETL and ET members will be further developed in the individual TORs.

8   Evaluation team composition and profile

8. The evaluation team will comprise two consultants: a team leader and a team members. As a whole, the evaluation team will have expertise in

   - Multi-country Evaluation / Project/Programme management;
   - Climate change adaptation and enabling policies (and corresponding policy development processes);
   - Agriculture and agricultural policies (and corresponding policy development processes);
   - Capacity assessment and development;
   - Gender and social inclusion (in particular, gender mainstreaming);
   - Economics of climate change

9. Regarding methods, the team should have joint proven experience in qualitative data-collection and analysis, data-collection and analytical tools and frameworks to evaluate policy influence, and results-based management evaluation.

10. All the team members should be highly aware of gender equality considerations in the agricultural and climate change context and they should be familiar with FAO's Gender Policy.

11. The team leader would need a minimum of 10 years of professional experience and other team member (s) with at least 7 years, or equivalent level of competence, in their respective areas of specialization. All will possess excellent communications, both oral and written, in English[5]. At least one team member will have working-level communications skills in Spanish.

12. The team members should be independent. They should not have been involved in the design and execution of the project or in advisory activities related to any aspect of the project.

13. Furthermore, to the extent possible, the ET will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

---

[5] Please notice that according to FAO Human Resources policy, non-native speakers of UN languages must present a language certificate or have concluded masters or phd (written) in an UN language.

9   Evaluation products (deliverables)

14. The evaluation team will be accountable for producing the following deliverables:

- **Evaluation inception report:** the inception report should include the evaluation matrix; an elaboration of the methodology based on the evaluation matrix and the initial methodology proposed in these TORs; sample and sampling criteria; an analysis of the main stakeholders to be interviewed by the team; an indicative programme for the data collection including sites to be visited; the main evaluation tools (interview guides, online questionnaire design, workshop plans and tools etc). An inception meeting would be organized to discuss the inception report and facilitate finalization of the methodology, timeline, and deliverables.

- **Draft evaluation report:** OED will review the draft zero of the evaluation report submitted by the evaluation team to ensure it meets OED's quality standards and criteria. The draft evaluation report will then be circulated to the project team and stakeholders for comments before finalization; suggestions will be incorporated by the evaluation team when considered pertinent.

- **Final evaluation report:** The report should include an executive summary. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs, following the OED template for report writing. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. A template table of contents for the final report is on **Annex 3**

- **Presentation** of evaluation key-findings, conclusions and recommendations at a debriefing session with the Project team on a data/occasion to be further defined.

15. The outline of the deliverables will be discussed and agreed with the team at the beginning of the evaluation process and reviewed, if necessary, along the way.

10 Evaluation timeframe

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which evaluators or the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office, indicating for each the due date or time-frame (e.g. briefings, draft report, final report), as well as who is responsible for its completion.

Task	Dates	Responsibility (for OED-managed)
ToR finalization	November 2019	EM with inputs from PTF and UNPD Evaluation Office
Mission to the Philippines	16-18 December 2019	EM
Team identification and recruitment	December 2019/January 2020	EM
Reading background documentation provided by PTF	February 2020	ET
Briefing of ET	February 2020	EM
Organization of the Evaluation Mission (travel arrangements, meetings arrangements with project stakeholders and partners, field visits, etc.)	February 2020	PTF
Evaluation mission	March 2020	ET
Evaluation Report first draft for circulation	April 2020	ET and EM for comments and quality control
Evaluation Report final draft for circulation	May 2020	ET and EM for comments and quality control
Validation of the recommendations	May 2020	ET to the PTF, with help of EM
Final Report, including publishing and graphic design	June 2020	EM
Management Response	1 month after the Final report is issued	BH
Follow-up report	1 year after the MR is issued	BH

Annexes

Annex I – Implementation progress (Outputs) – updated until 31 December 2018

Output I: Technical capacity and institution-building on NAPs strengthened					
Indicator I.1: Proportion of technical staff and public service officers supporting agriculture-based livelihood adaptation in relevant ministries trained in national adaptation planning and budgeting, including the technical aspects of formulating roadmaps, and conducting economics of adaptation assessments.	Unit N. technical staff	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value Variable	Achieved value at in the reporting period (2018 only)	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period (cumulative)
	Zambia	No data	120	126	214
	Kenya	321	120	60	195
	Uganda	No data	120	49	315
	Viet Nam	No data	90	362 (124f, 238m)	689
	Nepal	616	90	30 (5f, 25m)	57
	Philippines	38	90	86 (52f, 34m)	212
	Thailand	No data	90	66 (40f, 26m)	212
	Uruguay	148	90	478 (226f, 252m)	838
	Gambia	n.a.	60	269 (46f, 223m)	269
	Colombia	No data	60	462 (200f, 262m)	721
	Guatemala	n.a.	60	192 (19f, 173m)	245
Output II: Integrated roadmaps for NAPs developed					
Indicator II.1: Number of national and subnational planning and budgeting roadmaps formulated taking gender into account to guide the process of integrating climate change concerns affecting livelihoods into the agriculture sector.	Unit N. roadmaps	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period	
	Zambia	0	1	1	
	Kenya	0	1	1	
	Uganda	0	1	1	
	Viet Nam	1	1		

	Unit	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period
	Nepal	1	1	1
	Philippines	1	1	1
	Thailand	0	1	1
	Uruguay	1	1	In progress
	Gambia	n.a.	1	In progress
	Colombia	0	1	In progress
	Guatemala	n.a.	1	In progress
				1
Indicator II.2: Number of target institutions with increased technical capacity to manage adverse impacts of climate change on agriculture-based livelihoods.	Unit	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period
	N. institutions		Variable*	
	Zambia	0	5	3
	Kenya	0	5	7
	Uganda	0	5	1
	Viet Nam	0	5	12
	Nepal	0	5	5
	Philippines	0	5	2
	Thailand	0	5	1
	Uruguay	0	5	18
	Gambia	n.a.	5	No tangible evidence yet
	Colombia	0	5	
	Guatemala	n.a.	5	No tangible evidence yet
				4
Indicator II.3: Assessment methodology for medium term and annual budget climate change adaptation relevant expenditure for the agriculture sector demonstrated in at least 4 countries	Unit	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period
	Country		Assessment methodology demonstrated in at least 4 countries	
	Zambia	0		-
	Kenya	0		-
	Uganda	0		-
	Viet Nam	0		-
	Nepal	0		Completed

	Philippines	0		In progress
	Thailand	0		-
	Uruguay	0		-
	Gambia	0		In progress
	Colombia	0		To be carried out in 2019
	Guatemala	0		-

Output III: Evidence-based results for NAPs improved

Indicator III.1 Number of Ministries of Agriculture where impact evaluation or M&E frameworks for adaptation in the agriculture sector are demonstrated	Unit	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period
	N. Ministries		Variable*	
	Zambia	0	1	1
	Kenya	1	1	In progress
	Uganda	0	1	1
	Viet Nam	0	1	1
	Nepal	0	1	In progress
	Philippines	1	1	In progress
	Thailand	0	1	In progress
	Uruguay	1	1	2
	Gambia	n.a.	1	-
	Colombia	1	1	In progress
	Guatemala	n.a.	1	1

Output IV: Advocacy and knowledge-sharing on NAPs promoted

Indicator IV.1: Number of best practices and lessons learned taking into account gender dimensions, from the programme disseminated.	Unit	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period
	N. best practices & lessons learned	0	4 national exchange consultations and 8 case studies shared per country	12 National exchange consultations in which good practices and lessons learned on adaptation were shared

		(see table below) Philippines case study[6]

Source: NAP-Ag's Interim report 2018 – submitted on 30 June 2019

---

[6] FAO & UNDP. 2018. *Integrating Agriculture in National Adaptation Plans Case Study – The Philippines*, Rome. http://www.fao.org/3/CA3024EN/ca3024en.pdf

Annex II – Programme's Outcomes, outputs and indicators

Planned outcome: Climate change concerns as they affect agricultural sector-based livelihoods are integrated in associated national and sectoral planning and budgeting processes.

Outcome indicator 0.1: 22 gender sensitive adaptation action areas prioritised by the agriculture sectors and commenced implementation in the context of existing national and subnational development frameworks.	Unit	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value (additional to baseline value)	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period (additional to baseline value)
	Zambia	8	2	In progress
	Kenya	7	2	4
	Uganda	4	2	8
	Viet Nam	6	2	8
	Nepal	7	2	2
	Philippines	4	2	10
	Thailand	2	2	In progress
	Uruguay	7	2	2
	Gambia	n.a.[7]	2	In progress
	Colombia	9	2	5
	Guatemala	n.a.	2	4
Outcome indicator 0.2: Medium term and annual budget for the agriculture sector adjusted to accommodate requirements for addressing climate change concerns	Unit	Baseline (start of project)	Final Target value	Achieved value at the end of the reporting period
	No. of assessments in selected countries	0	Assessment demonstrated in 3-4 countries	In progress

---

[7] Not available (n.a.) – as baseline assessments are still ongoing, but will inform 2019 reporting.

	Planned date of achievement according to project proposal
	Currently planned date of achievement
	(Project Closure) June-December 2019

Annex 3 – Table of Contents template for the TE Report

Contents

Acknowledgements

Acronyms and abbreviations

Executive Summary (including Project Summary table, Evaluation Rating, Summary Table including rating scales + Rating Project Performance table - see Annex 4)

ANNEX 4: Project Summary Table, Evaluation Rating & Rating Scales

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:				
GEF Project ID:			_at endorsement (Million US$)_	_at completion (Million US$)_
UNDP Project ID:		GEF financing:		
Country:		IA/EA own:		
Region:		Government:		
Focal Area:		Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:		Total Project Cost:		
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:

Evaluation Ratings:

The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.   The obligatory rating scales are included in the Rating Scales provided in this document

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

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	**Rating**	**Comments**
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	**Rating**	**Comments**
Overall quality of M&E	(rate 6pt. scale)	
M&E design at project start-up	(rate 6pt. scale)	
M&E at implementation	(rate 6pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of project implementation/ execution	(rate 6pt. scale)	
Implementing agency execution	(rate 6pt. scale)	
Executing agency execution	(rate 6pt. scale)	
Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of project outcomes	(rate 6pt. scale)	
Relevance: Relevant (R), Not Relevant (NR)	(rate 2pt. scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6pt. scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6pt. scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U)		
Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Financial resources	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Institutional framework and governance	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Environmental	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental status improvement	(rate 3pt. scale)	
Environmental stress reduction	(rate 3pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3pt. scale)	
Overall project results	(rate 6pt. scale)	

RATING SCALES:		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	*Sustainability ratings:*	*Relevance ratings*
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability	2. Relevant (R)
5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings	3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks	1.. Not relevant (NR)
4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks	
3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings	1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	*Impact Ratings:*

2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems		3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A		

ANNEX 5: Management Response to the Midterm Review

Management response to the Midterm Review of the project 'Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAP-Ag)'[8]

Project Title: Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into
National Adaptation Plans (NAP-Ag)
Project PIMS #: 5246
Midterm Review Mission Completion Date: 13 March 2018
Date of Issue of Management Response: 19 March 2018
Prepared by: UNDP-FAO Global Programme Management Unit
Contributors: Country Teams, Technical Advisors, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor
Cleared by: UNDP-FAO Global Programme Management Unit, UNDP-GEF RTA, Project Board

Context, background and findings

1. Least developed and developing countries are facing disproportionate impacts from climate change. Increases in temperatures and the variability in precipitation, weather patterns and the increased frequency of extreme events are and will be increasingly felt most in countries with strong dependence on the agriculture sectors for economic development and livelihood options. In response to the growing need to consider medium- to long-term planning for climate change adaptation within the framework of national development priorities, the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process was established under the Cancun Adaptation Framework to promote political and financial support at the national level for countries to mainstream climate change into development planning.

   This project responds to the UNFCCC Draft Conclusions FCCC/SBI/2013/L.10/Add.1 and SBI/2014/L.19, inviting UN organizations, specialized agencies, and bilateral organizations to enhance financial and technical support to the NAP process for developing countries. The project is also consistent with the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) draft conclusions on adaptation issues related to agriculture (SBSTA/2014/L.14) which emphasizes the importance of identifying and assessing agricultural practices and technologies to enhance productivity in a sustainable manner, as well as risks and vulnerability of such systems to climate change scenarios at regional, national and local levels.

   This project is implemented by UNDP, with FAO as a responsible party. The goal of this project is to integrate climate change concerns related to agriculture-based livelihoods into existing national planning and budgeting processes of 11 countries to assist them in building technical capacities to integrate key adaptation requirements for the agriculture sectors into sectoral and cross-sectoral planning and budgeting processes. These countries include a cohort of four LDCs (the Gambia, Nepal, Uganda and Zambia) and seven non-LDCs (Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, and Uruguay).

---

[8] This template is in alignment with the Management Response Template for UNDP project-level evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

The goal is based on four different outcomes:
a)   strengthened technical capacity and institution-building on NAPs;
b)   development of integrated roadmaps for NAPs;
c)   improved evidence-based results for NAPs; and
d)   strengthened advocacy and knowledge-sharing on NAPs.

Initially the project targeted eight countries, and subsequently received a top up in funding from the donor (in early 2016) whereby three more countries and activities were added to the original framework of outcomes of the programme to provide a greater focus on gender, peer to peer exchange and leveraging of climate finance.

Since its inception, the NAP-Ag Programme has been instrumental in translating global decisions to national level activities, and at the same time, feeding lessons learned back to the global processes. This has been demonstrated through meetings of the UNFCCC´s Adaptation Committee, the Least Developed Countries (LDC) Expert Group (LEG), Technical Examination Process on Adaptation and more recently, connecting to MRV of adaptation related issues under the Standing Committee on Finance. Significant work has also been ongoing in countries to ensure alignment of in-country activities on Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) and NAP support. Through the two implementing agencies (FAO and UNDP), the programme is also playing a growing role in assisting agricultural ministries in countries to connect to climate change adaptation financing such NAP Readiness funding through the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

2. The purpose of the MTR was to assess its intervention logic, progress made toward the achievement of stated outcomes and identifying emerging results. Also, the exercise aimed at identifying gaps in the implementation and providing forward looking recommendations to addressing gaps and strengthening the project's delivery. In doing so it was intended to provide the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) (Donor), the UNDP-FAO Global Programme Management Unit (PMU?), and programme participating countries with practical recommendations to achieve the programme objectives by the conclusion of the Project and as planned in the programme document..

3. The MTR provides ratings on the programme's performance, based on 11 criteria. The ratings range from moderately unsatisfactory/unlikely (2), to moderately satisfactory (6), satisfactory (2) and highly satisfactory (1). Of the 11 criteria, two received the lowest ratings including 'Outcome 3' and 'Sustainability'. As a result, a response has been outlined below.

Outcome 3 was rated "moderately unsatisfactory". The review notes that '*the CBA training activities have been or are soon to be completed in the countries, indicating that an important milestone for the Outcome has been achieved*', and that '*pre-training workshops for IE were carried out and based on several governments' response to the method*'. It then concludes that '*the methods are too complex and simpler ones incorporating a range of criteria are needed*', praising the example of Thailand, where multi-criteria analysis was used as an alternative to CBA (cost-benefit analysis). The Agencies agree that the tools are complex and sophisticated but disagree with the conclusion suggesting scaling back of these activities. Firstly, the purpose of these activities is to build capacity for national and sub-national decision making. Secondly, the usefulness of applying economic appraisal tools and methods has been reiterated by economic decision makers in finance ministries and globally in the UNFCCC NAP technical guidelines.

The Agencies, therefore, argue for a different conclusion suggesting instead that greater attention and investment need to be made under the remainder of this programme to improve uptake of economic tools such as CBA and IE (impact evaluation) which are seen as central to prioritization of adaptation options under the NAP process. In the remainder of the project period, the agencies will connect the CBA and IE work to country cases and project proposal development that involve strengthening countries' incentives to apply these tools. Regarding impact evaluation, the agencies agree that it is complex, and plan to continue pursuing it in the countries that have expressed interest and propose follow-up capacity development activities. In addition, there is interest in diversifying activities in other countries that are interested in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities more broadly. Therefore, the Agencies are of the opinion that the programme has already diversified its strategy to ensure it is fulfilling country needs. Indeed, in the spirit of country ownership, it has broadened its support to those countries that are more interested in M&E as opposed to IE.

Similarly, the Agencies disagree with the rating given to the program's 'sustainability', which was deemed "moderately unlikely". For the purpose of this review, sustainability is defined as the prospects for sustaining and scaling up the programme's results after the termination of the programme. The programme has supported the development and/or adoption of key adaptation and sectoral planning instrument such as the National Adaptation Plan and Climate Smart Agriculture Framework of Kenya, the Agriculture NAP of Uganda, the revised Climate Change Strategy of Thailand, which are an integral part of the countries' institutional frameworks and, as such, will ensure the sustainability of outcomes. Besides, the knowledge and data developed through the program has been instrumental for countries to secure resources for adaptation planning beyond the project life-cycle. Namely, the program is currently supporting Thailand and Vietnam in accessing funds through UNDP, Philippines through UNDP and FAO, and will be contributing to mobilize resources for NAP in Uganda and Zambia with the Global Water Partnership (GWP) and the Gambia with the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) or a national delivery partner. Knowledge and data acquired through the NAP-Ag form an integral part of the baseline analysis supporting the formulation of said proposals and is freely available to the participating countries beyond the end of the project, supporting the sustainability of the capacity developed, also after the program completion.

In general, while recognizing the value of the MTR exercise, both UNDP and FAO note the usefulness of some recommendations but express reservations towards some methodological and factual elements, and more broadly the relevance of a number of findings, conclusions and recommendations of the review.

4. Overall, the MTR found the programme's objective to be highly relevant, timely and highly useful for countries, although noting the limitations in its budget, consequently making its scope overambitious (p6). Despite such recognition, the MTR then provides a set of 17 recommendations suggesting a revised strategy to improve the strategic relevance of the programme, through various proposed additional activities. The Agencies commit to ensure that the recommendations, where agreed upon, will be addressed in the next phase of the programme.

Recommendations and management response

Midterm Review recommendation 1. To improve the inter-institutional coordination among the relevant ministries and enhance their participation in the NAP process (or for MOA departments involved in the formulation of an agriculture CCA plan) the NAP-Ag should offer support to the ministries to outline the process for the submission and consolidation of LNG inputs. This "institutional roadmap" development support should include all the relevant agricultural ministries (i.e. agriculture, fisheries, forestry, land, livestock, water and gender) and agriculture departments, with staff at both the senior and technical levels involved.

Management response: The Agencies partially accept the recommendation. In every country, the NAP-Ag has involved all agricultural subsectors, and in many cases representatives from different departments are members of the national project steering committee. Furthermore, every country has different coordination mechanisms in place and, through the Programme, FAO has recently published supplementary guidelines on how institutional arrangements for NAPs in the agriculture sectors. However, the Agencies similarly recognize the value of providing additional guidance to the counties in the form of "institutional roadmap".

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking[9]	
			Comments	Status [10]
1.1 Develop an explicit NAP road-map development guidance for the Agriculture sectors with clear understanding of institutional roles of Ministries of Agriculture and central NAP coordination ministries	December 2018	UNDP-FAO Global Programme Management Unit (PMU)		
1.2 Map inter-institutional coordination for NAP design and implementation and identify gaps	December 2018	Country PMUs		
1.3 Sensitize relevant ministries on this guidance at country level through a webinar	June 2019	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
1.4 Finalize roadmaps or other strategic documents that can serve as roadmaps in each country, that carry elements of the guidance as appropriate to country needs	June 2019 (8 initial countries) March 2020 (3 new countries)	Country PMUs		

Midterm Review recommendation 2. Recognizing that the programme has not aimed to develop a full NAP in any country, the NAP-Ag should provide guidance to all the agricultural ministries and departments and to the NAP entity on how the various data (i.e. socio-economic and food security-related, capacity stocktakings, R/VA assessments, climate projections, analyses of adaptation options, consultations with resource users, tested CCA practices, existing adaptation actions, priorities and other relevant information) for the sub-sectors and suggested in the LNG should eventually be linked and synthesized in the future to develop coherent, quality and uniform CCA plans.

Management response: The Agencies partially accept the recommendation. Firstly, the guidance referred to in the recommendation has already been widely shared partly through the NAP Supplement on Agriculture. In addition, the 2018 workplan contains the delivery of a guidance on NAP road-map development which will be part of a NAP Handbook, which builds on the results of the MOOC and will include almost all elements mentioned. The teams do agree, however, that the mapping on available data and analysis, and roles and responsibilities could be integrated in the stock-taking exercise. It should also be noted that food security is within the purview of this programme.

---

[9] If the MTR is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC).

[10] Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
2.1 Include guidance on use of data and information for adaptation planning into the NAP road-map guidance	Q4 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
2.2 Ensure that the Handbook includes all the LNG relevant elements	Q4 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 3. The NAP-Ag in coordination with the ministry responsible for the NAP and/or agriculture CCA plan should more actively engage producer organizations, research institutions and the private sector, including those representing women's and marginalized peoples' concerns, into discussions on the NAP or sector plan process.

Management response: The Agencies accept the recommendation. The programme already involves civil society and academia, however their engagement is not tracked regularly and their participation could also be enhanced. Therefore, the program will enhance its efforts to engage non-state actors through a series of targeted actions and monitor their participation.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
3.1 Ensure reporting of civil society, private sector, academia engagement in quarterly reports of the programme.	Continuous	Country PMUs		
3.2 Identify entry points in the remaining activities in the country workplans for greater engagement and use of non-state actors	Q3 2018	Country PMUs		

Midterm Review recommendation 4. The NAP-Ag should offer to support the NAP-formulating entity in facilitating discussions among the agricultural sectors to identify potential solutions and conflicts to be addressed.

Management response: The Agencies partially accept this recommendation. The programme is managed at the national level by the project steering committees, which are composed by representatives from different ministries and entities (agriculture, livestock, forestry and fisheries). For example, in Uganda, the sub-sectors represented include agriculture, animal industry and fisheries, while in Nepal and Kenya, livestock, fisheries and agriculture are included. However, the engagement needs to be better documented and sub-sector participation could also be enhanced, and the NAP formulating entity should be informed regularly.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
4.1 Review multi-sectorial approaches already identified in the countries and facilitate engagement between agricultural sub-sectors to report the needs/ priorities to the NAP Formulating entities	Continuous	Country PMUs		

Midterm Review recommendation 5. The two UN agencies are already engaged in supporting several countries on resource mobilization for NAP and CCA planning. But these efforts should seek to ensure

that the funding proposals include measures to address the capacity, technical, gender mainstreaming and institutional gaps that the NAP-Ag capacity assessments and stocktaking exercises identified.

Management response: The recommendation is noted. The project is currently supporting resource mobilization efforts in most of the NAP-Ag countries. For example, Thailand and Vietnam are being supported in accessing funds through UNDP, Philippines through UNDP and FAO, Kenya with FAO and the programme will be contributing to mobilize resources for the NAP in Uganda and Zambia with the GWP and the Gambia with a national delivery partner. Knowledge and data acquired through the NAP-Ag already forms an integral part of the baseline analysis and the barriers/gaps analysis supporting the formulation of said proposals.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
5.1 Continue to build on the data and information acquired to help countries access funding in partnership with other agencies	Continuous	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 6. The programme should request its UNDP experts working with ministries of Finance and/or Planning (MOF-MOP), or senior staff in UNDP Country Offices, to bring the MOF and MOP into discussions with the agricultural ministries.

Management response: The PMU accept the overall recommendation, but not with the context in which it is provided. Namely, this recommendation is provided considering the need for the programme to meet its targets under outcome 2**:** *Percentage of the budget of the public institutions (national-sub national) allocated to climate change adaptation concerns of the agricultural sector*. The challenge encountered by the programme is the lack of baseline (climate budgets related to the Ag sector) at country level as well as the target for increased spending on agriculture which cannot be guaranteed through one programme alone. The suggestion provided by the reviewer is not actionable unless backed with activities for data gathering on climate relevant expenditure and budgeting that would prompt informed decisions. Under the auspices of the programme, UNDP has already carried out an analysis of sources of climate finance data in six countries (summary here: http://sdg.iisd.org/news/undp-gflac-urge-better-monitoring-of-climate-change-spending/).

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
6.1 Expand the review of sources of climate finance in the 5 countries not covered by the review	Q42018	UNDP PMU		
6.2 Support the expenditure review of the agriculture sector in the NAP-Ag countries, by applying the UNDP public expenditure methodology.	Q2 2019	Country PMUs		
6.3 Develop an information package on the program, to be distributed to and discussed with MOF and MOP through the UNDP COs during the planned stakeholder engagement activities	2018/2019	UNDP PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 7. The programme should continue to explore and introduce tools and approaches more tailored to the capacity, needs and contexts of the planning entities.

Management response: The Agencies accept the recommendation. The program will continue to tailor its support to countries needs

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status

7.1 Tailor climate change adaptation planning approaches and tools to the country context.	Continuous	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
7.2 Identify CCA planning approaches and tools already applied by the NAP-Ag countries	December 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
7.3. Introduce the NAP-Ag knowledge tank to identify with countries a range of tools for CCA planning to address their needs and gaps	December 2018	FAO-PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 8. In its efforts to support the countries on the development of M&E systems for NAPs or sector CCA plans, the NAP-Ag will need to adopt a new paradigm of "adaptive M&E", given the challenges that climate change brings.				
Management response: Recommendation noted. The program is currently developing a guidance note on Strengthening M&E for Adaptation in the Agriculture Sectors in addition to a training programme for countries. The programme is identifying follow up activities in the country work-plans on M&E in up to four countries (e.g. Uganda, Uruguay, Guatemala, and Colombia) where the institutions have expressed an interest for M&E instead of impact evaluation.				
Key action(s)	**Time frame**	**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**	
			Comments	**Status**
8.1 Finalize the guidance note on M&E, and disseminate it to all participating countries	Q2 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
8.2 Organize training activities to advance on the development of national M&E frameworks for adaptation, including the selection of indicators to track adaptation at national levels in selected countries (either through workshops or technical backstopping depending on the number of countries interested)	Q4 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU and Country PMUs		
8.3 Explore the possibility of testing the framework of FAO tools such as Tracking Adaptation in Agricultural Sectors (TAAS) (2017) at country level. http://www.fao.org/3/a-i8145e.pdf	Q4 2019	FAO PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 8. Organize an activity in each country to gather and document, as a stocktaking exercise, the tested CCA practices, or good practices, for CCA in the different agricultural sectors, including those that are tailored to women producers since these practices will be among the key elements to incorporate in CCA plans and the NAP and should be the focus of any exercises to assess adaptation options and of IE or M&E. These practices should be gathered from the agricultural ministries and departments, universities, research institutions, and other agricultural CCA projects implemented by international organizations. To support Recommendation 4 on cross-sectoral adaptation solutions, some focus could be placed on identifying successful inter-sectoral approaches or ones potentially so.
Management response: The Agencies partially accept this recommendation. We have collected a subset of CCA practices for the purposes of CBA training in countries. The stocktaking of a whole suite of CCA practices related to all the subsectors is a considerable undertaking and out of scope of the programme. However, the programme can conduct a review of more recent literature on CCA practices and their assessment.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
9.1 Review literature and studies that have already been done on CCA practices related to the agricultural sectors in each country	Q2 2019	UNDP FAO Global PMU		
9.2 Document CCA practices in the 11 participating countries	Q2-Q 3 2019	Country PMUs		

Midterm Review recommendation 10. The MTR recognizes that under the funding provided by the donor, food security is not a focus area. However, for future programming to support the integration of agriculture in the NAP process, the MTR suggests addressing the link between agriculture and food security. The programme should provide, where countries are interested, technical assistance and/or training for the assessment of CC impacts on food security.				
Management response: The Agencies reject the recommendation and note that the donor (BMEL/ICI) had explicitly asked that the NAP-Ag programme should not concentrate on food security since this would be under the mandate of the Ministry of Development cooperation (BMZ).				
Key action(s)	**Time frame**	**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**	
			Comments	**Status**
10.1 NA				

Midterm Review recommendation 11. With the programmes in the three new countries, Colombia, Guatemala and the Gambia, in their early phase, the NAP-Ag should revisit the workplans with the counterpart ministries and ensure that it offers the logical design used in the Asian countries, presenting the merits of the approach. More specifically, this would involve ensuring that CC Risks/Vulnerability Assessments and climate modeling constitute some of the first steps in the WP. It would also be beneficial to implement the other applicable MTR recommendations listed here in the three new countries from the beginning.				
Management response: The Agencies partially accept the recommendation. Firstly, as recommended by the MTR the activities included in the workplans should be country-driven and following specific country needs – not all countries identified climate risk assessments as their priority. Consequently, countries may choose different approaches and the Asian model might not be applicable.				
Key action(s)	**Time frame**	**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**	
			Comments	**Status**
11.1 Review the countries work plans to include an activity to identify existing information and key gaps on climate risk and vulnerability assessments	Q4 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
11.2 Include activities where applicable and feasible to address these gaps	Q1 2019	Country PMUs		

Midterm Review recommendation 12. All members of the NAP-Ag team, at global and country levels, should make an effort to ensure that gender is integrated right from the start and in all stages of planning. Gender analysis questions should be included in any baseline, KAP, or vulnerability assessment to identify the gendered roles and inequalities in food security, vulnerability, resources and technology access.			
Management response: The Agencies accept the recommendation, noting that food security falls outside the purview of the project.			
Key action(s)		**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**

	Time frame		Comments	Status
12.1 Include a section on undertaking gender analysis in all steps of developing the NAP road-map in guidance documents and in the Handbook.	Q4 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
12.2 Include sex-disaggregated data on participation in the NAP country level reporting. Use the data to carry out a gender analysis and embed its findings in the analytical activities that are part of the planning processes.	Continuous	FAO NCs and UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
12.3 Include a gender section in the stocktaking reports of the 3 additional countries	Q3 2018	Country PMUs		
12.4 Devote time of gender advisors to supporting the integration of gender analysis questions in baselines, KAPs and vulnerabilities assessments	Q2 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
12.5 Prepare a common message and checklist on gender mainstreaming, to be shared with all NAP-Ag personnel, globally	Q2 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 13. Improve the peer-to-peer learning exchanges by making them less formal, and one-to-one (or small-group depending on the preference of the participants) to give NCs and government counterparts the opportunity to share their experiences more openly and discuss possible solutions to their issues. For the webinars, case studies, MOOC, global events and other KM and communications products, use also the lessons emerging from the challenges at country level.
Management response: The Agencies accept the recommendation.

Key action(s)	**Time frame**	**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**	
			Comments	**Status**
13.1 Organize online peer-to-peer exchanges for National Coordinators at least twice a year	Continuous	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
13.2 Organize up to 3-4 online bilateral exchanges between countries	Continuous	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
13.3 Organize face to face meetings during and on the sidelines of the NAP Expo every year	Q2 2018 Q2 2019	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 14. A no-cost extension should be granted to end-2019
Management response: The Agencies partially accept the recommendation. Given the current status of the technical and financial delivery, and the need to apply adaptive management approaches to respond to the recommendations from the MTR, the Agencies believe the extension will be needed until September 2020 for FAO and end-2020 for UNDP, to allow for an orderly operational and financial closure of the project.

Key action(s)	**Time frame**	**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**	
			Comments	**Status**
14.1 Amend the Agencies' workplans to reflect the activities	April 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		

recommended by the MTR and accepted by the Agencies				
14.2 Request an extension to the Donor	April 2018	UNDP GEF		
14.2 Secure internal approvals for the extension	Q2 2018	UNDP PMU, RTA		
14.3 Amend the UN-to-UN agreement	Q3 2018	UNDP GEF- FAO		

Midterm Review recommendation 15. Increase the engagement of regional focal points with the NCs and country teams for the global team to have a better understanding of the issues in the countries and how they are evolving, and to discuss, on an equal footing, whether the strategy may need to be adjusted in light of them. The programme managers (PM) of each agency, who are more senior, should engage as well wherever possible. The experience and ideas of the NC's should be given an opportunity to emerge and shape the future course of activities. Specifically, this could take the form of greater though a feasible number of missions that are also longer and less formal by the regional focal points and programme managers to the countries as well as more regular virtual discussions with the NCs.
Management response: The Agencies partially accept the recommendation. The engagement of the regional focal points with the NCs and country teams is indeed continuous and hinges on the support needed by the specific country supported. The Agencies agree that the PMs should engage with countries wherever possible. While this has been the case on general matters, it could be improved. The experience and ideas of the NCs are indeed given an opportunity to shape the course of activities, through the work-planning development and revision exercises. It is not clear how longer, less formal and more missions would support the inclusion of NC's ideas into the workplans. Missions are organized at the working levels and are therefore not very formal, unless in the presence of high government officials; and their numbers and duration are based on the support needed by the specific country supported.

Key action(s)	**Time frame**	**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**	
			Comments	**Status**
15.1 Conduct bi-annual bilateral engagement calls with the NAP AG FAO/UNDP country teams and the global programme managers and technical backstopping officers.	Continuous	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
15.2 Organize at least one country backstopping mission per country per year	2018/20	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 16. Adopt a revised set of indicators for NAP-Ag programme M&E that captures both the proposed new strategy and the actual outcomes versus the outputs from it. This will involve some survey and light assessments by the NCs, assisted by the global team, to see for example how different capacity development initiatives, including for easier tools and in gender mainstreaming are followed up upon. In so far as resources allow, the NAP-Ag should also conduct brief studies on the impact of capacity strengthening activities.
Management response: The Agencies partially agree with the recommendation. Given that the project is more than halfway in the implementation stage, with clear workplans adopted and agreed at the country level, it is the view of the team that the revision of indicators should be limited. The team suggests to mainly modify the indicator and targets under the programme objective on budgeting (*medium term and annual budget for agriculture adjusted* and *adaptation action areas prioritized by the agriculture sectors*) and modifying the indicator and target for outcome 3 (*number of ministries with Impact evaluation frameworks based on quasi-experimental design*). The outcomes and outputs remain unchanged, but the structure of the logical framework will be revised to illustrate how the outputs contribute to the achievements of the outcomes and reflect the change pathways between different elements. Moreover, the teams agree to conduct an assessment of the impact of the capacity building activities.

Key action(s)		**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**

	Time frame		Comments	Status
16.1 Conduct a survey of the impact of capacity building to assess the knowledge applied in relevant planning activities	Continuous	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
16.2 Modify indicators and targets under the programme objective and outcome 3in the logframe for discussion with the Donor	Q2 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		
16.3 Revise the structure of the logical framework to distinguish among outputs and outcomes and illustrate how the outputs contribute to the achievements of the outcomes and development objective. I.e. develop a clear TOC for the project, considering the logframe, the MTR recommendations and the need to modify the targets and indicators as for 16.2 above	Q1 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 17. For future collaborative initiatives between FAO and UNDP on CCA or CC more generally, the agencies must aim to improve efficiency in implementation, focus the use of resources to the country level where needed, and ensure that the comparative advantage of each entity is truly used. This should entail the following: (i) allocating the larger share of programme resources to whichever agency is in the lead, enabling it as the responsible entity to the donor, to better direct the use of resources in the programme; (ii) preventing the global teams from becoming too large and duplicating each other's responsibilities by having, wherever feasible, only 1 person (if part-time, with preferably greater than 50 percent of time dedicated to the NAP-Ag) in charge of a region or work stream representing both agencies; (iii) dividing the activities along clear lines of comparative advantage; (iv) having two experienced co-coordinators, one from each agency, in the country team so that the strengths and relationships that each agency brings are present. If more basic programme management support is required, the task should not fall on the coordinators but instead on a junior staff person.	
Management response: The Agencies partially accept the recommendation. The composition of the teams and the specific setup of any collaborative programme will depend on the nature of the services provided, the geographical scope of the initiative, the amount and other factors that will affect the design of the project.	

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
17.1 Discuss with FAO the applicability of the recommendation to the project	Q1 2018	UNDP-FAO HQ		
17.2 Share the recommendation with the agencies project developers	Q2 2018	UNDP-FAO Global PMU		