

EVALUATION OF THE UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMME DOCUMENT (CPD) FOR SÃO TOMÉ AND PRÍNCIPE – 2017-2022

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE (OUTCOME 3)

United Nations Development Programme

September 2022

Patrícia Carvalho
(patricia.carvalho@impacteconsultants.com)

João Silveira
(joao.silveira@impacteconsultants.com)

Miguel Fonseca
(miguel.fonseca@impacteconsultants.com)



| Project/outcome Information | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| Project/outcome title | Outcome 3: Sustainable development and resilience to Climate Change of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe – 2017-2022 | |
| Atlas ID | tbc | |
| Corporate outcome and output | tbc | |
| Country | São Tomé and Príncipe | |
| Region | Africa | |
| Date project document signed | 7 July 2016 | |
| Project dates | Start | Planned end |
| | 2017 | 2022 |
| Project budget | \$ 7,300,000 | |
| Project expenditure at the time of evaluation | \$ 15,181,039 | |
| Funding source | tbc | |
| Implementing party¹ | UNDP | |

| Evaluation information | | |
|---|--|-------------------|
| Evaluation type (project/outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.) | Evaluation of outcome 3: Sustainable development and resilience to Climate Change of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe – 2017-2022. An extraction from “Evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe – 2017-2022” | |
| Final/midterm review/ other | Final | |
| Period under evaluation | Start | End |
| | 2017 | 2022 |
| Evaluators | Patrícia Carvalho, João Silveira, Miguel Fonseca | |
| Evaluator email address | patricia.carvalho@impacteconsultants.com | |
| Evaluation dates | Start | Completion |
| | July 2022 | September 2022 |

¹ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

CONTENT

| | |
|---|-----------|
| TABLES..... | 4 |
| ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS..... | 5 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 7 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 13 |
| 2. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION..... | 14 |
| 2.1. PROJECT'S FRAMEWORK..... | 14 |
| 2.2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES..... | 15 |
| 3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK..... | 17 |
| 3.1. EVALUATION CRITERIA..... | 17 |
| 3.2. EVALUATION QUESTIONS..... | 17 |
| 3.3. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS..... | 19 |
| 3.4. DATA ANALYSIS..... | 20 |
| 3.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS..... | 21 |
| 3.6. LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES..... | 21 |
| 4. EVALUATION RESULTS..... | 23 |
| 4.1. RELEVANCE..... | 23 |
| 4.2. EFFECTIVENESS..... | 27 |
| 4.3. EFFICIENCY..... | 35 |
| 4.4. SUSTAINABILITY..... | 41 |
| 4.5. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY..... | 42 |
| 5. CONCLUSIONS..... | 43 |
| 6. LESSONS LEARNED..... | 45 |
| 7. RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 46 |
| ANNEXES..... | 48 |
| 1. LIST OF QUALITATIVE INTERACTIONS..... | 49 |
| 2. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS..... | 51 |
| 3. BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 58 |
| 4. TERMS OF REFERENCE..... | 60 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1 – CPD (2017-2021) indicative budget of outcome 3..... | 15 |
| Table 2 - Sample of sustainable development and resilience to climate change indicators São Tomé and Príncipe..... | 24 |
| Table 3 – Target progress color scheme | 27 |
| Table 4 - Table of results Outcome 3 | 28 |
| Table 5 – Indicative budget vs resources delivered | 35 |
| Table 6 – Financial Execution | 37 |

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| AFDB | African Development Bank |
| BGFI | Banque Gabonaise et Francaise Internationale |
| CONPREC | <i>Conselho Nacional de Preparação e Resposta às Catástrofes</i> |
| CPD | Country Programme Document |
| CSO | Civil Society Organizations |
| DGEG | Portuguese Directorate General for Energy and Geology |
| DGRNE | <i>Direção Geral dos Recursos Naturais e Energia</i> |
| EM-DAT | International Disaster Database |
| EU | European Union |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| GEF | Global Environmental Fund |
| GFCF | Gross Fixed Capital Formation |
| HACCP | Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point |
| HDI | Human Development Index |
| HR | Human Resources |
| IEO | Independent Evaluation Office |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |
| INE | National Institute of Statistics |
| INM | National Meteorology Institute |
| IOs | International Organizations |
| JP | SDG Joint Program |
| LL | Lessons Learned |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MM | Million |
| NDC | National Determined Contributions |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| OECD/DAC | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee |
| OR | Operational Recommendations |
| PND | National Development Plan/ <i>Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento</i> |
| PwD | Persons with Disabilities |
| RAP | Autonomous Region of the Príncipe |
| REINA | National Network of Business Incubators / <i>Rede Nacional de Incubadoras e Aceleradoras de Negócio</i>) |
| ROAR | Results Oriented Annual Report |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SIDS | Small Island Developing State |
| SME | Small Medium Enterprise |
| SR | Strategic Recommendations |
| SSC | South-South Cooperation |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| SSTI | Secretary of State for Trade and Industry |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group |
| UNFPA | United Nations Population Fund |
| UNIDO | United Nations Industrial Development Organization |
| UN-SWAP | United Nations System Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women |
| US\$ | United States Dollars |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| WTO | World Trade Organization |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Context of the evaluation: The Evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe 2017-2022 was conducted from July until September 2022. The Evaluation used in-person and online data collection processes, which included a field mission to São Tomé and Príncipe. As part of the CPD Evaluation, this report presents specifically the findings under priority area (outcome) three (3) of the CPD: Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change. Under this outcome, the CDP delivered 15,181,039 US\$, which were funded by different sources (e.g., the Global Environmental Fund -GEF) and internal regular and other resources from UNDP.

2. Objectives of the evaluation: The Evaluation responds to the need for vertical and horizontal accountability, as well as to generate knowledge that can help future programming. The Evaluation (specifically for the outcome 3 area) has three specific objectives: (i) make an overall independent assessment of the performance of the CPD for São Tomé and Príncipe, with specific emphasis on the outcome area 3 (ii) identify key lessons learned from the CPD and propose practical recommendations for outcome 3 in the next CPD, and (iii) review the CPD's outcome 3 contribution towards cross-cutting issues, such as human rights, gender, leaving no one behind and capacity development.

3. Methodological Framework: This Evaluation uses as reference the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Gender and human rights considerations were also considered as part of this evaluation. This Evaluation employed a mixed method methodology, which included: (i) desk review, (ii) analysis of secondary data, (iii) semi-structured interviews that reached of 25 key informants (9 female and 17 male) from the UNDP and partner institutions, as well as (iv) structured interviews with 8 final beneficiaries (3 female and 5 male) from entrepreneurship-related activities.

4. Evaluation results (by criteria):

4.1. Relevance: This evaluation has found evidence that outcome 3 of the CPD was well aligned with identifiable needs and priorities of São Tomé and Príncipe. It aligned with the National Development Plan (*Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento - PND*) 2017-2021, namely the ambition of promoting agricultural resilience to climate change, development of the blue economy, support the improvement of the business and entrepreneur environment in São Tomé and Príncipe, increase the production of renewable energy, and the strengthening of institutional and legal arrangements in disasters management. Moreover, the CPD aligned with sectoral strategies, such as the national programme for the promotion of decent work 2018-2021. Likewise, the proposed actions aligned with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 1, 8, 10 and 16. Additionally, all key informants consulted agreed all Projects/Programmes under outcome 3 were relevant. Sustainable development and resilience to climate change linked indicators equally suggest the relevance of outcome 3 of the CPD, for instance, the santomenean business environment had a business density of 3.3 in 2016, access to energy remained below 80 percent between 2016 and 2020, and renewable energy share in total final energy consumption was below 40 percent in 2016 and 2019.

The relevance of the CDP, as well as its alignment with national priorities and needs is explained by two complementary factors: (i) the long history of UNDP implementation in São Tomé and Príncipe enabled the UNDP to formulate an accurate reading of the national context, priorities, and needs, and (ii) there was a consistent effort in auscultating national partners. Further strengthening consultation with national partners, particularly civil society organizations (CSOs) would further strengthen the UNDP's strategic planning capacity. Overall, the UNDP is perceived as a relevant, trustworthy, and valuable partner.

Evidence collected during this evaluation suggests the UNDP was a key partner in assisting São Tomé and Príncipe in addressing the challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic. The UNDP successfully mobilized almost one million US\$ between 2020 and 2022 for its COVID-19 response plan. Under outcome 3 the UNDP contributed to the immediate response by (i) providing technical assistance to the definition of national plans to address COVID-19, (ii) delivery of protective equipment such as masks and alcohol gel, and (iii) transition of activities from in-person working environment to online working environment. It equally contributed to COVID-19 economic recovery by funding/adapting entrepreneurship activities (e.g., Muala + projects), and assisting in the strengthening of the agriculture value-chain.

5.2. Effectiveness: This evaluation has found evidence that the implementation of outcome 3 of the CPD has made a significant contribution to the planned objectives. The UNDP contributed to the resilience and dynamism of the economic landscape of São Tomé and Príncipe by supporting (youth) entrepreneurship, the development of the agriculture value-chain, and by supporting local communities in finding climate change resilient livelihood alternatives. The UNDP supported the national early warning and disaster preparedness system with capacity-building, equipment, and technical capacity to improve disaster response planning

The UNDP contributed to the energy transition of São Tomé and Príncipe with extensive support for the development of legal frameworks for the energy, water, and forestry sectors, as well as with capacity-building of national partners' structures (e.g., buildings, training) and the development of several feasibility studies for the production of hydroelectricity, as well as several integrated watershed management plans. Additionally, the UNDP supported the construction of the first solar plant in the country and the first solar rooftop initiative, currently under construction. At macro environmental level, the UNDP provided technical assistance in 2021 for the update of the National Determined Contributions (NDC).

The UNDP's activities contributed to strengthening national government capacity and institutions within state/government and CSO bodies. The key interventions leading to institutional strengthening were: (i) infrastructure building (e.g., *Direção Geral dos Recursos Naturais e Energia* – DGRNE - office building), (ii) provision of equipment (e.g., office equipment, vehicles), (iii) capacity-building of partner's staff (e.g., energy transition) at managerial and technical level, (iv) improvement of legal frameworks (e.g., energy sector, forestry), and (v) strengthening of HR quantity (e.g., consultants hired).

South-South (SSC) and Triangular cooperation activities were mostly *ad hoc*, and focused on internationalization activities of São Tomé and Príncipe businesses (e.g., benchmarking in the Camaroon, Youth Connekt), signing of African Union Treaties, and exchanges in the context of the energy transition (e.g., Taining of Trainers (ToT) for forestry staff in Benin).

According to outcome 3 key informants, the most relevant programme areas that the UNDP should consolidate and/or scale up moving forward include: (i) State/Governmental and CSOs

institutional support which encompasses (a) equipment and infrastructure and (b) transversal capacity-building of HR, (ii) (green) economic growth, which encompasses the scaling-up of activities to (a) strengthen the internal market and (b) strengthening of internationalization, (ii) blue economy, including the protecting marine areas and enhancing the blue economic activities (e.g., coastal tourism), (iv) energy transition particularly regarding green energy, including through mini-grids, hydropower, and solar, (v) scale-up efforts to increase the availability of socio-economic, and environmental data availability, (vi) develop efforts in the waste management sector, and (vii) scale-up investment in the entire chain of disaster response (e.g., data collection, information analysis and dissemination, post-disaster response), and (viii) biodiversity and climate change. with the provision of technical and financial assistance to assist São Tomé and Príncipe in achieving the targets established in the NDC.

5.3. Efficiency: The mobilization of resources by the UNDP for the programmed cycle was impressive. From a total indicative budget of 7,300,000 US\$ for outcome 3 in 2016, by the time of this evaluation, the UNDP had mobilized funds that enabled a delivery of 15,181,039 US\$, which represents roughly 39,9 percent of the total budget the UNDP delivered during the CPD 2017-2022 (i.e., 38,076,973,40 US\$). The resources allocated were reportedly adequate to the intended purposes. However, some delays in the attribution of funding were reported, and often linked with perceived complexity of UNDP bureaucratic processes. It was also noted an excessive focus on substantial financial execution within the first half of the year, which may result in suboptimal implementation. Transversally to all outcomes, on M&E, this evaluation has found an opportunity for improved comprehensive strategic communication and learning among the staff from the different outcomes within regular staff meetings. To favor a culture of building institutional knowledge, and sharing of know-how and lessons learned, the UNDP could potentially devote resources into maintaining an institutional archive. The process of resource mobilization and programme/project design could be further improved with the establishment of a backstopping mechanism to support project design. Higher efforts should be made to install a data collection culture across managing and implementing partners of UNDP projects.

The workflow between the UNDP and its partners is overall positive, and the UNDP is regarded as a trusted partner that adds value to its partners. The factors mostly evoked to explain the overall positive assessment of UNDP-Partners' workflow include (i) a spirit of systematic and open dialogue, (ii) UNDP flexibility in adapting activities in perceived changing contexts and beneficiary needs, (iii) overall good relation at operational level, (iv) efficient communication lines, (v) good interpersonal relations between UNDP staff and partner's staff, (vi) UNDP's efficiency in mobilizing resources (funds and HR), (vii) UNDP's capacity of linking with key stakeholders and fostering partnerships, (viii) UNDP's accurate reading of the national context and institutional constrains, and (ix) UNDP's access to high-level decision makers. Across outcomes, three themes emerged as suboptimal aspects of the partnership, namely, the complexity of UNDP procedures, external staff/public servants' relation, and financial management of projects/programmes. The aspects mentioned may be overcome with enhanced mechanisms for mutual awareness, as the root causes of tensions appear to be linked with misperceptions and/or lack of awareness.

5.4. Sustainability: Some key achievements of the country programme are highly likely to be sustainable. A clear area of sustainability is the adoption of legal and regulatory frameworks in multiple areas, including laws on resources use (forestry, water), energy regulation, among many others. Laws and procedures solidify change, and the adoption of new principles and practices. Capacity-building and strengthening of state/government partners as well as CSOs is another area that offer signs of sustainability. Some institutions that were strengthened during the CPD have reportedly become part of the governmental organic (e.g., Incubadora Central) and likely to

continue. The positive signs are, however, contingent to the availability of resources from national counterparts. São Tomé and Príncipe is highly dependent on foreign aid, and in that sense, the UNDP's acute *modus operandi* of seeking partnerships and in establishing synergies and networks is relevant in the continuous effort of funding mobilization. Likewise, the investment in the private sector, and in the emergence of an economically sustainable internal market is the seed for a more dynamic economic landscape, which in the long-term may assist São Tomé and Príncipe in achieving higher levels of growth and reducing poverty.

5.6. Cross-cutting issues: The CDP's outcome 3 addressed key human rights issues including, for example, equal rights of men and women, adequate standard of living for well-being, and the right to work. On gender and youth, for instance, the UNDP youth entrepreneurship activities were gender inclusive, and the project Muala+ was purposely directed towards female entrepreneurs. The CPD proposed to target persons with disabilities (PwD), however this evaluation has found no significant evidence that PwD were particularly targeted under outcome 3. M&E gender reporting tools can be further strengthened.

6. Lessons learned: Several lessons (LL) have been drawn from the implementation based on the evidence gathered in the evaluation process (cutting across all outcomes):

LL1. A solid project design phase with in-depth consultations with key stakeholders from governmental, CSO, IOs, and other UN agencies is key to ensure that the programme has a clear, feasible, and realistic projects/programmes strategy.

LL2. Solid data on key socio-economic and environmental indicators is essential for accurate and well-suited programme design planning, decision-making, and monitoring of programme outcomes. Particularly when the Agenda 2030 approaches its culmination, accurate and credible data availability is indispensable to enhance knowledge, and track results and effective change.

LL3. Leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies and mobilizing additional funding contributes to cost-effectiveness. The UNDP was successful in leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies, as well as with other partners, and in securing additional funding, which has contributed to Programme cost-effectiveness.

LL4. Ensuring the existence of clear monitoring and evaluation mechanisms from the inception phase of the programme – such as an assigned team/unit monitoring tool to record progress on outcomes outputs and activities as well as a centralized programme library which is shared with all team members -, enables sharing of crucial information on relevant initiatives between the teams of different outcomes, enabling them to understand the progress made in other outcomes and what synergies can/should be explored. It can also further inform management decisions.

7. Main recommendations: Based on the evidence, findings and lessons learned, collected during the evaluation, the evaluation team identified a set of Strategic (SR) and Operational (OR) recommendations:

7.1. Strategic Recommendations (SR):

SR1. Consider scaling-up partnerships and investments with the private sector, including the improvement of the national business environment (e.g., legislation enhancement), support for entrepreneurial/business activities (e.g., business grants, micro-credit, access to financial services, capacitation of business managers), internationalization of São Tomé and Príncipe economy (e.g.,

support participation in international trade fairs, support establishment of cooperatives, providing technical assistance to the participation of São Tomé and Príncipe in regional trade agreements).

SR2. Consider strengthening investments in enhancing the national blue economy, protecting marine areas, and improving the quality of marine ecosystems (e.g., mangrove forests).

SR3. Consider deepening financial and technical support to assist the country in achieving the targets established in the NDC, notably in matters of energy green transition, energy efficiency, reduction of the carbon footprint in the transport sector, and waste management.

SR4. Consider continuing undertaking efforts for in-depth consultations and discussions at the design phase of the CDP and other thematic projects and initiatives, with both governmental and CSO representatives to ensure that the programme has a clear, feasible and realistic strategy, well suited to the national context in all its dimensions.

SR5. Consider enhancing the coordination between different Programme outcomes/projects, with the establishment of an M&E unit with the clear role to centralize the information/knowledge (including indicator tracking) produced across the multiple projects/programmes, maintain an updated UNDP's archive/library, promote strategic level opportunities, and promote cross-fertilization of lessons learned across outcomes, as well as sharing of best practices and knowledge within UNDP.

SR6. Consider enhancing efforts in data collection initiatives of key socio-economic and environmental trackers in order to enable the systematic monitorization of the context of São Tomé and Príncipe. Strengthening of the National Statistics Institute, as well as providing capacity-building of key governmental staff on data collection and statistical analysis may contribute to improve monitoring capacity, as well as country situational awareness.

SR7. Consider intensifying efforts in the systematic involvement of the private sector and CSOs in the multiple projects/programmes, from inception to implementation. Taking advantage of private sector perspectives and foster private sector engagement in UNDP activities may assist in revitalizing the economic landscape tissues of São Tomé and Príncipe, and in improving the sustainability of UNDP actions.

SR8. Consider continuing strengthening South-South and triangular cooperation activities in order to enhance interaction between technical staff from different countries, including training, exchanges and sharing of experiences, especially in a face-to-face format.

7.2. Operational Recommendations (OR):

OR1. Consider developing an induction guidance toolbox for new UNDP staff members, including consultants and volunteers. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors the quick integration of new staff into the practices, methods, language, processes, and procedures of the UNDP. Such integration is crucial in small offices with high staff turnover.

OR2. Consider improving guidance for UNDP implementing partners. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors a good communication with implementing partners, and a thorough transmission of operating instructions, particularly on payment procedures/access funding and the implementation of activities/projects' monitoring and reporting (including financial reporting).

OR3. Consider developing or activating a backstopping mechanism (on-sight or remote) to support consultants on the technical specifications of project/programmed/proposal writing (including theories of change, intervention logic, results frameworks, indicators). Particularly in a small office, highly reliant on volunteers and external consultants that are experts on particular areas/sectors but that sometimes lack experience on the development of project/programme proposals, a backstopping mechanism could assist in improving the quality of projects/programmes design, as well as in mobilizing additional resources.

OR4. Consider developing a Communication and Visibility Strategy. An effective visibility strategy promotes greater understanding and ownership of the project among stakeholders, and allows the UNDP's successes to be projected, as well as the beneficiary and donor countries. It also promotes the replicability of good practices developed by entities outside the scope of the programme.

OR5. Considering developing projects/programmes targeting PwD.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document (CPD) 2017-2022 for São Tomé and Príncipe was contracted in June 2022, and carried out from July and September 2022. As part of the CPD Evaluation, this report presents specifically the findings under priority area (outcome) three (3) of the CPD: Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change.

The CPD started in 2017 and it will end in 2022. The Programme was implemented by the UNDP, and it aimed to strengthen the health system of São Tomé and Príncipe, boost good governance and justice sector reform, promote sustainable and inclusive growth, strengthen human capital and social services delivery, increase climate change environmental and social resilience, and bolster social cohesion and social protection. As part of the CPD, outcome 3 focused on “developing policy instruments for natural resources management and disaster preparedness together with plans to address disaster risk and climate change impact”³.

This evaluation intends to respond to the need for vertical and horizontal accountability⁴. Additionally, it intends to generate knowledge that can help improve the following CPD for the country. This evaluation aims specifically at assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. Its main users include the UNDP, donors, state/governmental UNDP partners, civil society organizations (CSOs), and final beneficiaries.

The report begins with a context chapter that explains the framework of the Project, as well as the objectives of the evaluation. Following, a methodological framework chapter explains the methodological processes, the criteria of the evaluation, the evaluation questions, the methods of evaluation, as well as the ethical consideration and limitations of this evaluation. Subsequently, the evaluation results chapter presents the findings of the evaluation, segmented by evaluation criteria, namely, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. Finally, this report has dedicated chapters to present its key conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. In the **Annexes**, this report presents additional information pertaining the methods, objectives, and conclusions of this evaluation, namely, the list of stakeholders consulted, data collection instruments, bibliographical references, and the terms of reference for this evaluation.

² At design, the CPD duration was between 2017 and 2021. However, the Country Office granted one year extension due to COVID-19 challenges.

³ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)”, September 2016.

⁴ Assess the use of resources allocated to the Programme for donors (vertical responsibility) and beneficiaries (horizontal responsibility).

2. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

2.1. PROJECT'S FRAMEWORK

Outcome 3 (Sustainable development and resilience to climate change) of the UNDP's CPD 2017-2022 was implemented by the UNDP in São Tomé and Príncipe; a Small Island Developing State (SIDS) situated in the Gulf of Guinea – off the western equatorial coast of Central Africa - which faces severe socioeconomic difficulties. In 2014 São Tomé and Príncipe was ranked “medium” in the Human Development Index (HDI)⁵, with a score of 0.555⁶. Five years later (2019), São Tomé and Príncipe remained as an HDI medium country, but its score improved to 0.625⁷. In income groupings São Tomé and Príncipe was considered a lower-middle income country both in 2017⁸ and 2021⁹.

São Tomé and Príncipe population is exposed to vulnerabilities, in a context of modest social safety nets, as only 11.5 percent of the population was covered by at least one social protection benefit in 2020¹⁰, and the Universal Health Coverage (UHC) service coverage did not surpass 60 percent in 2019¹¹. Access to energy is not universal as it reached only 77 percent of the population in 2020. Energy access is lower in rural communities¹². Information on the labor market is scarce and tendentially outdated. The business environment is not vibrant as São Tomé and Príncipe registers low new business density (2.21 in 2020)¹³. In 2017 São Tomé and Príncipe scored relatively low on key governance indicators, including government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law¹⁴, and national budget transparency¹⁵. According to the World Bank, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) – current United States Dollars (US\$) – has consistently increased since 2015, having reached almost 550 million US\$ in 2021¹⁶. Despite the ascendent trend, the national budget remains insufficient to address the needs of the state and the almost 228 thousand santomeans (2022). In fact, roughly 97 percent of public investment is financed through debt and external aid¹⁷.

It is in this context of transversal challenges that the UNDP developed the CDP 2017-2022, whose outcome 3 focused on Sustainable development and resilience to climate change. The establishment of outcome 3 took into consideration what the UNDP perceived to be its

⁵ HDI included the following categories: Very high: 0.800 to 1, High: 0.700 to 0.799, Medium 0.550 to 0.699, Low: 0 to 0.549.

⁶ UNDP (United National Development Programme), “Human Development Report 2015”, 2015.

⁷ UNDP (United National Development Programme), “Human Development Report 2020”, 2021.

⁸ ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2017-2019”, 2017.

⁹ ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2020-2022”, 2021.

¹⁰ ILO (International Labour Organization): “SDG indicator 1.3.1 – Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/system (%) – Annual”, SDG_0131_SEX_SOC_RT_A, June 2022, <https://ilostat.ilo.org/data/#> (consulted 06/08/2022).

¹¹ WHO (World Health Organization): “UHC Service Coverage Index (SDG 3.8.1)”, UHC_INDEX_REPORTED, November 2021, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/uhc-index-of-service-coverage>, (consulted 03/08/2022).

¹² IEA (International Energy Agency), IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), UNSD (the United Nations Statistics Division), the World Bank, and WHO (World Health Organization): “Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report”, n.d., (consulted 05/08/2022).

¹³ World Bank: “Entrepreneurship Database”, n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

¹⁴ WGI (Worldwide Governance Indicators): “Interactive Data Access”, 2021 (consulted 07/08/2022).

¹⁵ IBP (International Budget Partnership): “Open Budget Survey 2017 São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2018.

¹⁶ World Bank: “GDP (current US\$) – Sao Tome and Principe”, NY.GDP.MKTP.CD, 2022.

¹⁷ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation”, December 2021.

institutional comparative advantages, as well as its past achievements¹⁸. Outcome 3 directly responds to the following Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Goal 1 (End poverty in all its forms everywhere), 8 (Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all), 10 (Reduce inequality within and among countries), and 16 (Peace, justice and strong institutions). All SDGs covered in the CPD were considered priority by national authorities¹⁹.

For the entire period of implementation (2017-2022) the CPD established an **indicative total budget of 7,300,000 US\$ for outcome 3** (see **Table 1**). Yet, as this evaluation will show, the actual budget delivered to São Tomé and Príncipe was vastly superior, as a consequence of the UNDP's successful resources mobilization performance between 2017 and 2022.

Table 1 – CPD (2017-2021) indicative budget of outcome 3

| | Regular | Other | Total |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Outcome 3 | 500,000 US\$ | 6,800,000 US\$ | 7,300,000 US\$ |

Source: UNDP: “Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)”, September 2016.

Outcome 3 focuses on “developing policy instruments for natural resources management and disaster preparedness together with plans to address disaster risk and climate change impact”. Specifically, outcome 3 identified the following areas of intervention: (i) support agriculture traders, and fisherfolk, (ii) support the blue economy²⁰ to reduce poverty and encourage public and private investment in disaster risk prevention and reduction, (iii) develop renewable energies, and mitigate energy deficit in rural areas, (iv) increase economic growth and provide job opportunities for vulnerable groups, particularly youth and women, and (v) facilitate the formulation of a vulnerability profile of São Tomé and Príncipe. Outcome 3 purposely targeted vulnerable groups, including women, young girls and boys, and persons with disability (PWD) that are part of the labour force²¹.

2.2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

2.2.1. GENERAL OBJECTIVES

Upon UNDP's request and based on the Terms of Reference (ToR)²², this evaluation is part of a comprehensive evaluation that assessed the CPD 2017-2022²³. It captured evidence on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the implementation. The evaluation covered the full extent of interventions funded by the UNDP resources, donors, and government funds, while

¹⁸ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)”, September 2016.

¹⁹ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation”, December 2021.

²⁰ There is no consensual definition of “blue economy”. For that reason, the evaluation team used the definition provided by the World Bank: the blue economy is “the sustainable use of ocean resources for economic growth, improved livelihoods, and jobs while preserving the health of ocean ecosystem”. The World Bank: “What is the Blue Economy?”, June 2017 (consulted 07/07/2022).

²¹ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)”, September 2016.; UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation”, December 2021.

²² UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation”, December 2021.

²³ Carvalho, Patrícia, João Silveira, and Miguel Fonseca: “Evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe (São Tomé and Príncipe) – 2017-2022”, 2022.

analyzing its contribution towards supporting national development priorities, as well as the inclusion of cross-cutting issues (e.g., human rights, gender). Special attention was paid to the Outcome 3.

2.2.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The Evaluation specific objectives included:

- I. Make an overall independent assessment of the performance of the CPD for São Tomé and Príncipe, with specific emphasis on the outcome area 3.
- II. Identify key lessons learned from the outcome 3 and propose practical recommendations for the next CPD.
- III. Review the CPD's outcome 3 contribution towards cross-cutting issues, such as human rights, gender, leaving no one behind and capacity development.

2.2.3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

According to the ToR the scope of the evaluation was as follows:

- I. **Thematic Scope.** The Evaluation focused on outcome 3 of the CPD: Sustainable development and resilience to climate change.
- II. **Chronological scope.** This Evaluation covered the period of implementation of the CPD: 2017 to 2022, including a one-year prorogation.
- III. **Geographic scope.** The geographic scope of the CPD Evaluation included initiatives in São Tomé and Príncipe, including the autonomous region of the Príncipe (RAP).

3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Final Evaluation was based on the four of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Gender, human rights, and good governance considerations were also considered as part of this evaluation.

Relevance

The term "relevance", in the context of an evaluation, refers to the appropriateness of the explicit objectives of the Project in relation to the socio-economic problems it is supposed to address. In ex ante evaluation, questions of relevance are the most important because the focus is on the choosing the best strategy or on justifying the one proposed. In intermediate evaluation, the aim is to check whether the socio-economic context has evolved as expected and whether this evolution calls into question a particular objective.

Effectiveness

The term "effectiveness" concerns whether the objectives formulated in the Project are being achieved, what the successes and difficulties have been, and how appropriate the solutions chosen have been and what is the influence of external factors that come from outside the Project.

Efficiency

The term "efficiency" is assessed by comparing the results obtained or, preferably, the impacts produced, and the resources mobilised. In other words, are the effects obtained commensurate to the inputs? (The terms 'economy' and 'cost minimisation' are sometimes in much the same way as efficiency).

Sustainability

The term "sustainability" refers to the extent to which the results and outputs of the intervention are durable. Often evaluations consider the sustainability of institutional changes as well as socioeconomic impacts. (The criterion of sustainability is also linked to the concept of sustainable development which can itself be regarded as one definition of utility, particularly if, sustainable development is defined as concerning the maintenance of human, productive, natural and social 'capitals' rather than just the maintenance of the environment for future generations).

Source: the evaluation team based on OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development): *Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/543e84ed-en>, 2021.

3.2. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The ToR presented a set of evaluation questions to guide this evaluation. The evaluation team revised, reorganized, and regrouped them to be coherent with the standalone evaluation report of the CPD's 2017-2022 outcome 3.

3.2.1. RELEVANCE

1. *To what extent has outcome 3 of the current UNDP programme supported the government of São Tomé and Príncipe in achieving the national development goals and implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development?*
2. *To what extent has outcome 3 of the UNDP programme responded to the priorities and the needs of target beneficiaries as defined in the programme document?*
3. *To what extent is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving sustainable development and resilience to climate change in São Tomé and Príncipe?*
4. *Have the efforts made by UNDP and national partners to mobilize resources and knowledge been in line with the current development landscape? How?*
5. *Has UNDP been able to effectively adapt outcome 3 programme to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in São Tomé and Príncipe?*

3.2.2. EFFECTIVENESS

1. *By reviewing the programme results and resources framework, is outcome 3 of the UNDP programme on track to achieve intended results at the outcome and output levels? What are the key achievements and what factors contributed to the achievements or non-achievement of those results?*
2. *By examining the small-size initiatives funded by UNDP regular sources, how have these projects fulfilled their objectives? What are the factors (positive and negative) that contribute to their success or shortcomings? Are there recommendations or lessons that can be drawn from this approach?*
3. *To what extent has outcome 3 of the UNDP programme contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening? How could UNDP enhance this element in the next UNDP programme?*
4. *Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up going forward?*
5. *To what extent did the UNDP programme promote SSC/Triangular cooperation?*

3.2.3. EFFICIENCY

1. *To what extent has there been an economical use of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) in a timely manner? What are the main administrative constraints/strengths?*
2. *To what extent is the results-based management system operating effectively and is monitoring data informing management decision making?*
3. *To what extent has UNDP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in São Tomé and Príncipe?*
4. *How well does the workflow between UNDP and national implementing partners perform?*
5. *How well did UNDP perform in the implementation of support services in the context of an MOU with an implementing partner?*

3.2.4. SUSTAINABILITY

1. *To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?*

2. *To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?*
3. *To what extent have national partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?*
4. *To what extent do existing partnerships with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners are able to sustain the attained results?*

3.2.5. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY

1. *To what extent have has the inclusion of vulnerable groups been addressed in outcome 3 UNDP's work? What barriers have been found and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?*
2. *To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the outcome 3 programme's strategic design, implementation, and reporting? Are there key achievements? In what way could UNDP enhance gender equality in the next country programme?*

3.3. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The methodology developed for this evaluation took into consideration the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines, as well as the UNEG Evaluation Standards and Norms *vis-à-vis* the integration of cross-cutting elements, a human rights-based approach, equity and gender equality. It is aligned with the Guidance Document Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, and the United Nations System Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP).

The evaluation used the *Contribution Analysis* approach to provide information on the contribution of the Project to the expected results. To that end, it employed a mixed method methodology of data collection and analysis which included desk review, primary qualitative data analysis (e.g., interviews), and secondary qualitative and quantitative data analysis (e.g., news sources, statistics from authoritative organizations). The evaluation used different lines of evidence and triangulation of sources to further verify its results.

The methodology included the incorporation of gender principles in all stages of the evaluation, including in the design of data collection and analysis tools, sampling of stakeholders and beneficiaries of the Country Programme, and disaggregation of data by categories (e.g., type of institution, location, gender).

3.3.1. DESK REVIEW

The desk review collected information from the programme documents, progress reports, grey literature, news, among others. This information was important to get an overview of the initiative, triangulate information, identify knowledge gaps, and help developing/supporting hypotheses about the evaluation criteria (see Annex 3).

3.3.2. ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY DATA

Secondary data analysis considered data collected at baseline shared by the UNDP's team (e.g., CPD indicators), as well as other relevant statistical data that came up from other sources during data collection phase. Additionally, the secondary analysis included statistical data reported in databases or trackers from credible national or international organizations (e.g., HDI; World Health Organization (WHO) stats, International Labour Organization (ILO) stats, World Bank Stats).

3.3.3. SEMI-STRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

This evaluation conducted semi-structured interviews that reached 25 key informants (8 female and 17 male) from the UNDP (9), government/state partners (11), national and international CSOs (4), and International Organizations partners (1). 23 key informants were consulted in person in São Tomé, and 2 by Zoom.

All key informants were purposively identified based on recommendations from the UNDP team and through the snowballing sampling technique. The interviews contributed to fill knowledge gaps emerging from the desk review. The questions for the key informants were specifically designed to reveal the extent of the respondents' awareness of the programming and the perception of changes or improvements resulting from the implemented approaches by the UNDP, as well as their recommendations for the new CPD.

The list of key informants consulted, as well as the interview guides are provided in Annex 1 and 2, respectively.

3.3.4. STRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

This evaluation organized structured qualitative interviews with 8 (3 female, and 5 male) final beneficiaries from outcome 3, namely those participating in the Youth Entrepreneurship and Muala+ activities. The interviews were carried out by phone (WhatsApp) in August 2022. The final beneficiaries were randomly identified based on a list of participants provided by the UNDP team. The list provided included only final beneficiaries whose business activities remained open and/or were in the process of opening.

The list of interactions and instruments for data collection are presented in Annex 1 and 2. The names of the final beneficiaries were proposedly hidden to respect their right of privacy.

3.4. DATA ANALYSIS

The evaluation team conducted a systematic review and analysis of all data, to identify key themes, patterns, relationships, and explanations relevant to the issues and indicators in the evaluation matrix. Content analysis techniques were used for the analyses of the interviews. The content analysis process was composed of two sequential steps: 1) direct content analysis for identification of the themes addressed by the interviewees by evaluation criteria, and 2) conventional content analysis, for identification of emerging themes and patterns within the categories previously selected through the direct content analysis. In this process, the semi-automatic content analysis software Dedoose was used.

3.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The evaluation complied with ethical guidelines, applied at all stages. Data collection and processing was carried out in full compliance with the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, and its principles, namely:

- Intentionality: take into account the usefulness and the need for an evaluation from the beginning;
- Conflict of interests: exercise the commitment to avoid conflicts of interest in all aspects of work, thus maintaining the principles of independence, impartiality, credibility, honesty, integrity and responsibility;
- Interactions with the participants: appropriate and respectful involvement with the participants in the evaluation processes, maintaining the principles of confidentiality and anonymity and their limitations; dignity and diversity; human rights; gender equality; and damage prevention;
- Evaluation processes and products: ensuring accuracy, integrity and reliability, inclusion and non-discrimination, transparency, and fair and balanced reports that recognize different perspectives; and
- Finding irregularities: discreetly reporting the discovery of any apparent misconduct to a competent body.

With regard to human rights, equity and gender, the evaluation took into account the integration of cross-cutting elements (human rights-based approach, equity and gender equality), based on the Guiding Document Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations and the UN-SWAP.

Specifically, the evaluation team took the following steps to respect these ethical principles:

- Ensured informed (oral) consent by key informants and beneficiaries;
- Requested permission to record audio and / or photographs in all interactions;
- Respected confidentiality and anonymity;
- Included specific evaluation questions to address the issues of equity, gender and human rights in the design of the evaluation, definition of the respective indicators and sources in the evaluation matrix and their integration in the information collection instruments within the scope of the evaluation.

3.6. LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

As summarized below, the evaluation team has identified three key limitations that have negatively impacted the evaluation process of the CPD 2017-2022, which equally affected the evaluation of outcome 3:

- I. The **challenging timeframe** in which this evaluation was carried out limited the evaluation process both in terms of data collection and report writing. The number and breath of evaluation questions to be answered was demanding to the available time. As a mitigation measure this evaluation held in-depth meetings with UNDP staff and key UNDP partners to ensure all relevant information was quickly obtained by the evaluation team. An unintended consequence was that interviews ended-up being strenuous for all parts involved, which was suboptimal, but indispensable to cover all the enunciated evaluation themes. Furthermore, after agreement with UNDP management, an additional two team

elements accompanied the evaluation team leader to the field mission to further expedite data collection.

- II. As soon as the initial list of key informants was agreed, the evaluation team send-out invitations to schedule interviews. However, this evaluation faced **low levels of responsiveness**, particularly from national partners. To mitigate low responsiveness, the evaluation team reached out key informants by phone to schedule interviews. The mitigation measure held positive results, as the evaluation team secured a high number of interviews.
- III. In the inception report **it was envisioned the application of an online survey** to increase the inputs from national partners, without the necessity of in-person interviews. Since there were low levels of e-mail responsiveness, this evaluation expanded the number of interviews *in lieu* of the online survey.

4. EVALUATION RESULTS

This chapter aims to answer the evaluation questions for the different evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and human rights and gender equality), presenting evidence for each question.

3.7. RELEVANCE

3.7.1. ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES, SDGs, AND PRIORITIES AND NEEDS OF BENEFICIARIES

To evaluate the relevance of outcome 3 of the CDP, this evaluation resorted to three sets of indicators: (i) data from standardized and internationally recognized data sets (ii) documental analysis of strategic documents, and (iii) perception of stakeholders.

This evaluation has found evidence that outcome 3 of the CPD was well aligned with identifiable needs and priorities, with the National Development Plan (*Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento - PND*) 2017-2021, including the ambition of promoting agricultural resilience to climate change, development of the blue economy, support the improvement of the business and entrepreneur environment in São Tomé and Príncipe, increase the production of renewable energy, and the strengthening of institutional and legal arrangements in disasters management²⁴. Moreover, the CPD aligned with sectoral strategies, such as the national programme for the promotion of decent work 2018-2021²⁵. Likewise, the proposed actions aligned with SDG's 1, 8, 10 and 16. Additionally, all key informants consulted agreed all Projects/Programmes under outcome 3 were relevant

Sustainable development and resilience to climate change linked indicators (see **Table 2**) suggest the relevance of the CPD. For example, the CPD focused on agriculture, forestry, and fishing; sectors that in 2017 represented almost eleven percent of the São Tomé and Príncipe's GDP²⁶. Such sectors represented a value added of 44 million (MM) US\$ in 2017²⁷, and a gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) of 1.9 MM US\$²⁸. Focusing on sustainable development, and building a resilient business environment is relevant, particularly when considering the low dynamism of the São Tomé and Príncipe economy, both in terms of new limited liability companies created, and business density²⁹. On energy, the national access to energy by the population was relatively low in 2016 (69 percent), and lower in rural areas (59 percent). The share of renewable energy in total final energy consumption was 39 percent³⁰. The levels of CO₂ emissions *per capita* was relatively low³¹, which would be expected considering the lack of intensive industry in São Tomé and Príncipe. Another relevant aspect was the ambition of contributing to improve the disaster

²⁴ São Tomé e Príncipe: "Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento 2017-2021", 2017.

²⁵ São Tomé e Príncipe: "Programa de Promoção do Trabalho Digno 2018-2021 de São Tomé e Príncipe", 2018.

²⁶ FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): "Aquastat, Agriculture, Value Added (% GDP)", <https://www.fao.org/aquastat/statistics/query/index.html?lang=en>, 2022.

²⁷ FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): "Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Value Added (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)", May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.

²⁸ FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): "Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Gross Fixed Capital Formation (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)", May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.

²⁹ World Bank: "Entrepreneurship Database", n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

³⁰ IEA (International Energy Agency), IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), UNSD (the United Nations Statistics Division), the World Bank, and WHO (World Health Organization): "Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report", n.d., (consulted 05/08/2022).

³¹ Climate Watch: "GHG Emissions. Washington", 2020.

preparedness of São Tomé and Príncipe. Data is scarce on the type, number, and effects of natural disaster in São Tomé and Príncipe. However, the International Disaster Database (EM-DAT) recorded that in 2021 almost 220 thousand - virtually the entire population - were directly or indirectly affected by floods in São Tomé and Príncipe, and eight lost their lives³². The absence of comprehensive data suggests the national capacity for monitoring and reporting natural disasters was low when the CPD was designed, which indicates the relevance of actions in this area, and further stresses the need for improving data access and reliability as a means to improve situational awareness, and decision-making capacity.

Table 2 - Sample of sustainable development and resilience to climate change indicators São Tomé and Príncipe

| Indicator | Baseline | Latest available year | |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Agriculture, value added (% GDP) ¹ | 10.88% (2017) | 11.12% (2018) | (+0.24) |
| Value Added (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing) ² | \$ 41 MM (2017) | \$ 53 MM (2020) | (+12) |
| Gross Fixed Capital Formation (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing) ² | \$ 1.9 MM (2017) | \$ 2.7 MM (2020) | (+0.8) |
| Number of new limited liability companies ³ | 360 (2016) | 268 (2020) | (-92) |
| New business density ³ | 3.3 (2016) | 2.21 (2020) | (-1.09) |
| Access to electricity (% of population) ⁴ | 69% (2016) | 77% (2020) | (+8) |
| Access to electricity, rural (% of rural population) ⁴ | 59% (2016) | 71% (2020) | (+12) |
| Access to electricity, urban (% of urban population) ⁴ | 74 (2016) | 78% (2020) | (+4) |
| Renewable energy share in total Final Energy Consumption (%) ⁴ | 39% (2016) | 37% (2019) | (-2) |
| CO ₂ emissions (metric tons per capita) ⁵ | 0.6 (2016) | 0.7 (2019) | (0.1) |
| Total population affected by flood ⁶ | - | 219 668 (2021) | - |

Source: ¹FAO: "Aquastat, Agriculture, Value Added (% GDP), 2022", 2022, ²FAO: "Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe", 2022., ³World Bank: "Entrepreneurship Database", n.d., ⁴IEA et al.: "Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report", n.d., ⁵Climate Watch: "GHG Emissions. Washington", 2020, ⁶EM-DAT): "Custom Request: disaster classification (all natural), location (Sao Tomé and Principe), range (1900-2022)", n.d..

According to key informants, the relevance of the CDP, as well as its alignment with national priorities and needs is explained by two complementary factors. First, the long history of UNDP implementation in São Tomé and Príncipe enabled the UNDP to formulate an accurate reading of the national context, priorities, and needs. Second, a consistent auscultation of national partners in the strategic definition of UNDP priorities was reported, which was conducive for the definition of priorities and activities that were relevant and well aligned with both national and sectorial strategies, as well as with institutional priorities of partners.

Regarding the auscultation of partners, it is worth separating State/Governmental and CSOs partners. State/Governmental partners have consistently reported a strong and consistent dialogue with the UNDP in defining strategic orientations, as well as in implementing plans. Differently, CSOs reported that the dialogue and auscultation took place during specific implementation plan/projects definition, but not during macro strategic orientation definition.

In assessing the 2007-2011 and 2012-2016 CPD, the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) concluded that the partnerships between NGOs and the UNDP were limited to contractual relationships for

³² EM-DAT (The International Disaster Database): "Custom Request: disaster classification (all natural), location (Sao Tomé and Principe), range (1900-2022)", n.d. (consulted 03/08/2022).

implementation, and no steps had been made to build a strategic partnership³³. Evidence collected during this evaluation indicates improvements in this area, and a consistent UNDP effort in improving strategic partnerships with CSOs (e.g., partnerships with Birdlife, OIKOS, Fundação Príncipe, among others) which is relevant particularly in a country where CSOs are fragile.

According to key informants improving the rapport with CSOs would strengthen the UNDP strategic planning capacity. Tapping into CSOs knowledge could assist the UNDP in better refining its specific activities targets, as well as specific areas of action. The full use of CSOs as strategic partners may require further UNDP action in strengthening CSOs institutional and HR capacity, as well as national/local implementation.

Another relevant aspect to further boost UNDP's strategic planning is access to reliable, consistent, and comprehensive databases with quantitative and qualitative data on multiple features of São Tomé and Príncipe. This process is hindered by fragilities in data collection mechanisms of São Tomé and Príncipe linked with insufficiency of national HR, as well as transversal suboptimal data monitoring and communication systems of São Tomé and Príncipe authorities both at INE level, and within multiple state/government bodies. Building a culture and capacity for data collection and monitoring seems to be crucial both to the UNDP's strategic planning, as well as to improve national responses and decision-making in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

3.7.2. STAKEHOLDER'S PERCEPTION ON UNDP PRESENCE IN SÃO TOMÉ AND PRÍNCIPE

This evaluation was asked to shed light on the extent to which the UNDP is perceived as a strong advocate for improving sustainable development and resilience to climate change in São Tomé and Príncipe. In questioning UNDP partners, this evaluation has found that the perception of partners is overall positive, as the UNDP is perceived as a relevant, trustworthy, and valuable partner.

key informants conveyed a shift in perception, whereas only recently the UNDP became perceived as an obvious partner. It was reported that if it was not for public calls for the implementation of outcome 3 activities key economic-linked informants would not have considered the UNDP as a natural partner. Projects/Programmes such as the social and youth entrepreneurship as well as support to the agribusiness value-chain were often stressed as perception turning points. It should be noted that from 2019 onwards the UNDP started targeting Micro and Small Enterprises (MSE) and the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem, which represented a new stream of UNDP work that normally works with Government institutions. On climate resilience key informants recognized the UNDP's relevance on resources mobilization and management but have not conveyed the perception of the UNDP as a strong partner in terms of conservation and disaster preparedness, due to lack of institutional specialization.

3.7.3. COVID-19 EFFECTS AND RESPONSE

Evidence collected during this evaluation suggests the UNDP was a key partner in assisting São Tomé and Príncipe in addressing the challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite not being enshrined in the CPD – as the CPD precedes the COVID-19 pandemic – the UNDP effectively adapted its outcomes to the effects of the pandemic, including immediate response, and post-pandemic response. According to the CPD 17-22 Financial Execution³⁴, the UNDP

³³ IEO (Independent Evaluation Office): "Assessment of Development Results, Evaluation of UNDP Contribution São Tomé & Príncipe", United Nations Development Programme, 2016.

³⁴ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REVI", 2022.

successfully mobilized US\$ 969 817,15 between 2020 and 2022 for its São Tomé and Príncipe COVID-19 response plan.

As this evaluation now briefly summarizes, COVID-19 negatively affected the implementation of the CPD's outcome 3, and led to an institutional response.

a. COVID-19 implementation effects

During the COVID-19 outbreak, health services globally were called upon to address the effects of the pandemic, there were national lockdowns worldwide, restrictions of movement, and the global logistic system lowered its responsiveness. According to key informants, the pandemic had a negative effect in the implementation of outcome 3 activities, including in the achievement of the established goals. The findings of this evaluation on the negative effects of COVID-19 to outcome implementation confirm the conclusions of the *2020 Results Oriented Annual Report*³⁵ (ROAR)

Specifically to outcome 3, key informants reported to this evaluation that **logistical constraints** – linked with the global logistic system slowdown - delayed the delivery of equipment and products which were crucial for implementation including, for example, renewable energy-linked materials. National lockdowns affected **close contact activities**, including technical assistance – via consultancy – which could not visit institutions. The transition of the work model from presential to remote also delayed activities. Likewise, south-south cooperation (SSC) activities were delayed due to travel restrictions.

b. COVID-19 Response

According to key informants, upon COVID-19 linked adversity the UNDP reacted with national partners to contribute to immediate response, and post-COVID-19 economic recovery.

Immediate Response:

- I. It was reported that the UNDP contributed **with technical assistance to the definition of national plans** to address the COVID-19 pandemic.
- II. **Equipment delivery**, the UNDP contributed with equipment, including masks and alcohol gel.
- III. In order to mitigate the adverse effects of COVID-19, all activities that could be moved online (e.g., capacity-building, technical assistance) were moved online. The **transition of activities into an online mode** enabled, in some cases, the full continuation of activities, while when transition was not possible (e.g., training that require interpersonal proximity) there were disruptions or delays in implementation.

COVID-19 Economic Recovery:

- I. The UNDP **funded/adapted entrepreneurship activities**, including the Youth Social Entrepreneurship, the Youth Entrepreneurship, and the Muala+ projects. For example, the first call for the Youth Social Entrepreneurship project focused on COVID-19 projects, which included social projects for the production of alcoholic cleaning solutions. The Youth Entrepreneurship, and the Muala+ projects sought to contribute to the post-pandemic economic revitalization. For instance, the Muala+ assisted female entrepreneurs in gaining knowledge and acquire equipment to sustain/expand their business.

³⁵ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2020.

- II. Adding to entrepreneurial activity, the UNDP’s economic recovery action equally included efforts to **strengthening the agriculture value-chain**.

3.8. EFFECTIVENESS

3.8.1. KEY RESULTS

The macro country indicators collected on **Table 2** suggest São Tomé and Príncipe registered improvements. It was registered an increase of the value added, and GFCF of agriculture, forestry, and fisheries. Business environment data indicates a worsening of the new business density, yet data refers to 2020 which was one of the years the COVID-19 pandemic hit the most on businesses. Electricity access indicators improved between 2016 and 2020. The brief collection of indicators here presented indicate an overall improvement in the areas of the CPD, as well as insufficiencies in data availability.

Information collected during this evaluation indicates that the UNDP has had an overall positive intervention in São Tomé and Príncipe, which was conducive to actual change between 2017 and 2022. The UNDP focused on four key processes: (i) infrastructure building (e.g., refurbishment of buildings) and equipment acquisition (e.g., computers, vehicles), (ii) capacity-building of HR from state/governmental, CSOs, and private sector staff on a myriad of areas (e.g., energy transition, financial literacy), (iii) technical assistance leading to the development/update of national plans, strategies, legal regimes, studies, and participation on international regimes, and (iv) advocacy on key areas of interests, such as the adoption of environmental sustainable business practices leading to sustainable and inclusive socioeconomic growth.

This evaluation will briefly discuss the main results within outcome 3 below. To that end this evaluation departed from the analysis of the outputs defined in the CPD for outcome 3. To ease the identification of the level of achievement, this evaluation built a color scheme as presented in **Table 3**. It should be noted that this evaluation did not proceed to an exhaustive reporting of results, instead it focused on key processes and achievements.

Table 3 – Target progress color scheme

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|
|  | Goal achieved |  | Goal without progress |
|  | Goal partially achieved |  | No information available |

As

Table 4 suggests, outcome 3 has overachieved the output targets established in the CPD. According to information provided by the UNDP team, the implementation of the CPD was successful in contributing to the structural transformation of productive capacities, creation of green jobs, and development of activities that benefit community’s livelihood. Regarding the business environment, indicators suggest a considerable job creation, as well as a relevant insertion of Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs), NGOs, and cooperatives within the financial services system. Additionally, the UNDP exceeded the targets on institutions instilled with environmental principles, as well as on the number of institutions and rural communities using natural resources for inclusive growth. At output level, according to the UNDP team, there is an indication that the renewable energy currently being injected in the national grid is coming from hydropower plant

(1,5 MW), which is roughly 7.9 of the percentage of renewable energy injected into national electric grid. Furthermore, UNDP data sent to this evaluation indicates the Santo Amaro solar plant will inject 10 percent of the current demand, and the Papagaio MHPP will cover 50 percent of the demand of the RAP.

Table 4 - Table of results Outcome 3

| Indicator | Baseline | Target | Latest year available | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| CPD Output 3.1 National, local and regional systems and institutions (environment, climate change and disaster risk reduction) enabled to achieve structural transformation of productive capacities that are sustainable and support employment/livelihoods | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of policies, systems and/or institutional measures in place at central, local and regional levels to generate and strengthen employment and livelihoods | 1 (2015) | 4 (2021) | 5 : Youth Connekt, 3 Innovation challenges, REINA network, NDC (2022) | ● |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of green jobs created | 0 (2015) | 150 (2021) | 1 833 (2022) | ● |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of communities benefiting from livelihood initiatives | 0 (2015) | 150 (2021) | 195 (2022) | ● |
| CPD Output 3.2: The private sector, especially small-and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), NGOs in urban and rural areas, and populations of the most vulnerable communities are able to increase their contribution to inclusive growth and employment through better access to markets, technical assistance and financial aid. | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of persons from most vulnerable communities self-employed, disaggregated by sex and areas | 0 (2015) | 150 (2021) | 784 (2022) (disaggregated information by sex and area not provided) | ● |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of SMEs, NGOs and cooperatives that access financial services | (2015) 0 SMEs 0 NGOs 0 Cooperatives | (2021) 5 SMEs 5 NGOs 5 Cooperatives | 123 (2022) (Without disaggregated information) | ● |
| CPD Output 3.3: Public and private institutions and rural communities are able to apply sustainability principles for better use of natural resources, biodiversity conservation and protection for inclusive growth. | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of public and private institutions and rural communities that adopt environmental principles | (2015) 1 Public 1 Private 1 Rural community | (2021) 3 Public 3 Private 3 Rural community | (2022) 7 Public 33 Private 10 rural communities | ● |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of institutions and rural communities using natural resources for inclusive growth | 2 (2015) | 7 (2021) | 10 rural communities | ● |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of renewable energy injected into national electric grid | 5 % (2015) | 25% (2021) | 7,9 % (2022) (1,5 MW coming from hydropower). | ● |

Source: The evaluation team, based on information provided by the UNDP Team

On **sustainable economic growth**, the UNDP has identified key intervention areas that according to key informants are essential to the future development of the country. The UNDP was innovative in focusing on sustainable agriculture value chain practices, and in assisting local communities in transitioning into economically feasible, viable, and sustainable activities. Additionally, the UNDP has supported youth entrepreneurship programmes which, according to key informants have contributed to instill a business culture among youth, and in imprinting a new vibrancy in the private sector. Indeed, it was reported to this evaluation that the entrepreneurship programmes attracted private partners, and the model followed is expected to be reproduced by other donors.

In encouraging the entrepreneurial ecosystem, UNDP gave progressive and consistent steps that marked the entrepreneurship landscape in São Tomé and Príncipe. It was reported to this evaluation that the model implemented has contributed to instill a culture of entrepreneurship in São Tomé and Príncipe, attracted private investment, and it is currently in process of being replicated. Proof of concept interventions are institutionally risky, particularly in the field of entrepreneurship where the failure of ideas and new business is believed to be tendentially high over a five-year period³⁶.

According to information collected, the first UNDP approach to entrepreneurship activities was through **social entrepreneurship** (Empreendedorismo Social), and in partnership with the Ministry of Youth, Sport, and Entrepreneurship. The objective was to instill a culture of entrepreneurship in youth, *via* the development of businesses to address social problems. Upon public call, 1000 youth received information of the project, roughly 120 completed remote business training, 88 submitted a business idea, and 15 ideas received a funding of between two to three thousand dollars. The 15 ideas funded involved 22 youth and created 45 part-time jobs³⁷. According to key informants, from the 15-business financed in 2019, 10 remained active at the time of this evaluation. The initiative, the first of the kind for the São Tomé and Príncipe UNDP, contributed to raise the UNDP profile as a partner to private sector development.

In the sequence of the social entrepreneurship project, and in partnership with the Incubadora Central (Ministry of Youth, Sport and Entrepreneurship), the UNDP contributed to launching the **youth entrepreneurship programme** (*Empreende Jovem*) directed to the youth. The project expected to finance 15 projects. According to the UNDP Team the project was intended at improving youth entrepreneurial capacities and contribute to economic growth. This project developed a Digital Platform for Entrepreneurship, a business database, and rehabilitated a colonial building to host the National Network of Business Incubators (REINA - *Rede Nacional de Incubadoras e Aceleradoras de Negócio*). To boost business activities directly, this project launched three innovation challenges that ended up funding 55 businesses. The innovation challenges were conceived as COVID-19 response and recovery mechanisms. A relevant feature of the project was that some of the projects funded were from the diaspora.

According to final youth beneficiaries consulted - which participated in youth entrepreneurship initiatives - the main channels of communication on to attract participants were the radio, internet, family referral, and participation in the social entrepreneurship project. The motives for participation were similar: a business idea and an entrepreneurial spirit, but insufficient resources and knowledge to launch a business.

Regarding knowledge, when inquired on key knowledge acquired that was useful in the implementation of their business, entrepreneurs mentioned the training modules of financial literacy, business plan, business management, sales, marketing, management of supplies and suppliers, and customer service. During the project, there was a partnership with the Banque Gabonaise et Francaise Internationale (BGFI), which offered entrepreneurs the possibility of opening a bank account free of charge.

³⁶ Data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics which indicates that approximately 19 percent of new businesses fail in the first year, 45 percent in the first five years, and 65 percent in the first ten years is usually referred when assessing the success rates of new businesses. Such data should be interpreted with cautious, as the US reality and economic vibrancy is not comparable to the one of São Tomé e Príncipe. An accurate reading of company success rate in São Tomé e Príncipe can only be well established once there is sufficient data to measure company creation/closure, and informality rates drop.

³⁷ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2019.

Upon completion of the training, it was reported the financial envelop to fund the entrepreneurs' ideas took between two to six months to be delivered. It was reported by final beneficiaries that they were unaware of the schedule to the delivery of the funds. All final beneficiaries consulted mentioned their business remains active and has contributed to generating employment. A relevant aspect was the consistent feedback that the Incubadora Central makes post-training monitoring of the entrepreneurs funded. It was unclear to this evaluation the success rate of businesses funded by the grants.

When asked on recommendations to improve future editions, most final beneficiaries stressed two aspects: 1) the clear definition of a chronogram that clearly shows the time gaps between training and funding, and 2) the creation of a follow-up financing line for businesses that remain active and may require additional funding.

Linked to Empreende Jovem, the Muala+ came as a Joint Programme between the PNUD, OIT and UNICEF. Muala+ was a COVID-19 response project proposedly targeting informal businesswomen that had been negatively affected by COVID-19. The objective was to support women-led businesses with training, raw materials, equipment, and infrastructure. More than 2000 applications were received. From those, 256 received training in business management and 44 women were funded.

According to final beneficiaries consulted, the Muala+ provided support for businesses during the hard period of COVID-19. It was reported the training was useful in matters of financial and business management, business plan, customer service, and marketing. The delivery of equipment was reportedly slow (2-6 months), yet the process was relatively simple with the exception of the slow-motion culture of São Tomé and Príncipe. According to what was reported, the Incubadora Central monitors entrepreneurs after training. The project assisted in improving beneficiaries' businesses and acquiring equipment that otherwise they would not be able to acquire.

Besides entrepreneurs the project assisted in strengthening the institutional capacity of Incubadora Central, which was established and developed as the entrepreneurship projects were being implemented. According to key informants, the establishment of the Incubadora Central is a benchmark in the process of instilling a business culture in São Tomé and Príncipe and in dynamizing the national business environment.

Another area in which the UNDP has contributed to sustainable economic growth relates to the **agribusiness value chain**. The UNDP supported the increase of agricultural production and exporting with both governmental (e.g., Ministry of Commerce) and CSO partners - mainly MSE and cooperatives. According to the UNDP Team, tailor-made support packages for 23 MSE were designed. The packages included seven typologies of support lines, namely: marketing and communication, knowledge acquisition, food quality, product development, equipment & reconstruction of production units. The support packages were agreed between the Implementing Partner - Secretary of State for Trade and Industry (SSTI) - and each MSE that in return committed to contributing to sustainable development goals, setting concrete targets.

The support to the agribusiness value chain included market studies – elaborated by externally hired consultants -, business benchmark activities in pepper sector (e.g., to the Cameroon), participation in international trade shows and fairs (e.g., BIOFACH), acquisition of small equipment, training, and Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) certification. According to key informants, the strategy that is being followed is to place São Tomé and Príncipe agribusiness

products into biologic market niches (e.g., spices, coconut, coffee). It was reported the governmental ambition is to maintain a fully biological production.

In the implementation of entrepreneurship projects, and in the promotion of the local business environment, it was reported that the slow-motion culture of the country, the incipency of the local market, lack of resources, as well as deficiencies in the national business legal framework are key hinderances. According to key informants, the UNDP, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Bank are currently contributing to the improvement of national legislation, as well as to capacity-building of staff of the Ministry of Commerce in matters of trade agreements.

It was reported the UNDP was visionary in assisting communities in transition into environmental and economic sustainable business activities that are resilient to climate change³⁸. Furthermore, according to key informants, the UNDP, along with national and international partners, is contributing to the need of preserving biodiversity by improving the use of natural resources. In the area of conservation, the UNDP focus was on strategic planning, which included the assistance in the update of the National Determined Contributions (NDC-São Tomé and Príncipe); a key document guiding the relation between economic growth, climate change and environmental protection³⁹.

With the objective of building resilience and capacity in addressing disasters, the UNDP engaged with national partners in establishing an **early warning system**, as well as capacity to **manage disaster response**. Upon assessment, the UNDP supported the establishment and improvement of the Conselho Nacional de Preparação e Resposta às Catástrofes (CONPREC), which was established with the Decreto-Lei 14/2011. CONPREC receives, validates, and disseminates information to multiple emergency disaster related bodies, including the National Meteorology Institute (INM), the Coast Guard, Fireman, the military, health services, among others. According to key informants the CONPREC has been instrumental in the adaptation of legal frameworks, as well as national risk assessment. The UNDP supported CONPREC with infrastructure, equipment (e.g., office equipment, vehicles, clothing, tents, communications), capacity-building, and technical assistance to the elaboration or update of disaster response planning (e.g., contingency planning). It further supported the establishment of local committees for risk management – 31 teams nationwide with a total of 450 members. It was reported the UNDP assisted in improving the disaster response system in São Tomé and Príncipe. Furthermore, it was reported the UNDP strongly encouraged the constitution of networks and partnerships (e.g., the World Bank and the International Committee of the Red Cross) in order to improve efficiency and increase the sustainability of the system. According to key informants, the system remains fragile in terms of access to key information (e.g., meteorological information), analysis, and energy sustainability.

Another key area in which the UNDP was consequential was in its assistance to the **energy transition** that will eventually lead to greening the energy mix of São Tomé and Príncipe via hydro energy and solar energy. The UNDP has contributed to the country's transition into renewable energies. *Via* technical assistance it has assisted the São Tomé and Príncipe government in strengthening the body of legislation, regulation, and codes intended at de-risking investment in renewable energies, in conducting feasibility studies on hydroelectric and photovoltaic plants, drafting integrated watershed management plans and improving the national stakeholders'

³⁸ Iueva, Lili, Antonio Correia and Marion Denantes: "Project terminal Evaluation: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Cantagalo and Lobata (CMPLCL)", 2019.

³⁹ São Tomé e Príncipe: "São Tomé e Príncipe National Determined Contributions (NDC-São Tomé e Príncipe) Update", 2021.

capacities to manage the energy transition. Furthermore, in partnership with AfDB, the UNDP has built the first photovoltaic plant in São Tomé and Príncipe, which is expected to produce a peak production of 540 kilowatts. The plant (Santo Amaro) was inaugurated by the Prime Minister in August 2022. A second phase of the plant is expected to be financed by the African Development Bank (AFDB) and it is expected to reach 1.5 megawatts at peak production⁴⁰. The continuation of UNDP and its national partners work by another organization indicates the leadership role of the UNDP in identifying core needs and processes. It further indicates the sustainability and governmental ownership of activities.

In this regard, and in partnership with the *Direção Geral dos Recursos Naturais e Energia* (DGRNE) and other partners, the UNDP supported an extensive legal and plan framework revision (e.g., Plano de Gestão Integrado de Bacias Hidrológicas, Lei-Quadro de Recursos Hídricos, Lei base de sistema elétrico nacional, Decreto lei 26/2014, Plano de Manejo Florestal), and feasibility studies including on hydroelectric and solar use, and watershed management plants.

The UNDP equally supported the elaboration of the national Training Plan for Energy Transition and within this, the capacity-building of 208 public servants from 15 public institutions. The capacity-building was deemed adequate and improved the capacities of public institutions. Additionally, the UNDP supported with infrastructure and equipment (e.g., the DGRNE building, which was rehabilitated and equipped with solar panels).

The government requested an investment to build the first solar photovoltaic plant in São Tomé and Príncipe. The UNDP developed the feasibility and other technical studies for the construction of the solar plant in Santo Amaro. According to national stakeholders, the UNDP further supported the mobilization of resources, setting of partnerships, and sectoral coordination including with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the World Bank, and the AFDB. As noted previously the solar plant was inaugurated in August 2022, which represents a key achievement of the UNDP and its partners.

3.8.2. STATE/GOVERNMENT AND CSOs INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

As previously explained and demonstrated, this evaluation has found evidence that the UNDP's activities contributed to strengthening national government capacity and institutions within state/government and CSO bodies. The key interventions leading to institutional strengthening were: (i) infrastructure building (e.g., DGRNE office buildings), (ii) provision of equipment (e.g., office equipment, vehicles), (iii) capacity-building of partner's staff (e.g., energy transition) at managerial and technical level, and business training for private sector (iv) improvement of legal frameworks (e.g., energy sector, forestry), and (v) strengthening of HR quantity (e.g., consultants hired). According to key informants, the strengthening resulted in an overall improvement of services and practices.

The current UNDP's intervention model addresses the structural elements of partners' needs. The pertinence of these core processes remains valid and necessary, as the institutional fabric of São Tomé and Príncipe (both at state/government and CSO levels) remains fragile.

⁴⁰ Observador: "São Tomé e Príncipe inaugura Primeira Central de Energia Fotovoltaica", 25 August, 2022.

3.8.3. FUTURE PROGRAMME AREAS FOR CONSOLIDATION AND SCALE UP

As part of the interview data collection process, the evaluation team consulted key informants in their areas of expertise about the most relevant programme areas that the UNDP should consolidate and/or scale up moving forward, specifically for outcome 3. Key areas include:

- I. **(Green) Economic Growth.** During the current CPD the UNDP gave steps towards building a stronger economic sector in São Tomé and Príncipe. Key informants regard a stronger business environment as a foundational step to improve the resilience and capacity of São Tomé and Príncipe. It is considered the economic sector maintains severe limitations and requires interventions at internal and external levels. At internal market level it is considered the UNDP could scale-up its interventions in improving the internal business environment by (i) providing support to enhance internal legislation, including quality standard setting, (ii) through activities to promote national products and services, and (iii) by providing incentives to the constitution of businesses, for instance, through incentives to (young) entrepreneurs and SMEs, micro-credit, as well as capacity-building in the areas of business management, and financial education. At external level, key informants stressed assistant to the internationalization of the São Tomé and Príncipe economy through (i) supporting the establishment of cooperatives – a means to mitigate the lack of scale of the São Tomé and Príncipe economy -, (ii) supporting participation of national business in international trade shows, as well as (iii) supporting and providing technical assistance to the participation of São Tomé and Príncipe in regional trade agreements. Governmental and CSOs key informants often conveyed to the evaluation team that investing in biological/eco-friendly production could be an appropriate pathway, as it could potentially place São Tomé and Príncipe in relevant international market niches. In this regard key informants mentioned the relevance of integrating forestry management with agrobusiness investments in order to ensure sustainable development.
- II. **Blue economy:** Protecting marine areas and enhancing the blue economy (e.g., coastal tourism) were stressed as areas of interest with potential to assist in improving the national economy, and the environmental sustainability of the country. Key informants noted the need to improve the quality of marine ecosystems – particularly close-to-shore ecosystems -, such as mangrove forests, which may have a triple positive effect in the marine ecosystem-recovery, food-security, and tourism. The UNDP Team stressed the need for a dedicated and continuous effort to protect the islands' ecosystem and renewable natural resources in order to support São Tomé and Príncipe in meeting SDG targets, as well as the country's commitments under the Rio Conventions.
- III. **Energy Transition.** It was deemed relevant for the UNDP to further contribute to the resilience of the energy sector in São Tomé and Príncipe, particularly regarding green energy, including through mini-grids, hydropower, and solar. On hydropower, for instance, it was noted to this evaluation that studies in some hydrographic basins have already been made - some of which with UNDP support -, thus in the future it would be relevant to take the studies into implementation.
- IV. **Data and Statistics.** The issue of socio-economic, and environmental data availability was recurrent across key informants. Improving situational awareness is regarded as quintessential to improve decision making and monitor progress. Further work is required to increase capacities, including HR of the INE, other state/governmental bodies, and CSOs. A culture of data collection should be instilled across public and private services as a means to increase cost-effectiveness of interventions.

- V. **Waste Management.** Key informants referred waste management as a priority area in São Tomé and Príncipe, as at the present waste management is an underdeveloped area in the country.
- VI. **Disaster response.** Despite the investment made, the disaster response of São Tomé and Príncipe remains suboptimal, thus key informants noted the need to scale-up investment in the entire chain of disaster response, including data collection, information analysis and dissemination, coordination and capacity in the theater of operations, as well as post-disaster response.
- VII. **Biodiversity and climate change:** Considering the decree-law 17/2022, which officialized key measures included in the NDC, the UNDP Team stressed the need to support the country in achieving the targets established in the NDC (e.g., greenhouse gas emissions reduction of 109.000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, corresponding to a 27 percent emission reduction compared to its 2030 Business as Usual projected emissions). Accordingly, the UNDP Team suggested the provision of technical and financial assistance, in several areas of interests, namely: (i) increase in renewable energy share integrated in the national grid, (ii) reduction in power grid losses and increase of energy efficiency, (iii) reduction in the transport sector's carbon footprint, (iv) reduced use of nitrogen-based fertilizers in agriculture, (v) water management, (vi) fisheries, (vii) resilience in coastal areas, (viii) sustainable management of forests, and (ix) waste management.
- VIII. **State/Governmental and CSOs institutional support.** Key beneficiaries consistently noted a structural need to continue strengthening state/governmental bodies as well as CSOs. The support referred to the evaluation team includes:
 - o Equipment and Infrastructure. Key informants considered relevant the scaling up of projects to improve infrastructure and support the procurement of equipment and goods. For instance, it was considered relevant to further invest in infrastructure to collect weather information, as well as equipment for disasters response (e.g., flood response).
 - o Capacity-building. Improving the capacity-building of HR in the country in multiple areas was consistent feedback across key informants, including on-the-job training, professional training, and tertiary education. In terms of targets, key informants referred the need for vertical training within state/governmental and CSOs, as a mechanism to ensure actual institutional change, and proper ownership. Digital literacy was transversally identified as a key area. Key informants identified outcome-specific areas of capacity-building needs, as following⁴¹: financial literacy, business management, weather forecast, and data collection and reporting.

3.8.4. SOUTH-SOUTH (SSC) / TRIANGULAR COOPERATION

According to key informants SSC/Triangular cooperation activities were mostly ad hoc, and focused on internationalization activities of São Tomé and Príncipe businesses such as benchmarking in the Cameroon, and the Youth Connekt, signing of African Union Treaties, and exchanges in the context of the energy transition, including Training of Trainers (ToT) for forestry staff in Benin, visit to the Portuguese Directorate General for Energy and Geology (Direção-Geral de Energia e Geologia - DGEG), and benchmark to the University of Évora (Portugal) for photovoltaic technology assessment.

⁴¹ In an attempt to scrutinize priority areas, the evaluation team requested key informants to provide only one or two examples of capacity-building needs. Therefore, the list of identified needs may be more extensive than those reported here.

Key informants reported added value and gains in terms of exchange of ideas for practices and considered the practice should be scaled-up

3.9. EFFICIENCY

3.9.1. FINANCIAL EXECUTION AND RESOURCES EFFICIENCY

According to the CPD 17-22 Financial Execution⁴², the UNDP had an impressive mobilization of resources strategy (see **Table 5**). When compared to outcome 3 indicative budget established in the CPD, the actual resources delivered under outcome 3 almost doubled what was initially envisioned. Indeed, the total indicative budget for outcome 3 was 7,300,000 US\$, and by the time of this evaluation the UNDP had delivered 15,181,039US\$, which represents roughly 39,9 percent of the total budget the UNDP delivered during the CPD 2017-2022 (i.e., 38,076,973 US\$).

Table 5 – Indicative budget vs resources delivered

| | Indicative ¹ | Delivered ² | |
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Outcome 3 | 7 300 000 US\$ | 15 181 039 US\$ | (+7,881,039) |

Source: ¹UNDP: “Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)”, September 2016. ²UNDP: “CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REV1”, August 2022.

Within outcome 3, the programmatic area that absorbed more resources was renewable energy, with roughly 5 MM US\$ delivered, followed by building resilience to communities with roughly 2,2 MM US\$, and Young Social Entrepreneurship with roughly 2 MM US\$ (see **Table 6**).

This evaluation has found evidence partnerships were positive for mobilization of resources and sharing of knowledge and resources. As a non-specialized United Nations (UN) agency, the UNDP often bridged partners and fostered the establishment of networks which, according to key informants, had significant effects in the mobilization efforts. For instance, key informants reported UNDP partnership was indispensable to access funds from the European Union (EU).

According to key informants, the resources allocated to the several projects were adequate to the intended purpose. Key informants reported delays in the attribution of funding. The delays were often attributed to bureaucratic processes which partners – and UNDP staff members - perceive as being complex, thus creating delays. Furthermore, some key informants noted an excessive pressure for substantial financial execution within the first half of the year, regardless of the stage of implementation. The pressure may result in suboptimal implementation, as some projects/programmes may require initial periods of implementation without substantial financial execution in order to achieve a cost-effective, well-thought, and adequate implementation. This is the case, for instance, in projects that involve community engagement - which require confidence-building measures with population before substantial project financial delivery -, or that require lengthy procurement strategies.

Regarding HR, it was generally acknowledged that the consultants hired by the UNDP to either manage or assist in the implementation of projects/activities had adequate expertise. Most key informants noted the importance of Portuguese speaking consultants for knowledge sharing. The practice of hiring external consultants to suppress HR national needs enabled access to

⁴² UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REV1”, August 2022.

knowledge that was otherwise unavailable in the country. However, the practice equally results in a loss of accumulated institutional knowledge, as consultants leave by project end. Moreover, key informants from partners institutions noted a paradox relation with external consultants. On the one hand, key informants recognized their added value. On the other hand, because consultants are external, they are often not integrated within national teams, and are sometimes perceived as a 'strange' body within the institutions.

Table 6 – Financial Execution

| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | Total | % total |
|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Total CPD | \$6 185 759,54 | \$5 441 751,74 | \$4 253 469,13 | \$7 207 380,88 | \$7 065 789,97 | \$7 922 822,14 | \$38 076 973,40 | 100% |
| OUTCOME 3 | \$1 865 738,12 | \$2 228 622,85 | \$1 830 990,51 | \$3 077 086,67 | \$3 439 845,59 | \$2 738 755,74 | \$15 181 039,48 | 39.9% |

| Activity | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | Total Geral |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| OUTCOME 3 | \$1 865 738,12 | \$2 228 622,85 | \$1 830 990,51 | \$3 077 086,67 | \$3 439 845,59 | \$2 738 755,74 | \$15 181 039,48 |
| Pims4602 - Renewable Energy | \$458 174,74 | \$1 034 216,88 | \$1 081 946,90 | \$931 423,61 | \$1 270 536,47 | \$234 055,00 | \$5 010 353,60 |
| Resilient Capacities Communities | \$1 011 290,00 | \$940 485,53 | \$336 208,12 | \$10 980,97 | \$690,84 | | \$2 299 655,46 |
| Young Social Entrepreneurship | | | | \$1 370 465,26 | \$556 023,97 | \$131 090,03 | \$2 057 579,26 |
| Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation; Sust Land and Nat R | | | | \$37 426,76 | \$393 725,15 | \$1 083 079,00 | \$1 514 230,91 |
| Export Value Chain | | | | | \$732 515,73 | \$750 000,00 | \$1 482 515,73 |
| Delivering Climate Promise in São Tomé and Príncipe NDC Support Programme | | | | \$380 352,17 | \$449 537,88 | \$158 782,00 | \$988 672,05 |
| Preparedness Warning System | \$396 273,38 | \$253 920,44 | \$24 999,64 | \$4 700,00 | | | \$679 893,46 |
| Implementation of SDGs | | | | \$270 726,95 | | \$271 881,71 | \$542 608,66 |
| Partnership for the SDG Autonomous Region of Príncipe | | | \$295 514,29 | -\$4 066,87 | \$97,54 | | \$291 544,96 |
| Biodiversity Resilience Degradation Land | | | \$87 299,88 | \$54 450,99 | | | \$141 750,87 |
| CliMateSud - Strategic Accelerator Partnership | | | | \$20 238,92 | \$36 718,01 | | \$56 956,93 |
| PPG African Minigrids Program São Tomé and Príncipe | | | | | | \$50 000,00 | \$50 000,00 |
| Recovery and Resilience-Building in Response to Floods | | | | | | \$50 000,00 | \$50 000,00 |
| Climate resilience in Agriculture | | | | | | \$9 868,00 | \$9 868,00 |
| Innovation Facility | | | \$4 926,62 | \$394,13 | | | \$5 320,75 |
| Promoting the empowerment of Girls | | | \$95,06 | -\$6,22 | | | \$88,84 |

3.9.2. UNDP MANAGEMENT, STRUCTURE, AND M&E

The São Tomé and Príncipe's UNDP team is relatively small and young, and it is complemented with transitory staff (seconded staff and volunteers). Data collected indicates that there is a relatively high staff turnover, which is justified by the suboptimal living conditions in São Tomé and Príncipe. Key informants often mentioned the low quality of medical access and lack of country infrastructure as the main reasons for staff turnover. It was reported office culture is adequate and leading to successful implementation of tasks.

Regular staff meetings with focus on reporting execution of projects were considered relevant to provide the opportunity for strategic discussion, sharing of lessons-learned, and cross-fertilization of the experiences across outcomes. However, this evaluation has found an opportunity for improved comprehensive strategic communication and learning among the staff from the different outcomes. The different programmatic outcomes share core processes (e.g., infrastructure building, acquisition), thus there is ground for further knowledge sharing.

To favor a culture of building institutional knowledge, and sharing of know-how, information, and lessons learned, the UNDP could potentially devote resources into maintaining a well curated and updated institutional archive. In a small office where staff members often participate in several projects, it is important to establish a responsible for curating an UNDP project library.

According to key informants, staff turnover has not led to evident losses in implementation. However, it was reported that staff turnover sometimes leads to strategic realignment of project implementation, which sometimes creates frictions with partners. Moreover, new staff often require time to have a comprehensive knowledge of the processes and procedures of the UNDP, which sometimes lead to incomplete or inaccurate information provided to partners. This problem affects seconded and volunteer staff the most. In order to mitigate the negative effects of staff turnover, the UNDP could consider a strong staff induction package, with a guidance toolbox for all those who begin functions at UNDP. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors the quick integration of new staff into the practices, methods, language, processes, and procedures of the UNDP.

The need for effective staff induction processes seems to be particularly relevant as it was reported that UNDP procedures, including procurement procedures, are often complex, and hard to navigate through. In fact, multiple staff and former staff reported lack of knowledge on management tools such as the ATLAS. In this regard, it was reported that to ease adaptation – particularly by seconded staff and volunteers – key guidelines should be made available in Portuguese.

Resources mobilization was a key area of CPD success between 2017 and 2022. Reportedly, the process of resource mobilization and programme/project design could be further improved with the establishment of a backstopping mechanism to support project design. It was reported that sometimes experts in specific technical areas are also responsible for designing programmes/projects proposals. However, despite being experts in their respective fields, sometimes consultants lack specific technical knowledge in the redaction and design of development cooperation projects. The insufficiencies at design phase could lead to the

inadequate definition of goals, indicators, M&E instruments, etc. In fact, several project evaluation reports mentioned the insufficiency of at design phase, including at results framework level⁴³.

The CPD envisioned efforts to increase the M&E capacity of the UNDP. It was reported to this evaluation that steps were made to install a M&E office. However, staff turnover prevented the office from being implemented. Strengthening M&E efforts – which are currently focused on programme managers - is crucial for the consistent improvement of the UNDP activities, early detection of implementation divergencies, as well as for consistent reporting of UNDP achievements to partners and donors. M&E of projects in São Tomé and Príncipe may face difficulties at quantitative level due to lack of data collection and monitoring culture in the country. As already extensively discusses across this report, data is crucial for M&E, as well as for decision making. Therefore, higher efforts should be made to instill a data collection culture across managing and implementing partners of UNDP projects. Considering the relatively small size of the UNDP office, it should be considered the establishment of an M&E unit or a joint M&E office with other UN agencies in São Tomé and Príncipe.

The findings of this chapter cut across all CPD outcomes.

3.9.3. PARTNERSHIPS AND SYNERGIES

This evaluation has found evidence the UNDP developed its actions in São Tomé and Príncipe in partnership with national partners - both governmental and CSO -, and other international organizations. Partnerships were positive in terms of resources mobilization, as well as sharing of knowledge and resources. As a non-specialized UN agency, the UNDP often bridged partners and fostered the establishment of synergies and networks, which has contributed to implementation. Furthermore, the UNDP contributed to strengthen the capacities of national partners, which reportedly added value to partnerships.

The non-specialized nature of the UNDP was sometimes mentioned as a potential hindrance in terms of recognition. However, the findings in this evaluation seem to suggest the comprehensive scope of the UNDP has been instrumental in the process of establishing bridges and partnerships between partners. Furthermore, the bird-eye perspective of a generalist organization seems to have been useful in the identification of core needs and implementation of innovative activities within the context of São Tomé and Príncipe, such as the youth entrepreneurship activities, and the need for climate adaptation in the agricultural sector⁴⁴.

This evaluation has found evidenced of synergies with other organizations, including governmental institutions (e.g., DGRNE, Institute of Meteorology, Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Youth, CONPREC), CSOs (e.g., Cooperativa de Exportação e Produção Pimenta Biológica, OIKOS, Birdlife International), international organizations (e.g., UNIDO, AFDB, the World Bank), and the private sector (e.g., entrepreneurs, BGFI).

⁴³ See, for example, Lueva, Lili, Antonio Correia and Marion Denantes: "Project terminal Evaluation: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Cantagalo and Lobata (CMLPLCL)", 2019. Larrabure, Juan, Víctor Bonfim: "Final Evaluation Report Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change", 2019.

⁴⁴ Lueva, Lili, Antonio Correia, and Marion Denantes: "Project terminal Evaluaiton: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Catnagalo and Lobata (CMLPLCL)", 2019.

3.9.4. UNDP-PARTNER'S WORKFLOW

According to key informants, the workflow between the UNDP and its partners is overall positive. Partners from state/government bodies, as well as from CSOs conveyed to this evaluation satisfaction with the partnerships with the UNDP, which is perceived as a trusted partner that adds value to its partners.

The factors mostly evoked to explain the overall positive assessment of UNDP-Partner's workflow include (i) a spirit of systematic and open dialogue, (ii) UNDP flexibility in adapting activities in perceived changing contexts and beneficiary needs, (iii) overall good relation at operational level, (iv) efficient communication lines, (v) good interpersonal relations between UNDP staff and partner's staff, (vi) UNDP's efficiency in mobilizing resources (funds and HR), (vii) UNDP's capacity of linking with key stakeholders and fostering partnerships, (viii) UNDP's accurate reading of the national context and institutional constrains, and (ix) UNDP's access to high-level decision makers.

Key informants from partner institutions noted some key practices, and processes that can be improved. Across outcomes, three themes emerged as suboptimal aspects of the partnership. Those relate to the complexity of UNDP procedures, external staff / public servants' relation, and financial management of projects/programmes. As this evaluation now discusses the aspects mentioned may be overcome with enhanced mechanisms for mutual awareness, as the root causes of tensions appear to be linked with misperceptions and/or lack of awareness.

Perceived excessive bureaucracy, and complexity of UNDP procedures is often referred as a source of friction. Partners consider UNDP procedures to be extremely complex, even in comparison to other organizations such as the EU, and other UN agencies. Reportedly, dialogue with UNDP staff often assists in overcoming bureaucratic challenges, yet it was reported that sometimes even UNDP staff might not be entirely aware of these procedures. This evaluation was informed that the UNDP has in place sessions to explain key processes to new partners at the beginning of implementation. However, state/government and CSOs partners experience high staff turnover rates, which may explain a perceived less successful experience of initial sessions. Therefore, the UNDP should consider improving guidance for UNDP implementing partners, including actionable manuals in Portuguese and in English, and clear schedules for the delivery of documentations (e.g., narrative, or financial reports).

Effective, clear, and comprehensive induction processes favor a good communication with implementing partners, and a thorough transmission of operating instructions, particularly on payment procedures/access funding and the implementation of activities/projects' monitoring and reporting (including financial reporting).

An interesting process often mentioned by partners that causes implementation difficulties and delays is the relatively standard procedural demand of presenting three pro-forma invoices whenever there is a planned expense. According to key informants, the small size of the São Tomé and Príncipe economy and lack of competing businesses, aligned with the slow-motion culture of the country, often renders obtaining the pro-forma invoices difficult. The difficulty is often majored when the same supplier is chosen more than once, as it results in other suppliers not being willing to send pro-forma invoices. Because of the economic context, it could be useful to attempt business diversification at supplier level, even when less cost-effective. Diversity of suppliers could assist in dynamizing the local economy, which could have positive externalities in terms of business environment, and local economy support.

Adding to procedures, key informants often mentioned **friction in the rapport between externally hired staff and public servants**. This evaluation already mentioned that sometimes UNDP hired staff is not fully integrated into institution's dynamics, which reduces both ownership and the establishment of institutional knowledge. However, HR frictions equally relate with the tendential higher salary offered by the UNDP and other IOs to national contracts. It has been reported that UNDP-placed staff often earn higher salaries when compared to public servants, including those with a higher hierarchical level. The salary gap has reportedly created grievances and frustrations among public servants, which has been linked with lower levels of project ownership. The issue of remuneration is not exclusive to the UNDP. Indeed, the same dynamics of pay gaps can be found in projects/programmes implemented by other IOs. There is no obvious solution to the frictions raised by pay gaps. Yet feedback provided by public servants to this evaluation indicate grievances that may cause unnecessary frictions with partner's staff and reduce the levels of public servants' engagement required to effective implementation and national ownership.

Lastly, there is the issue of **budget autonomy by partners**. It was reported by both state/governmental and CSOs a consistent ambition of having an enhanced participation in the financial management of projects/programmes. In the health sector, the UNDP successfully transitioned the management of the Global Fund project into the MoH. The transition was well celebrated and deemed to have strengthened the MoH. Considering that several partners explicitly ambition higher levels of responsibility, it could be relevant for the UNDP to focus on strengthening partner's capacities, and slowly transfer some financial management powers. Such institutional strengthening could assist the UNDP in finding partners for National Implementation projects, which would increase the levels of national ownership, and slowly reduce the levels of dependence on UNDP assistance. Indeed, ensuring national ownership, leadership and accountability were key.

The findings of this chapter cut across all CPD outcomes.

3.10. SUSTAINABILITY

Some key achievements of the country programme are highly likely to be sustainable. A clear area of sustainability is the adoption of legal and regulatory frameworks in multiple areas, including laws on resources use (forestry, water), energy regulation among many others. Laws and procedures solidify change, and the adoption of new principles and practices.

Capacity-building and strengthening of state/government partners as well as CSOs is another area that offer signs of sustainability. It contributes to improvements in governmental response, as well as to CSOs participation in decision-making, and monitoring across governmental areas. The capacity-building of staff also indicates the sustainability of results, as new practices and methods are slowly penetrating the São Tomé and Príncipe public administration, and CSOs staff consider to be better prepared to push their agendas.

Some institutions that were strengthened during the CPD have reportedly become part of the governmental organic, such as the Incubadora Central, and the CONPREC that, according to key informants, will become the National Risk Management Platform, which showcases national ownership in these areas.

The positive signs are, however, contingent to the availability of resources. As the context of this evaluation described, São Tomé and Príncipe is highly dependent on foreign aid, and foreign debt.

In this sense, the UNDP's acute *modus operandi* of seeking partnerships and in establishing synergies and networks is useful in the continuous effort of resource mobilization. Likewise, the investment in the private sector, and in the emergence of an economically sustainable internal market is the seed for a more dynamic economic landscape, which in the long-term may assist São Tomé and Príncipe in achieving higher levels of growth and reduce poverty.

3.11. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY

The CDP addressed key human rights issues including, for example, equal rights of men and women, adequate standard of living for health and well-being, and the right to work. Vulnerable groups and gender equality were addressed at strategic design level and implementation. For instance, on **gender and youth**, the UNDP youth entrepreneurship activities were gender inclusive, and the project Muala+ was purposely directed towards female entrepreneurs. Gender reporting was inconsistent which indicates the need for further strengthening of M&E tools (see **Table 4**).

The CPD proposed to target **PwD** which, according to the CPD, represented 3.5 percent of the labor force⁴⁵, however this evaluation has found no significant evidence that PwD were particularly targeted under outcome 3. To improve the inclusion of PwD, future action may consider launching specific activities to address PwD

⁴⁵ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This evaluation has found evidence the CPD outcome 3 was well aligned with identifiable needs and priorities, with the PND 2017-2021, and with sectoral plans and priorities, as well as with the (SDG's) 1, 8, 10 and 16. All key informants consulted agreed the outcomes proposed in the CPD, as well as the several Projects/Programmes that followed were relevant.

The relevance of the CDP, as well as its alignment with national priorities and needs is explained by two complementary factors. (i) the long history of UNDP implementation in São Tomé and Príncipe enabled the UNDP to formulate an accurate reading of the national context, priorities, and needs, and (ii) there was a consistent effort in auscultating national partners. Further strengthening consultation with national partners, particularly Civil society Organizations (CSOs) would further strengthen the UNDP's strategic planning capacity. Overall, the UNDP is perceived as a relevant, trustworthy, and valuable partner.

This evaluation has found that the CPD implementation has made a significant contribution to the planned objectives. Under outcome 3, the UNDP contributed to the resilience and dynamism of the economic landscape of São Tomé and Príncipe by supporting (youth) entrepreneurship, the development of the agriculture value-chain, and by supporting local communities in finding climate change resilient livelihood alternatives. The UNDP supported the national early warning and disaster preparedness system with capacity-building, equipment, and technical capacity to improve disaster response planning. Moreover, the UNDP contributed to the energy transition of São Tomé and Príncipe with extensive support for the adaptation of legal and plan frameworks (e.g., *Lei-Quadro de Recursos Hídricos*), as well as capacity-building of national partner's structures (e.g., buildings, training). Additionally, the UNDP supported the construction of the first solar plant in the country. At macro environmental level, the UNDP provided technical assistant to 2021 the update of the NDC.

The mobilization of resources by the UNDP for the programmed cycle was impressive. From a total indicative budget of 7,300,000 US\$ for outcome 3 in 2016, by the time of this evaluation, the UNDP had mobilized funds that enabled a delivery of 15,181,039 US\$, which represents roughly 39,9 percent of the total budget the UNDP delivered during the CPD 2017-2022 (i.e., 38,076,973,40 US\$). The workflow between the UNDP and its partners is overall positive, and the UNDP is regarded as trusted partner that adds value to its partners.

Some key achievements of the country programme are highly likely to be sustainable. A clear area of sustainability is the adoption of legal and regulatory frameworks in multiple areas, including laws on resources use (forestry, water), energy regulation, among many others. Laws and procedures solidify change, and the adoption of new principles and practices. Capacity-building and strengthening of state/government partners as well as CSOs is another area that offer signs of sustainability. Some institutions that were strengthened during the CPD have reportedly become part of the governmental organic (e.g., Incubadora Central) and likely to continue. The positive signs are, however, contingent to the availability of resources from national counterparts. São Tomé and Príncipe is highly dependent on foreign aid, and in that sense, the UNDP's acute *modus operandi* of seeking partnerships and in establishing synergies and networks is relevant in the continuous effort of funding mobilization. Likewise, the investment in the private sector, and in the emergence of an economically sustainable internal market is the seed for a more dynamic

economic landscape, which in the long-term may assist São Tomé and Príncipe in achieving higher levels of growth and reducing poverty.

Key human rights issues were included, such as, for example, equal rights of men and women, adequate standard of living for well-being, and the right to work. On gender and youth, for instance, the UNDP youth entrepreneurship activities were gender inclusive, and the project Muala+ was purposely directed towards female entrepreneurs. The CPD proposed to target persons with disabilities (PwD), however this evaluation has found no significant evidence that PwD were particularly targeted under outcome 3. M&E gender reporting tools can be further strengthened.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

This chapter focuses on the lessons learned from the implementation of the CPD (applicable to outcome 3), based on the evidence gathered in the evaluation process, and aims to build on the experience gained from it to identify clues for improving relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.

Lesson Learned (LL)

LL1. A solid design phase with in-depth consultations with key stakeholders from governmental, CSO, IOs, and other UN agencies is key to ensure clear, feasible, and realistic projects/programmes strategy. A clear project design also enhances coordination/inter-connection between the Programme outcomes/projects, which will increase effectiveness and efficiency.

LL2. Solid data on key socio-economic and environmental indicators is essential for accurate and well-suited programme design planning, decision-making, and monitoring of programme outcomes. Particularly when the Agenda 2030 approaches its culmination, accurate and credible data availability is indispensable to enhance knowledge, and track results and effective change.

LL3. Leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies and mobilizing additional funding contributes to cost-effectiveness. The UNDP was successful in leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies, as well as with other partners, and in securing additional funding, which has contributed to Programme cost-effectiveness.

LL4. Ensuring the existence of clear monitoring and evaluation mechanisms from the inception phase of the programme – such as an assigned team/unit to record progress on outcomes outputs and activities as well as a centralized programme library which is shared with all team members -, enables sharing of crucial information on relevant initiatives between the teams of different outcomes, enabling them to understand the progress made in other outcomes and what synergies can/should be explored. It can also further inform management decisions.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations presented are supported by evidence, conclusions and lessons learned. They are intended to the UNDP. The evaluation team collected suggestions for recommendations through consultations with stakeholders. In this sector, the evaluation collated only high priority recommendations.

| Recommendation |
|--|
| Strategic Recommendations (SR) |
| SR1. Consider scaling-up partnerships and investments with the private sector , including the improvement of the national business environment (e.g., legislation enhancement), support for entrepreneurial/business activities (e.g., business grants, micro-credit, access to financial services, capacitation of business managers), internationalization of São Tomé and Príncipe economy (e.g., support participation in international trade fairs, support establishment of cooperatives, providing technical assistance to the participation of São Tomé and Príncipe in regional trade agreements). |
| SR2. Consider strengthening investments in enhancing the national blue economy, protecting marine areas, and improving the quality of marine ecosystems (e.g., mangrove forests). |
| SR3. Consider deepening financial and technical support to assist the country in achieving the targets established in the NDC , notably in matters of energy green transition, energy efficiency, reduction of the carbon footprint in the transport sector, and waste management. |
| SR4. Continue undertaking efforts for in-depth consultations and discussions at the design phase of the CDP and other thematic projects and initiatives, with both governmental and CSO representatives to ensure that the programme has a clear, feasible and realistic strategy, well suited to the national context in all its dimensions. |
| SR5. Consider enhancing the coordination between different Programme outcomes/projects, with the establishment of an M&E unit with the clear role to centralize the information/knowledge (including indicator tracking) produced across the multiple projects/programmes, maintain the UNDP's archive/library, promote strategic level opportunities, and promote cross-fertilization of lessons learned across outcomes, as well as sharing of best practices and knowledge within UNDP. |
| SR6. Consider enhancing efforts in data collection initiatives of key socio-economic and environmental trackers in order to enable the systematic monitorization of the context of São Tomé and Príncipe. Strengthening of the National Statistics Institute, as well as providing capacity-building of key governmental staff on data collection and statistical analysis may contribute to improve monitoring capacity, as well as country situational awareness. |
| SR7. Consider intensifying efforts in the systematic involvement of the private sector in the multiple projects/programmes, from inception to implementation. Taking advantage of private sector perspectives and foster private sector engagement in UNDP activities may assist in revitalizing the economic landscape of São Tomé and Príncipe, and in improving the sustainability of UNDP actions. |
| SR8. Continue strengthening South-South and triangular cooperation activities in order to enhance interaction between technical staff from different countries, including training, exchanges and sharing of experiences, especially in a face-to-face format. |

Operational Recommendations

OR1. Consider developing an induction guidance toolbox for new UNDP staff members, including consultants and volunteers. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors the quick integration of new staff into the practices, methods, language, processes, and procedures of the UNDP. Such integration is crucial in small offices with high staff turnover.

OR2. Consider improving guidance for UNDP implementing partners. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors a good communication with implementing partners, and a thorough transmission of operating instructions, particularly on payment procedures/access funding and activities/projects' monitoring and reporting (including financial reporting).

OR3. Consider developing or activating a backstopping mechanism (on-sight or remote) to support consultants on the technical specifications of project/programmed/proposal writing (including theories of change, intervention logic, results frameworks, indicators). Particularly in a small office, highly reliant on volunteers and external consultants that are experts on particular areas/sectors but that sometimes lack experience on the development of project/programme proposals, a backstopping mechanism could assist in improving the quality of projects/programmes design, as well as in mobilizing additional resources.

OR4. Consider developing a Communication and Visibility Strategy. An effective visibility strategy promotes greater understanding and ownership of the project among stakeholders, and allows the UNDP's successes to be projected, as well as the beneficiary and donor countries. It also promotes the replicability of good practices developed by entities outside the scope of the programme.

OR5. Considering developing projects/programmes targeting PwD.

ANNEXES

1. LIST OF QUALITATIVE INTERACTIONS
2. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
3. BIBLIOGRAPHY
4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. LIST OF QUALITATIVE INTERACTIONS

1.1. SEMISTRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

| ENTITY | NAME | FUNCTION |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| BIRDLIFE International | Julie Courret | Head of projects office in São Tomé and Príncipe |
| CEPIBA - Cooperativa de Exportação e Produção Pimenta Biológica | Carlos Tavares | President of the Board of Direction |
| CONPREC | Carlos Mendes | Coordinator |
| DGRNE | Belizardo Neto | Management Assistant |
| DGRNE | Carlos João | Administrative Support |
| DGRNE | Chicher Pires | Directorate of Water |
| DGRNE | Dudete Lima | Technical Staff - Water |
| DGRNE | Gabriel Maquengo | Directorate of Energy |
| DGRNE | José Bastos Sacramento. | Director |
| DGRNE | Lídia Barros | Technical Staff - Water |
| Institute of Meteorology | Aristones Mendes | Coordinator |
| Ministry of Commerce | Jorge Bonfim | Director of Trade |
| Ministry of Youth | Aleksander Ferreira | Director of Entrepreneurship (Incubadora Central) |
| OIKOS | Rogério Rosa | Coordinator |
| OIKOS | Tomás Pardo | Technical Staff |
| UNDP | Aderito Santana | ARR/Programme |
| UNDP | Damiano Borgogno | Int Chief Technical Specialist |
| UNDP | Dinka Amorim | Associate Project Manager |
| UNDP | Katarzyna Wawiernia | Resident Representative |
| UNDP | Maite Mendizabal | Portfolio Manager - CESA |
| UNDP | Olaf Juergensen | Deputy Resident Representative |
| UNDP | Rita Aguiar Santos | Programme Analyst CESA |
| UNDP | Vaciley Andrade | Project Manager CESA |
| UNDP | Zhaoying Ye | Research and Data Fellow |
| UNICEF | Alejandra Moncada | Partnership Specialist |

1.2. STRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

| | # OF FINAL BENEFICIARIES | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|
| | MALE | FEMALE | TOTAL |
| Empreende Jovem | 5 | - | 5 |
| Muala+ | - | 3 | 3 |
| | | Total | 8 |

2. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

2.1. INTERVIEW RULES AND PROCEDURES: DONOR, PROGRAMME TEAM & STAKEHOLDERS

This document lays out key standard rules and procedures that all facilitators (i.e., the person conducting interviews) must abide to when conducting interviews.

1. Duration of the interview: 60-90 min.

2. Objective of interviews by type

Interviews are supported by a script which determines the thematic axes of the dialogue. Interviews seek to increase the understanding about the Programme under evaluation and gather vital or complementary information to the evaluation process.

On semi-structured interviews, questions are tendentially open-ended to allow for a great flexibility in the conduction of the interview. This approach seeks to maximize the inputs provided by participants, for it allows room for participants to structure their reply according to his/her train of thought.

Differently **structured interviews** reduce flexibility in terms of question's leeway. Some questions may be open-ended, yet others clearly direct participants to specific aspects of interest to the evaluation. Structured interviews allow for a greater comparability of the inputs provided by different participants.

3. Posture during interviews

In **both semi-structured and structured interviews**, the reaction of interviewees should be clearly induced from the questions on the script. The questions are purposely designed to address the objectives of the evaluation.

During the interview, the facilitator may, whenever deemed necessary, request complementary data, information, examples, opinions and judgments to maximize the input's provided by key informants. This step is particularly relevant when interviewing shy or nervous participants. The request for further information should be made using follow-up questions and rephrasing techniques.

4. Procedures & Rules

- (i) Prior to the interviews, facilitators should acquaint themselves with the interview rules & script, with the nature of the interviewee role in the Programme and with the Programme itself.
- (ii) The objectives of the evaluation should be presented at the beginning of the meeting.
- (iii) Participants must decide whether to participate in the evaluation and may decide to withdraw at any time. It should be clear from the onset that participants can abandon the interview at any point.

- (iv) All participants must be treated with the uttermost respect, civility, and courtesy.
- (v) Interviews are a place of dialogue, and seek understanding and clarity of the position, perceptions, and opinions of the participants.
- (vi) All information collected during the interview can be used to inform subsequent interviews, **yet** the information cannot be linked to participants outside the transcripts of the interviews. To tease out additional information and/or validate information, the facilitator may mention the opinions, arguments, or declarations of previous participants **without ever** mentioning the identity of those who produced said opinions, arguments, or declarations.
- (vii) The facilitator should abstain from providing personal impressions about the Programme.
- (viii) All data collected should be recorded on the interview protocol sheet. The protocol sheets will be part of the documentation. It should include all comments considered relevant for a better interpretation of the participants' interventions (e.g., if participants expressed confidence, were nervous).
 - a. Before archiving the interview, the facilitator should review the content to make sure the recordings are intelligible, and accurate.
 - b. Special care should be taken to avoid subjective and abusive interpretations of the interviewee's words. When in doubt the facilitator should summarize to the participant how the reply was interpreted and ask if the interpretation was correct.
 - c. All sentences that by their potential uniqueness or by revealing a very personal approach of the participant should, whenever possible, be reproduced in the terms used by the participant.

2.2. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. INTERVIEWEE / INTERVIEW INFORMATION

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------|--|
| Name | | Entity | |
| Sex | | Place | |
| Function | | Date | |
| Typology of interview | 1) UNDP 2) Government/Beneficiaries 3) UN Agencies 4) Donors/ Development Partners 5) Civil Society Organizations | | |

2. DISCUSSION INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the objective(s) of the interview:

- Welcoming the interviewee, small talk to make the interviewee at ease.
- Mention the objectives of the evaluation of the Programme.
- Note the duration of the discussion (60-90 min).

Ask if there is need for further clarification

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

| QUESTION | UNDP | Government/ Beneficiaries | UN Agencies | Donors/ Development Partners | CSOs |
|--|------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------|
| 1. To what extent was the country programme relevant to the national development goals of São Tomé and Príncipe, and to implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development in the three main areas of the Programme: health, democratic governance, sustainable development, and resilience to climate change? | x | | | | |
| 2. To what extent were UNDP initiatives relevant to the national development goals of São Tomé and Príncipe, and to implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development? (NOTE: mention specific programmes/projects for each stakeholder) | | x | x | x | x |
| 3. To what extent were the planned activities clear, feasible and adequate to address the priorities and needs of the targeted beneficiaries in the three main areas of intervention: Health, democratic governance, sustainable development, and resilience to climate change? | x | | | | |
| 4. To what extent were the planned activities clear, feasible and adequate to address the priorities and needs of the targeted beneficiaries of the UNDP supported initiatives implemented with your organization? | | x | x | x | x |
| 5. Do you consider the UNDP is a strong advocate for improving health, democratic governance, and sustainable development and resilience to climate change in São Tomé and Príncipe? Can you provide an example in one or the three areas in which the UNDP manifested its advocacy efforts? | | x | x | x | x |
| 6. To what extent has the UNDP partnership model with international and national partners been effective in mobilizing resources (human, material) and knowledge to address the development challenges in São Tomé and Príncipe? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 7. To what extent did the UNDP Programmes include south-south and triangular cooperation features? Can you provide an example that show south-south and triangular cooperation in practice? | x | x | | | |
| 8. To what extent did the Programme manage to adapt to the demands of Covid-19 in São Tomé and Príncipe? Can you provide examples? | x | x | x | x | x |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. What results were achieved by the programme in each of the three main areas of intervention Health, democratic governance, sustainable development, and resilience to climate change? Were the proposed targets achieved? | x | | | | |
| 10. What results were achieved by the UNDP supported initiatives in partnership with your organization (NOTE: mention specific programmes/projects for each stakeholder)? | | x | x | x | x |
| 11. What were the main factors contributing to those achievements? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 12. What were the biggest challenges the CPD Programme faced? How were they mitigated/addressed? | x | | | | |
| 13. What were the biggest challenges the UNDP supported initiatives faced? How were they mitigated/addressed? | | x | x | x | x |
| 14. To what extent did small-size initiatives funded by UNDP were successful, and contributed to the overall objectives of the UNDP in São Tomé and Príncipe? Should the model be maintained in the future or adapted? | x | | | | |
| 15. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives in the country strengthen the capacity of the São Tomé and Príncipe government, and the São Tomé and Príncipe institutions? Can you provide concrete examples? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 16. In the future, which thematic areas should the UNDP pursue in São Tomé and Príncipe, and with what intent? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 17. To what extent were the Programme resources (human, technical, financial) sufficient and adequate? What shortcomings identified and how were they solved? | x | | | | |
| 18. To what extent were the allocated resources (human, technical, financial) sufficient and adequate to the initiatives implemented with UNDP's support? What shortcomings identified and how were they solved? | | x | | | |
| 19. What benefits and shortcomings were identified regarding Programme management (including M&E)? | x | | | | |
| 20. Were partnerships and synergies with other projects been leveraged? If yes, how? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 21. Which benefits and shortcomings do you identify on the work relations between the UNDP and national implementing partners? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 22. If applicable, were programme funds delivered in a timely manner to partners? | x | x | | | x |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23. Did the UNDP provide adequate political, technical, or other support? To what extent? | | x | | | |
| 24. What will be the impact of the UNDP programme(s) in terms of strengthening institutional capacities? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 25. What has changed in the way your institution works because of the UNDP supported initiatives? Will those changes be maintained? | | x | | | x |
| 26. Do you consider your institution has sufficient resources (human, technical and financial) to maintain the change introduced by the UNDP's Programme? If not, are there plans to increase resources? | | x | | | x |
| 27. What barriers have been seen to the inclusion of vulnerable groups (e.g., youth, women) in UNDP's work and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 28. How did the programme(s) integrate human rights and gender issues, from design to implementation and reporting? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 29. What lessons have you learned so far in implementing this programme? | x | | | | |
| 30. What lessons have you learned so far in implementing the UNDP supported initiatives? | | x | | | x |
| 31. What recommendations do you have for the next country programme? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 32. Are there any additional matters you would like to discuss? | x | x | x | x | x |

OUTCOME 3 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

The following questions complement the general questions previously outlined.

| QUESTION | UNDP | Government/ Beneficiaries | UN Agencies | Donors/ Development Partners | CSOs |
|---|------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------|
| 33. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives contribute to sustainable blue economy development (e.g., development of local businesses, increase climate resilience of communities), and reduction of fisherfolk poverty? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 34. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives contribute to increase the resilience of agriculture production against climate change? Which mitigation or adaptation measures were implemented? | x | x | x | x | x |
| 35. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives contribute to the adoption of renewable energy sources? To what extent will renewable energy sources contribute to mitigate the current energy deficit of São Tomé and Príncipe, particularly in rural areas? | x | x | x | x | x |

2.3. STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. INTERVIEWEE / INTERVIEW INFORMATION

| | | | |
|-------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Name | | Business | |
| Sex | | Place | |
| Date | | Activity | 1) Empreende Jovem 2) Muala+ |

2. DISCUSSION INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the objective(s) of the interview:

- Welcoming the interviewee, small talk to make the interviewee at ease.
- Mention the objectives of the evaluation of the Programme.
- Note the duration of the discussion (10-15 min).

Ask if there is need for further clarification

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

| QUESTION | Empreende Jovem | Muala + |
|--|-----------------|---------|
| 1. Como é que teve conhecimento do programa? | x | x |
| 2. O que o/a levou a participar no programa? | x | x |
| 2. Durante a formação quais foram os conteúdos mais importantes que apreendeu? | x | x |
| 3. O programa promoveu ligação com entidades bancárias/financeiras? | x | x |
| 4. O financiamento foi entregue em tempo devido? | x | |
| 5. O equipamento foi entregue em tempo devido? | | x |
| 6. O processo para aceder ao financiamento / adquirir equipamento foi simples? | x | x |
| 7. O seu negócio continua em atividade? | x | x |
| 8. Quantas pessoas estão a trabalhar no seu negócio? | x | x |
| 9. Depois da formação e recebimento do financiamento/equipamento teve contacto com a Incubadora Central? | X | x |
| 10. Recomendaria este programa a outras pessoas? | x | x |
| 11. Tem alguma recomendação para melhorar o programa nas próximas edições? | x | x |

3. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2019
- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2020.
- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2021.
- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2019.
- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2020.
- Carvalho, Patrícia, João Silveira, and Miguel Fonseca: “Evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe (São Tomé and Príncipe) – 2017-2022”, 2022.
- Climate Watch: “GHG Emissions. Washington”, 2020.
- EM-DAT (The International Disaster Database): “Custom Request: disaster classification (all natural), location (Sao Tomé and Principe), range (1900-2022)”, n.d. (consulted 03/08/2022).
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): “Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Value Added (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)”, May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): “Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Gross Fixed Capital Formation (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)”, May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.
- IBP (International Budget Partnership): “Open Budget Survey 2017 São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2018.
- IBP (International Budget Partnership): “Open Budget Survey 2021 São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2022.
- IEA (International Energy Agency), IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), UNSD (the United Nations Statistics Division), the World Bank, and WHO (World Health Organization): “Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report”, n.d., (consulted 05/08/2022).
- IEA (International Energy Agency), IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), UNSD (the United Nations Statistics Division), the World Bank, and WHO (World Health Organization): “Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report”, n.d., (consulted 05/08/2022).
- IEO (Independent Evaluation Office): “Assessment of Development Results, Evaluation of UNDP Contribution São Tomé & Príncipe”, United Nations Development Programme, 2016.
- ILO (International Labour Organization): “SDG indicator 1.3.1 – Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/system (%) – Annual”, SDG_0131_SEX_SOC_RT_A, June 2022, <https://ilostat.ilo.org/data/#> (consulted 06/08/2022).
- ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2017-2019”, 2017.
- ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2020-2022”, 2021.
- lueva, Lili, Antonio Correia and Marion Denantes: “Project terminal Evaluation: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Cantagalo and Lobata (CMPLCL)”, 2019.

Larrabure, Juan, Victor Bonfim: "Final Evaluation Report Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change", 2019.

Observador: "São Tomé e Príncipe inaugura Primeira Central de Energia Fotovoltaica", 25 August, 2022.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development): "*Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully*", OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/543e84ed-en>, 2021.

São Tomé and Príncipe: "Note Verbale", October 2020.

São Tomé e Príncipe: "Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento 2017-2021", 2017.

São Tomé e Príncipe: "Programa de Promoção do Trabalho Digno 2018-2021 de São Tomé e Príncipe", 2018.

São Tomé e Príncipe: "São Tomé e Príncipe National Determined Contributions (NDC-São Tomé e Príncipe) Update", 2021.

UNDP (United National Development Programme), "Human Development Report 2015", 2015.

UNDP (United National Development Programme), "Human Development Report 2020", 2021.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REV1", 2022.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation", December 2021.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "UNDP Evaluation Guidelines", June 2021.

UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group): "Norms and Standards for Evaluation", 2016.

WGI (Worldwide Governance Indicators): "Interactive Data Access", 2021 (consulted 07/08/2022).

WHO (World Health Organization): "UHC Service Coverage Index (SDG 3.8.1)", UHC_INDEX_REPORTED, November 2021, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/uhc-index-of-service-coverage>, (consulted 03/08/2022).

World Bank: "Entrepreneurship Database", n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

World Bank: "Entrepreneurship Database", n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

World Bank: "GDP (current US\$) – Sao Tome and Principe", NY.GDP.MKTP.CD, 2022.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE



Terms of Reference

UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation

December 2021

Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | Assignment Information | 2 |
| 1. | Introduction | 2 |
| 2. | UNDP's current programme | 2 |
| 3. | Evaluation purpose | 4 |
| 4. | Evaluation scope and objectives | 4 |
| 5. | Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions | 5 |
| | Relevance | 5 |
| | Effectiveness | 5 |
| | Efficiency | 5 |
| | Sustainability | 6 |
| | Human rights | 6 |
| | Gender Equality | 6 |
| 6. | Methodology and approaches | 6 |
| 7. | Evaluation products (deliverables) | 7 |
| 8. | Evaluation team composition and required competencies | 8 |
| 9. | Evaluation ethics | 10 |
| 10. | Evaluation arrangements | 10 |
| 11. | Time frame for the evaluation process | 12 |
| 12. | Application submission process and criteria for selection | 15 |
| 13. | TOR annexes | 16 |
| | Annex A: Country programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2021) | 17 |
| | Annex B: Guiding questions for the governance thematic evaluation. | 18 |
| | Annex C: Key stakeholders and partners | 20 |
| | Annex D: Documents to be reviewed and consulted. | 20 |
| | Annex E: Evaluation matrix | 20 |
| | Annex F: Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables. | 21 |
| | Annex G: Inception report template | 21 |
| | Annex H: Required format for the evaluation report. | 21 |
| | Annex I: Evaluation Recommendations. | 21 |
| | Annex J: Evaluation Quality Assessment | 21 |
| | Annex K: Code of conduct. | 21 |

Assignment Information

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Title | The evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme for the Sao Tome and Principe (STP) |
| Purpose | This term of reference (TOR) is designed to guide the evaluation of the 2017-2022 Country Programme Document (CPD) of UNDP STP and a Thematic Evaluation of UNDP's engagement on the Economic Growth Sector |
| Location/Country | Sao Tome and Principe |
| Region | Africa |
| Application categories | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. An individual international consultant (Team leader) to undertake the evaluation of the CPD2. An individual international consultant to cover the theme of governance3. An individual national consultant (Team member) to partner with the international consultants to undertake the CDP evaluation |
| Duration | Start date: January 2022 Complete date: March 2022 |

1. Introduction

São Tomé and Príncipe is a politically stable democracy and Small Island Developing State (SIDS), situated in the Gulf of Guinea, off the western equatorial coast of Central Africa. It comprises an archipelago of two main islands, São Tomé and Príncipe, situated about 140 km apart.

It's population of 215,000, has grown, on average, by 2.17% per annum over the last decade, and is highly urbanised with 72.8% of the population living in towns and cities, and 40% living in the district of Água Grande in the urban sprawl of the capital city on the island of São Tomé. By contrast, the Autonomous Region of Príncipe hosts a population of just less than 9,000.

Just over half of STP's population is female (50.5%) and more than one third of households are headed by women. Moreover, STP has a youthful population with 70% aged between 0 and 29 and 61% under the age of 24 (INE, 2012) which, if carefully managed, could create the potential for a demographic dividend.

Notable progress has been achieved in terms of human development in recent years, especially with regard to health and education indicators. STP's score in UNDP's Human Development Index (HDI) rose from 0.542 to 0.609 between 2010 and 2018 (UNDP, 2019), placing the country above average for Sub-Saharan Africa (0.537), but below the average for countries in the average human development group (0.645). These improvements are largely attributable to an increase in average life expectancy from 67.4 years in 2010 to 70.2 years in 2018, improvement in GNI per capita from \$2,567 in 2010 to \$3,024 in 2018, and an increase in the expected and average years of schooling from 10.6 to 12.7 and from 4.9 to 6.4 respectively over the period 2010 to 2018 (UNDP, 2019). These positive developments gains have led the country to be enlisted for LDC graduation status by 2024.

Yet **STP still confronts a number of challenges to achieving the SDGs** and an economic growth that has not been sufficiently inclusive. Lack of decent employment opportunities, particularly for women and young people, and rising inequality are two of the country's greatest challenges. When adjusted for inequality, STP's HDI drops by 16.7% (UNDP, 2019) and the country's GINI coefficient has risen from 32.1 in 2000 to 56.3 in 2017, indicating an alarming widening in the inequality gap (World Development Indicators, 2020). Poverty rates have

remained stubbornly high reducing marginally from 68.4% to 66.7% between 2010 and 2017. The 2017 Household Survey recorded the incidence of extreme poverty at 47% (INE, 2020). Some 46% of households comprising couples with children are poor, and 23% of households composed of extended families. Female-headed households are poorer than their male equivalents with a poverty rate of 61.6% compared to 55.8%. (INE, 2020). Urban areas and southern districts, such as Caué and Lembá, have higher levels of poverty incidence.

Severe food insecurity is a concern with around 10% of families reporting in 2017 that at least one family member had had to skip a full day of meals due to lack of money. And it appears this problem, due to seasonality, is not limited to the poor: 7.5% of non-poor families also reported a similar situation. Not having enough money for food seems to be a recurring problem with 42% of families reporting experiences of food shortages for a few months of the year, and 26% declaring that they are affected by this problem for almost the entire year.

Social protection programmes aimed at the poorest and most vulnerable groups are inadequately resourced and often unable to make timely and regular cash transfers to beneficiaries. In 2016, less than 0.65% of GDP was budgeted for social protection and social assistance programmes, significantly below the regional average of 1.2% (World Bank, 2018). Expanding these programmes to reach all poor households in STP would require expenditure of approximately US\$7.2 million, or 2% of GDP. In addition to the lack of funding, sector policies are poorly coordinated and lack a common set of tools to serve those most at risk of being left behind.

STP's economic challenges are typical of a SIDS and affect its ability to deal with shocks and achieve balanced budgets. The limited labour pool prevents the efficient production of goods and services at a scale needed to meet local and export market demand. Its insularity and limited transport connectivity increase imports and export costs, and the limited availability of land, and a small and largely unskilled workforce, prevent the country from diversifying its economy, making it more vulnerable to trade shocks. The economy is principally driven by agriculture, tourism, and foreign direct investment, and especially by government expenditures and investments. Socio-economic development is fragile and 97% of public investment budget is (on average) financed through debt and external aid. The economy is also overly dependent on trade and services (accounting for 70% of GDP), with tourism alone accounting for 65% of total exports. Paradoxically, and despite its potential, agriculture contributes barely 10% to GDP, principally through the production and export of cocoa which on average accounts for 90% of agricultural export earnings. However, although agriculture's contribution to GDP is small, the sector is of strategic importance in socioeconomic terms given that it accounts for more than 70% of rural employment.

In order **to control inflation, STP pegged its national currency (the Dobra) to the Euro in 2009 which has significantly contributed to price stability.** Inflation declined to 3.96% in 2015 but has increased since spiking at 9% in 2018 due to a supply shock connected to locally produced food. In order to safeguard the exchange rate regime, the authorities have implemented prudent monetary and fiscal policies to keep international reserves at the necessary level.

2. UNDP's current programme

The current country programme contributes to achievement of the SDGs, most specifically Goals 1, 8, 10 and 16. The national authorities have decided to implement all the SDGs, giving priority to Goals 1, 5, 8, 10 and 16. The three main outcome areas are aimed at: i) health, ii) governance, and iii) sustainable development and climate change.

In **health**, specifically COVID Response, Malaria, and HIV/AIDS, through the Global Fund, UNDP is supporting improvements in the provision of health services for sex professionals, who are especially vulnerable to HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. This will include a focus on reducing the prevalence of HIV and tuberculosis and eliminating malaria. UNDP's interventions will concentrate on strengthening the health system in three main areas: health information; drugs and medical products procurement; and community systems. UNDP supported the

Government in coordinating partners, decentralizing response management and aiding community involvement by vulnerable men and women. This support will be the key element of UNDP's strategy to transition the Global Fund programme to national management. Disparities and inequalities at all levels will be tackled through participation by vulnerable groups, and by increasing their access to social protection and basic social services. Unforeseen in the CPD, as part of the COVID Response plan UNDP played a central technical and analytical role in helping STP cope with the pandemic.

In **democratic governance** the emphasis has been on ensuring equitable access to justice and increasing citizen participation in decision-making bodies. This was done with an eye to increasing the effectiveness of central, regional and local public administration services and management institutions, which will benefit from more citizen participation, particularly by youth and women. To further this objective, UNDP worked at strengthening capacities at the Ministry of Justice, Parliament, the National Electoral Commission, the courts and the Police Crime Investigation unit.

Sustainable development and resilience to climate change: Interventions focussing on developing policy instruments for natural resource management and disaster preparedness together with plans to address disaster risk and climate change impact. UNDP is supporting small farmers, small agricultural traders (women, young girls and boys) and fisherfolk harmed by climate change as well as victims of injustice. The innovative 'blue economy' initiative will encourage public and private investment in disaster risk prevention and reduction. It will involve structural and non-structural measures to enhance the economic, social, health and cultural resilience of people and communities. This approach will help tackle social inequalities, in particular the prevalence of poverty in areas hurt by climate change.

UNDP is supporting the Government in developing renewable energies to mitigate the energy deficit in rural areas, build resilience to climate change and apply the blue economy to reduce the poverty of fisherfolk. Support is being provided to the private sector in promoting renewable energy to increase economic growth and provide job opportunities for vulnerable groups, particularly youth and women.

Evaluation purpose

This evaluation will assess the UNDP's contribution and performance in supporting the national development and priorities under the approved CPD. A special focus should be placed on Outcome area three (**Sustainable development and resilience to climate change**) thematic area. The evaluation will serve an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in STP with an impartial assessment of the results of UNDP support. The evaluation will capture evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the current programme, which will be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for new the preparation of new CPD (2023-2026).

3. Evaluation scope and objectives

The CPD evaluation will focus on the formal UNDP country programme approved by the Executive Board (2017-2022⁴⁶). The scope of the CPD evaluation includes the entirety of UNDP's activities at the outcome and output levels covering from 2017 to date. The evaluation covers interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources, donor funds and government funds. Initiatives from regional and global programmes will be included in the CPD evaluation. The evaluation will also examine UNDP's contribution toward cross-cutting issues, e.g. human rights, gender, leaving no one behind, and capacity development. The evaluation should be forward-looking by drawing lessons from the current CPD and propose recommendations for the next CPD.

4. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

The evaluation will answer three broad questions as follows:

- What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?

⁴⁶ The CO was granted a 1-year extension until December 2022 due COVID challenges.

- To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives at the output level, and what contribution has it made at the outcome level and towards the UN Partnership Framework?
- What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

In addition to the above questions, the evaluation is expected to produce answers surrounding the of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the country programme. Below are guiding questions. This evaluation will also include a special thematic evaluation of the Sustainable development and resilience to climate change theme & UNDP's engagement in the same. Guiding questions for the thematic evaluation are listed in the Annex C.

Relevance

- To what extent has the current UNDP programme supported the government of STP in achieving the national development goals and implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development?
- To what extent has the UNDP programme responded to the priorities and the needs of target beneficiaries as defined in the programme document?
- Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving Health, Governance, and sustainable development and resilience to climate change in STP?
- Have the efforts made by UNDP and national partners to mobilize resources and knowledge been in line with the current development landscape?
- To what extent did the UNDP programme promote SSC/Triangular cooperation?
- Has UNDP been able to effectively adapt the programme to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in STP?

Effectiveness

- By reviewing the programme results and resources framework, is the UNDP programme on track to achieve intended results at the outcome and output levels? What are the key achievements and what factors contributed to the achievements or non-achievement of those results?
- By examining the small-size initiatives funded by UNDP regular sources, how have these projects fulfilled their objectives? What are the factors (positive and negative) that contribute to their success or shortcomings? Are there recommendations or lessons that can be drawn from this approach?
- To what extent has UNDP programme contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening? How could UNDP enhance this element in the next UNDP programme?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up going forward?

Efficiency

- To what extent has there been an economical use of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)? What are the main administrative constraints/strengths?
- Is the results-based management system operating effectively and is monitoring data informing management decision making?
- To what extent has UNDP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in STP?
- How well does the workflow between UNDP and national implementing partners perform?
- To what extent have programme funds have been delivered in a timely manner?

- When UNDP provides implementation support services as per MOU with an implementing partner, how well has UNDP performed?

Sustainability

- What outcomes and outputs have the most likelihood of sustainability and being adopted by partners and why?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have national partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?

Human rights

- What barriers have been seen to the inclusion of vulnerable groups in UNDP's work and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?

Gender Equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the programme strategic design, implementation and reporting? Are there key achievements?
- In what way could UNDP enhance gender equality in the next country programme?

An important note: Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on achievement of the 2017-2022 CPD, as well as recommend key development priorities which shall inform the focus the new CPD. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer wider lessons for UNDP support in STP.

5. Methodology and approaches

The CPD evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The evaluation will be carried out by an independent evaluation team. The evaluation team should adopt an integrated approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis tools to generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits where/when possible. It is expected that the evaluation methodology will comprise of the following elements:

- Review documents (Desk Review);
- Interviews with key stakeholders including government line ministries, development partners, civil society and other relevant partners through a participatory and transparent process;
- Consultations with beneficiaries through interviews and/ or focus group discussions;
- Survey and/ or questionnaires where appropriate;
- Triangulation of information collected from different sources/methods to enhance the validity of the findings.

The evaluation is expected to use a variety of data sources, primary, secondary, qualitative, quantitative, etc. to be extracted through surveys, storytelling, focus group discussions, face to face interviews, participatory methods, desk reviews, etc. conducted with a variety of partners. A transparent and participatory multi-stakeholder approach should be followed for data collection from government partners, community members, private sector, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, etc.

Evidence will be provided for every claim generated by the evaluation and data will be triangulated to ensure validity. An evaluation matrix or other methods can be used to map the data and triangulate the available evidence.

In line with the UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, gender disaggregation of data is a key element of all UNDP's interventions and data collected for the evaluation will be disaggregated by gender, to the extent possible, and assessed against the programme outputs/outcomes.

Special note:

Given the COVID 19 pandemic and the resultant restrictions may require many of the in-person missions / consultations and data gathering / activities to be carried out remotely using electronic conferencing means. Alternatively, some or all in person interviews may be undertaken by the national consultant in consultation with the evaluation team leader.

6. Evaluation products (deliverables)

These products could include:

- **Evaluation inception report (up to 10 pages).** The inception report, containing the proposed theory of change, and evaluation methodology should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed (this element can be shared with UNDP well in advance). The inception report should be endorsed by UNDP in consultation with the relevant government partners before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluator. **(see the inception report template in Annex H).**
- **Kick-off meeting.** Evaluators will give an overall presentation about the evaluation, including the evaluator team's approach, work plans and other necessary elements during the kick-off meeting. Evaluators can seek further clarification and expectations of UNDP and the Government partner in the kick-off meeting.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, the evaluation team is required to present a preliminary debriefing of findings to UNDP, key Government partners and other development partners.
- **Draft evaluation report (max 60 pages including executive summary).** UNDP and other designated government representative and key stakeholders in the evaluation, including the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluators in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluators to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report (see final evaluation template in the Annex I).**
- **A report on the sustainable development and resilience to climate change thematic evaluation (max 15 pages) by the assigned consultant;** this paper will be presented as an appendix of the final report. The assigned consultant should integrate the important aspects of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the final evaluation report.
- **Evaluation brief (2 pages maximum) and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.
- **Evaluation Recommendations (see the management response in the Annex J)**
- **Presentations to stakeholders (this maybe done remotely)**

7. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of three independent consultants comprising of:

- An Evaluation Team Leader (International);

- An Evaluation Member (international) focusing specifically on UNDP's sustainable development and resilience to climate change portfolio; and
- A National Consultant who will provide knowledge of national context and support the full evaluation process as well as serve as an interpreter from Portuguese to English to and vice-versa when needed.

(a) Evaluation Team Leader (international), 39 working days

S/he has overall responsibility for conducting the CPD evaluation and providing guidance and leadership to the national consultant. In consultation with the team member, s/he will be responsible for developing a methodology for the assignment that reflects best practices and encourages the use of a participatory and consultative approach as well as delivering the required deliverables to meet the objective of the assignment. S/he will lead the preparation and revision of the draft and final reports, ensuring the assignments have been completed in the agreed timeframe.

S/he has responsibilities as follows:

- Leading the documentation review and framing of evaluation questions;
- Leading the design of monitoring and evaluation questions and field verification tools;
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between evaluation team members;
- Leading the evaluation team in planning, execution and reporting;
- Incorporating the use of best practice with respect to evaluation methodologies;
- Incorporating results from the governance thematic evaluation into the report;
- Responsible for and leading the drafting of inception report, finalization/quality control of the evaluation report including timely submission and adjustment;
- Leading the kick-off meeting and debriefing meeting on behalf of the evaluation team with UNDP and stakeholders;

Required Qualifications:

- Minimum Master's degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning or any other social sciences related to economic management and pro-poor development;
- 7 to 10 years relevant experience in undertaking evaluation in the development sector
- Strong knowledge of UNDP and its working approaches including partnership approaches with Government, civil society and community groups;
- Proven experience in conducting outputs/outcomes/impact/CPD/UNDAF evaluations;
- Experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice;
- Strong inter-personal skills, teamwork, analytical skills and organizational skills;
- Excellent presentation and drafting skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software;
- Fluency in Portuguese and English, both spoken and written;
- Previous experience working in STP or similar settings in the region is an advantage;
- Knowledge of the sensitivities of the context of STP is an asset.

(b) International Evaluation Consultant, Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change Area, 25 working days (Advertised and Recruited Separately)

S/he has overall responsibility for contributing to the CPD evaluation especially reviewing UNDP's engagement in the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change outcome area. In consultation with the team leader, s/he will be responsible for developing a methodology for the assignment that reflects best practices and encourages the use of a participatory and consultative approach as well as delivering the required deliverables to meet the objective of the assignment. S/he will substantively contribute to the preparation and revision of the draft and final reports, ensuring the assignments have been completed in the agreed timeframe. S/he will prepare a final report focusing on the findings, lessons learned and recommendations for UNDP's future portfolio in this area. The key elements and highlights of

Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change will be integrated into the final country overall programme evaluation report.

S/he has responsibilities as follows:

- Contributing to the documentation review and framing of evaluation questions;
- Contributing to the design of monitoring and evaluation questions and field verification tools;
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between evaluation team members;
- Conducting the evaluation of the governance portfolio while contributing to the overall planning, execution and reporting;
- Incorporating the use of best practice with respect to evaluation methodologies;
- Contributing to the drafting of inception report, finalization/quality control of the evaluation report including timely submission and adjustment;
- Contributing to and participating in the kick-off meeting and debriefing meeting on behalf of the evaluation team with UNDP and stakeholders;

Required Qualifications:

- Minimum Master's degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning or any other social sciences related to economic management and pro-poor development;
- 7 to 10 years relevant experience in undertaking evaluation in the development sector
- Extensive professional experience in the area of governance and sustainable development, including gender equality and social policies;
- Strong knowledge of UNDP and its working approaches including partnership approaches with Government, civil society and community groups;
- Proven experience in conducting outputs/outcomes/impact/CPD/UNDAF/thematic evaluations;
- Experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice;
- Strong inter-personal skills, teamwork, analytical skills and organizational skills;
- Excellent presentation and drafting skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software;
- Fluency in Portuguese and English, both spoken and written;
- Previous experience working in STP or similar settings in the region is an advantage;
- Knowledge of the sensitivities of the context of STP is an asset.

(c) National Evaluation Consultant, 39 working days) (Advertised and Recruited Separately)

S/he will support the Team Leader by providing knowledge of the development context in STP. S/he is well aware of STP cultural context and working with different government institutions; and when needed support as an interpreter between Portuguese and English. S/he collects all relevant documents and reports needed for the review. S/he will support the team leader in coordinating with UNDP, government partners and other stakeholders. S/he will play a crucial role in organizing meetings, workshops, interviews, consultations during the field missions. S/he will draft some parts of the report as assigned by the team leader. The consultant will advise the Team Leader on relevant aspects of the local context where the projects have operated.

Under the supervision of Evaluation Team Leader, s/he has responsibilities as follows:

- Support the documentation review and framing of evaluation questions;
- Support the coordination with UNDP, government partners, stakeholders and other parties;
- Undertake field visits and collect feedback from beneficiaries, project stakeholders etc.;
- Support the Evaluation Team Leader and international consultant in planning, execution, analyzing and reporting;
- Incorporate the use of best practice with respect to evaluation methodologies;
- Support the drafting of inception report, finalization/quality control of the evaluation report;

- Participate and support the kick-off meeting and debriefing meeting with UNDP and stakeholders;
- Facilitate and support the field data collection in country;
- Translate the evaluation brief in STP language;
- Perform translation from English to STP and vice versa for the evaluation team when required.

Required Qualifications:

- Master's degree or equivalent in Development, Economics, Public Policy, Communications, English, Social Sciences, Humanities or any other relevant field;
- 7 to 10 years-experience in undertaking evaluation in the development sector;
- Experience with evaluation methodologies; programme development and project implementation;
- Have a strong understanding of the development context in STP and preferably understanding of the strategic Poverty and inclusive growth, environment and governance issues within the STP context;
- Experience in oral and written translations;
- Fluent in Portuguese and English (written and spoken).

8. Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' which are available here: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultants must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

9. Evaluation arrangements

The below table outlines key roles and responsibilities for the evaluation process. UNDP and evaluation stakeholders will appoint an Evaluation Manager, who will assume the day-to-day responsibility for managing the evaluation and serve as a central person connecting other key parties.

The evaluators will report to the Resident Representative (RR) who will be technically supported by the Regional M&E Advisor. The final approval of the report will be made by the RR. The final payment will be made upon the satisfactory completion and approval of the report.

| Role | Responsibilities |
|---|---|
| Commissioner of the Evaluation: UNDP Resident Representative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lead and ensure the development of comprehensive, representative, strategic and costed evaluation; ▪ Determine scope of evaluation in consultation with key partners; ▪ Provide clear advice to the Evaluation Manager on how the findings will be used; ▪ Respond to the evaluation by preparing a management response and use the findings as appropriate; ▪ Safeguard the independence of the exercise; ▪ Approve TOR, inception report and final report. ▪ Allocate adequate funding and human resources. ▪ Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders. |
| Evaluation Manager: M&E Focal Point | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lead the development of the evaluation TOR in consultation with stakeholders; ▪ Manage the selection and recruitment of the Evaluation Team; |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manage the contractual arrangements, the budget and the personnel involved in the evaluation; ▪ Provide executive and coordination support; ▪ Provide the Evaluation Team with administrative support and required data; ▪ Liaise with and respond to the commissioners; ▪ Connect the Evaluation Team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation; ▪ Review the inception report and final report. |
| PROGRAMME/ PROJECT MANAGER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide inputs/advice to the evaluation on the detail and scope of the terms of reference for the evaluation and how the findings will be used; ▪ Ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations; ▪ Provide the evaluation manager with all required data and documentation and contacts/stakeholders list, etc.; ▪ Support the arrangement of interview, meetings and field missions; ▪ Provide comments and clarification on the terms of reference, inception report and draft evaluation reports; ▪ In consultation with Government, respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP; ▪ Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders including the project boards; ▪ Responsible for the implementation of key actions on evaluation recommendations in partnership with Implementing partners. |
| Regional Evaluation Focal Points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support the evaluation process and ensure compliance with corporate standards; ▪ Provide technical support to country office including advice on the development of terms of reference; recruitment of evaluators and maintaining evaluator rosters; implementation of evaluations; and finalization of evaluations, management responses and key actions ▪ Ensure management response tracking and support M&E capacity development and knowledge-sharing; ▪ Dispute resolution when issues arise in implementation of evaluations. ▪ Contributes to the quality assurance process of the evaluation. |
| Key Evaluation Partner- MPI (DIC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of key evaluation deliverables, including terms of reference, the inception report and successive versions of the draft evaluation report; ▪ Provide inputs/advice how the findings will be used; ▪ Assist in collecting required data; ▪ Review draft evaluation report for accuracy and factual errors (if any); ▪ Responsible for the implementation of key actions on evaluation recommendations and integrate the evaluation lessons learned in the future Country Programme Document and projects where appropriate. |
| Evaluation team (led by Team leader) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the terms of reference as appropriate; ▪ Ensure the quality (including editorial) of the report and its findings and recommendations; ▪ Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix, in line with the terms of reference, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines; ▪ Draft reports and brief the evaluation manager, programme/project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations; ▪ Finalize the evaluation, taking into consideration comments and questions on the evaluation report. Evaluators' feedback should be recorded in the audit trail; ▪ Support UNDP efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination if required. |

10. Time frame for the evaluation process

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively as follows:

| Timeframe for the CDP evaluation process | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Activity | Responsible party | tentative timeframe |
| Selection of the evaluation team | UNDP | January 2022 |
| Provide necessary information to Evaluation team | UNDP | Late January 2022 |
| Conduct desk review | Evaluation team | January-Mid February 2022 |
| Submit the inception report to UNDP | Evaluation team | February 2022 |
| Approve the inception report | UNDP | February 2022 |
| Hold a kick-off meeting with UNDP, Government and development partners | Evaluation team | February 2022 |
| Collect data/conduct field missions | Evaluation team | Early March 2022 |
| Organize a stakeholder workshop to brief on the preliminary observations (Participants include UNDP, UN agencies, Government and development partners) | Evaluation team & UNDP | March 2022 |
| Analyse data and prepare a report | Evaluation team | End-March 2022 |
| Submit the first draft | Evaluation team | April 2022 |
| Review the first draft | UNDP | April 2022 |
| Submit the second draft | Evaluation team | Late April 2022 |
| Review the second draft | UNDP, RBAP & MPI | Late April 2022 |
| Submit the final draft | Lead evaluator | May 2022 |
| Accept the final report and submit the management response | UNDP | May 2022 |
| Edit and format the report | Evaluation team | May 2022 |
| Issue the final report and evaluation brief | Lead evaluator | May 2022 |
| Disseminate the final report and evaluation brief / stakeholders workshop | UNDP | May 2022 |

Suggested working day allocation and schedule for evaluation

| ACTIVITY | ESTIMATE D # OF DAYS | DATE OF COMPLETION | PLACE | RESPONSIBLE PARTY |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------|
| Phase One: Desk review and inception report | | | | |
| <i>Meet/discuss with UNDP</i> | 0.5 day | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | UNDP or remote | Evaluation team & UNDP |
| <i>Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team</i> | - | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Via email | Evaluation manager |
| <i>Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology, the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed and prepare the inception report</i> | 10 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Home- based | Evaluation Team |
| <i>Submission of the inception report, 15 pages maximum (see the template in the annex section)</i> | - | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Via email | Evaluation team |
| <i>Comments and on approval of inception report</i> | 7 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Via email | UNDP |
| <i>Revise the inception report</i> | 2 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Home- based | Evaluation team |
| <i>Submit the final inception report</i> | - | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Via email | Evaluation team |
| <i>Approve the inception report</i> | 3 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Via email | UNDP |
| Phase Two: Data-collection mission | | | | |
| <i>Update on the detailed work plan including field mission and agree upon with UNDP</i> | 0.5 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | Via email | Evaluation team |
| <i>Kick-off meeting with UNDP, Government and development partners.</i> | 0.5 day | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | |
| <i>Conduct data collection including field visits, in-depth interviews, focus group and etc.</i> | 14 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | In country (subject to COVID pandemic restrictions) | |
| <i>Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders</i> | 0.5 day | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | In country (subject to COVID | Evaluation team |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | pandemic restrictions) | |
| | | | | | |
| 7 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | | Home-based | Evaluation team |
| - | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | | Via email | Evaluation team |
| 14 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | | UNDP | Evaluation manager |
| 2 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | | Via email | Evaluation team |
| - | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | | Via email | Evaluation team |
| 2 days | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | | UNDP | Evaluation manager |
| - | [indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY] | | | Via email | Evaluation team |
| -- 39 | | | | | |

Phase Three: Evaluation report writing

Preparation of draft evaluation report (see the template in the annex section)

Draft report submission

UNDP comments to the draft report

Update report taking into account UNDP comments

Submit the updated draft to UNDP for sharing to other stakeholders

Consolidated stakeholder comments to the draft report

Submit the final report to UNDP

Estimated total days for the evaluation

Total working day of evaluation team

11. **Application submission process and criteria for selection**

Evaluation team will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed approach, including following:

- 10%. Qualification and experience
- 15%. Technical approach as illustrated in the description of the proposed methodology.
- 10%. Timeline reflecting proposed activities, which emphasis the ability to meet the proposed deadlines
- 20%. Evidence of experience of the consultant in conducting evaluations as detailed in the CV
- 15%. Reference from Past performance. To enable this reference check is carried out, applicants are required to provide a list of all related consultancies/ evaluations conducted during the past three years with associated contact details of references.
- 30% Financial proposal

12. **TOR annexes**

- A. Country programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2021)
- B. Guiding questions for Governance thematic evaluation

Key stakeholders and partners

- C. Document to be reviewed
- D. Evaluation matrix
- E. Schedule of tasks, milestone and deliverables
- F. Inception report template
- G. Require format for the evaluation report
- H. Evaluation recommendations
- I. Evaluation quality assessment
- J. Code of conduct

Annex B: Country programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2022)

| Country Programme Outcome and Outputs | Indicative resources (2017-2022) US\$ |
|---|---|
| <p>Outcome 1. Output 1.1: The key and vulnerable groups, particularly children and women, use quality health services, within a legal framework and within strengthened national systems</p> <p><u>1.1 Indicators:</u> Proportion of children under five who sleep under an LLIN during the night Percentage of female sex workers infected by HIV Number of TB cases notified within the key and high-risk population</p> <p>1.1</p> | <p>\$ 3,120,000</p> |
| <p>Outcome 2</p> <p>Output 2.1: The capacities of the national institutions at the central, regional and local levels are strengthened in terms of control, transparency and mutual accountability.</p> <p>2.1 Insert indicators Number of Institutions (Parliament, Courts, Electoral Commission and Ministries) strengthened - control, transparency and accountability Proportion of women to men in decision making body</p> <p>Output 2.2: Capacity of justice and human rights institutions enabled and/or expanded to provide quality services and uphold the rule of law and redress</p> <p><u>2.2 Indicators:</u> Number of alternative conflict resolution and legal information mechanisms created at local level Number of disputes settled through alternative mechanism Number of updated alternative justice mechanisms (laws and annual regulations)</p> <p>Output 2.3: The public and private institutions are able to collect, compile and analyze relevant data for mainstreaming the SDGs into national plans, policies and strategies and coordination of aid for better implementation of the 2030 STP Transformation Agendas.</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> Number of plans, policies and strategies integrating SDGS Number of public institutions strengthened for Aid Coordination Number of training in data gathering and analysis for National Statistics Institute</p> | <p>2,256,000.</p> |
| <p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Output 3.1 National, local and regional systems and institutions (Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction) enabled to achieve structural transformation of productive capacities that are sustainable and employment - and livelihoods - intensive</p> <p>3.1 Insert indicators Number of policies, systems and/or institutional measures in place at central, local and regional levels to generate and strengthen employment and livelihoods Number of green jobs created Number of community benefiting from livelihood initiatives</p> <p>•</p> | <p>Regular: 250,000</p> <p>Other: 6,667,000</p> |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Other (global, regional, management projects) | |
| Total | \$ |

Source: UNDP STP Country Programme Document 2017-2021*22

Annex C: Guiding questions for the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change thematic evaluation.

Relevance

1. Was UNDP responsive to the evolution overtime of development challenges and the priorities in national strategies, especially significant shifts in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change and related areas?
2. Are UNDP activities aligned with national strategies, policies, and other development initiatives in the country in particular in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change and related areas?
3. How has UNDP engaged and partnered with women and youth in delivering their Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change programme?

Effectiveness

1. What has been the effectiveness of UNDP Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change portfolio in supporting the governance sector in STP?
2. Have the approaches taken by UNDP in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change been aligned with the governments approach or strategy?
3. What has been the impact of UNDP's support in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change activities at the national and subnational levels?
4. What comparative advantage does UNDP hold in the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change area? Is this recognized by the Government of STP and donors?
5. Did UNDP's programme facilitate the implementation of the national development strategies and policies related to advance Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change (e.g. linking UNDP initiatives to government policies or coordination of development actors)?
6. What have been the opportunities for support? Has UNDP STP taken advantage of these opportunities and any comparative advantage to strengthen Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change across government and society?
7. What have been the main challenges faced in the UNDP's support to Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change sector?

Efficiency

1. Has the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change programme been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates? What challenges have been faced?
2. Has UNDP and its partners taken prompt action to solve implementation and other managerial issues?
3. Has UNDP and the government used human & financial resources efficiently?
4. Did UNDP have an adequate mechanism to respond to significant changes in the country situation, in particular in crisis and emergencies?
5. Has UNDP used its network to bring about opportunities for South-South exchanges and triangular cooperation, and facilitate external expertise for government?
6. Has UNDP helped to mobilise other development partners (e.g. civil society, private sector, academia, etc.)?
7. How has UNDP integrated its Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change work with other country office programme (such as governance and health)? Has UNDP been able to develop integration or cooperation amongst its outcome areas and leverage Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change work into other areas?
8. Do the government and development partners see UNDP as a value for money partner? Are happy with costs incurred and charged? What issues were faced in the development of this modality of support?

Sustainability

1. Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks and did they include an exit strategy?

2. How did UNDP design to scale-up coverage and effects of its interventions? Or ensure adoption at a larger scale by the Government of the STP.
3. Has institutional, individual and/or national capacity been developed so that UNDP may realistically plan progressive disengagement?
4. How has UNDP responded to threats to sustainability during implementation

Annex D: Key stakeholders and partners

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

- Implementing Partner – Ministry of Planning
- Responsible Partners – Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Planning & Investment – Ministry of Commerce
- Project beneficiaries including government at national, and provincial (there may be a field mission at district level)
- Donors and non-donor partners (approx. 3-4)
- Civil Society Organization, NGOs, Academic Institutions and Private Sector (approx. 3-4)
- Project Manager (PM)
- National Consultants (1)
- UNDP staff (3)
- Hydrology Department Directorate General of Natural Resources and Energy (DGNRE), Conseil National Prévention de Risques et Catastrophes (CONPREC), Directorate of Agriculture and Rural Development (DADR), Institute National of Meteorology (INM), Technical Training Center for Agriculture and Livestock (CATAP), General Directorate of Environment (DGA), International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) concurring for the achievement of Outcome 3
- Ministry of Justice; Police Crime Investigation (PIC), the Courts, National Assembly; National Programme for Fighting against Malaria (PNLP)
- National Programme for Fighting Against AIDS (PNLS), Centre National des Endémies (CNE), Centre National d'Education á la Santé (CNES), Institut National de Promotion du Genre (INPG)Fond National de Médicaments (FNM) concurring for the achievement of Outcome 2
- **Additional Partners / Partnerships:**
- World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, Global Environment Fund (GEF), European Union (EU), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), World Bank, African Development Bank, Portugal, Canada, França
- **South-South Partnerships** - Brazil, Timor-Leste, Brazil, China, Nigeria, Angola, Equatorial Guinea

Annex E: Documents to be reviewed and consulted.

Evaluation team are required to review various documents related to STP and UNDP programme including but not limited to following documents:

- UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021)
<http://strategicplan.undp.org/>
- STP-United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF 2017-2021)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (2017-2021)
- Project Documents and Project Brief
- UNDP Evaluation guidelines
<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>
- UNEG norms and standard
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>
- Human Development Reports
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/STP>
- Other UNDP Evaluation Reports
<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>
- Gender Inequality Index

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii>

Annex F: Evaluation matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

Table 7. Sample evaluation matrix

| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific sub questions | Data sources | Data-collection methods/tools | Indicators/success standard | Methods for data analysis |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Annex G: Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.

Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.

Annex H: Inception report template

Follow the link: [Inception report content outline](#)

Annex I: Required format for the evaluation report.

The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports. Follow the link: [Evaluation report template and quality standards](#)

Annex J: Evaluation Recommendations.

Follow the link: [Evaluation Management Response Template](#)

Annex K: Evaluation Quality Assessment

Evaluations commissioned by UNDP country offices are subject to a quality assessment, including this evaluation. Final evaluation reports will be uploaded to the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC site) after the evaluations complete. IEO will later undertake the quality assessment and assign a rating. IEO will notify the assessment results to country offices and makes the results publicized in the ERC site. UNDP STP aims to ensure evaluation quality. To do so, the consultant should put in place the quality control of deliverables. Also, consultants should familiarize themselves with rating criteria and assessment questions outlined in the Section six of [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](#)

Annex L: Code of conduct.

UNDP requests each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report. Follow this link: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>