SAFEGUARDING RURAL COMMUNITIES AND THEIR PHYSICAL AND ECONOMIC ASSETS FROM CLIMATE INDUCED DISASTERS IN TIMOR-LESTE

(PIMS # 5916, GCF FP ID #: 109)

INTERIM EVALUATION

November 2023

Timor-Leste

Accredited entity: UNDP
Implementing Partner: Secretariat of State for Environment (SSE)
Responsible Parties: Ministry of State Administration (MSA), Secretary of State for Civil Protection (SSCP), Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF), Ministry of Public Works (MoPW)

Interim evaluation team: Matteo Borzoni (Team leader) and Octavio F. C. Oliveira de Araujo

Acknowledgments

This interim evaluation was prepared for the UNDP country office by Matteo Borzoni and Octavio Oliveira de Araujo.

The evaluation team members would like to express their gratitude to all persons met and who contributed to this evaluation, as listed in Annex IV.

The review team would like to thank the project team and UNDP Country Office and in particular Mr. Jehangir Khan, Mr Domingos Lequi, Mr Sergio Gaspar Bartolomeu, Mr. Crissantos Da Conceiçao, Julian Rangel, Liboria Fatima Savio, Ermenezinda Fritas, Nidia Alves da Costa, Ernestos Dos Santos, Nelson Vicente Pereira, José Pinto, Leonel Bere and Simone Done

Sincere appreciation is also expressed to the GCF reviewer, who took time to provide comments to the draft report.

The evaluation team hopes that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations will contribute to the successful finalisation of the current project, formulation of new projects and to the continuous improvement of similar projects in other countries and regions.

Table of contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

ANLA	Autoridade Nacional de Licenciamento Ambiental
AMA	Accreditation Master Agreement
APR	Annual Performance Report
CO	Country Office
CR	Climate Resilience
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
ET	Evaluation Team
FAA	Funded Activity Agreement
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
IPMF	Integrated Performance Management Framework
IOB	Institute of Business
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
LoVRA	Local Vulnerability & Risk Assessment
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MHVRA	Multi-Hazard Vulnerability Risk Assessment
MoPW	Ministry of Public Works
MSA	Ministry of State Administration
MSS	Ministry of Social Solidarity
MTE	Ministry of Tourism and Environment
NAD	National Agency for Development
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NDA	National Designated Authority
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NIM	National Implementation Modality
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PB	Project Board
PMU	Project management unit
PPE	Personal Protection Equipment
SDI	Spatial Data Infrastructure
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SDP	Strategic Development Plan
SES	Social and Environmental Safeguards
SSE	Secretary of State for Environment
SMASA	Municipal Service for Water, Sanitation and Environment
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SSCP	Secretary of State for Civil Protection
SSRI	Strengthening the Resilience of Small-Scale Rural Infrastructure
TERS	Timor Emergency Response System
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE

Project Title:	**Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste**		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	5916	GCF FP Approval Date:	8 July 2019
GCF FP ID:	109	Funded Activity Agreement date	11 December 2019
UNDP Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID:	00106661	ProDoc signature date:	16 February 2020
Country:	Timor-Leste	Effective date:	9 March 2020
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	Inception Workshop Date:	26 and 27 August 2020
UNDP focus area	Climate and disaster resilience	GCF Focus area	Adaptation
Trust Fund:	Trac	Planned Operational Closure Date:	9 March 2026
Implementation modality	National	If revised, new closing date:	N/A
Implementing Partner:	Secretariat of State for the Environment		
Other Executing Entities	Responsible Partners: Ministry of State Administration, Secretary of State for Civil Protection, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Ministry of Public Works		

Project financing	**at Board Endorsement (US$)**	**At the interim evaluation (US$)**
[1] GCF Funding	22,356,805.00	22,356,805.00
[2] Government	36,687,062.00	36,687,062.00
[3] Co-financing	400,000.00	400,000.00
Total project costs [1+3]	59,443,867.00	59,443,867.00

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project description

The primary objective of this project is to safeguard vulnerable communities and their physical assets from climate change-induced disasters. To accomplish this goal, the project aims to enhance the technical capabilities of mandated institutions in assessing and managing the risks associated with climate-induced physical damages and economic losses. Additionally, it seeks to integrate climate-resilient measures into policies and planning. The project also involves implementing climate risk reduction and climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructure. These actions are aimed at bolstering the resilience of vulnerable communities in the municipalities of Baucau, Ermera, Aileu, Viqueque, Lautem, and Liquiça.

The first outcome of the project is “Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate responsive planning and development”. The second outcome is “Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risk”.

The project has two main outputs. Output 1 is “Climate risk information is developed, monitored and integrated into policies, regulations and institutions to inform climate resilient small-scale rural infrastructure planning and management”. This includes providing climate risk information services and vulnerability mapping to all sectoral institutions through the creation of maps and a multi-hazard vulnerability risk assessment (MHVRA) using a geographic information system (GIS). It also includes establishing a database system for monitoring, recording, and accounting for climate-induced damages. Furthermore, the project aims to refine ordinances, regulations, and associated codes and standards to enable climate-proofing of small-scale rural infrastructure.

The other main output of the project is Output 2, which focuses on implementing climate risk reduction and climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructure. This involves rehabilitating small-scale rural infrastructure with climate-proofing measures and supporting catchment management and infrastructure rehabilitation measures through agro-forestry and forestry interventions.

The project is implemented through UNDP’s national implementation modality (NIM) with UNDP Country Office Support. The national implementing partner is the Secretary of State for Environment (SSE), which is supposed to implement the project in compliance with UNDP rules and regulations, policies, and procedures, including NIM guidelines. Following the parliamentary election of May 2023 and the establishment of a new constitutional government, the SSE was abolished, while its functions have been absorbed by the Minister of Tourism and Environment.

Project progress summary

Under Output 1, the project has successfully delivered a Multi-Hazard Vulnerability Assessment (MHVRA) tool based on a GIS). Progress is underway to complete the Timor Emergency Response System (TERS), a tool designed for collecting loss and damage data. Additionally, a Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI) laboratory has been established within the Secretary of State for Civil Protection (SSCP). The project conducted comprehensive training sessions for SSCP officials and municipal representatives, covering areas such as Disaster Risk Management (DRM), utilization of the MHVRA tool, drone implementation for data acquisition, application of the Local Vulnerability & Risk Assessment (LoVRA) methodology, and testing of the TERS application.

Under Output 1 the project has successfully delivered a Multi-Hazard Vulnerability Assessment (MHVRA) tool, which is based on a GIS. Progress is underway to complete the Timor Emergency Response System (TERS), which is a tool to collect loss and damage data. Additionally, a Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI) laboratory was established within the Secretary of State for Civil Protection (SSCP). The project conducted comprehensive training sessions for SSCP officials and municipal representatives, covering areas such as Disaster Risk

Management (DRM), the utilisation of the MHVRA tool, the application of drones for data acquisition, the implementation of the Local Vulnerability & Risk Assessment (LoVRA) methodology, and testing of the TERS application.

Despite significant delays, nearly all main deliverables outlined under Output 1 have been achieved, with the exception of those resulting from Activity 1.3 (which involved the redefinition of ordinances, regulations and associated codes to enable climate proofing small-scale infrastructure). For this particular activity, guidelines for the design of rural infrastructures have been developed (currently utilized by the project). However, substantial work remains to establish Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and institutionalize the use of these guidelines for climate risk reduction measures in rural infrastructures.

Regarding Output 2, the end-of-project (EoP) targets entail 66 infrastructure units funded by the GCF grant and 64 infrastructures funded by the government, totaling 130 infrastructures. The project has completed the construction of 4 infrastructures (all roads) of the GCF-funded 66 infrastructure. Additionally, GCF-funded infrastructure work has commenced for another 13 infrastructure projects. The government has implemented 8 infrastructures. The baseline assessment revealed that 17 of the 66 infrastructures planned to be implemented through GCF funds had already been implemented by the government or other donors before the project commenced (the project board is supposed to propose replacements for these 17 infrastructures).

To strengthen capacity-building efforts, the project organized comprehensive training programs benefiting engineers from all project municipalities, as well as professionals from the Ministry of Public Works (MoPW) and the National Agency for Development (NAD). These programs covered critical topics including climate-resilient construction, bioengineering techniques, labor-based technologies, environmental and social safeguards, and the use of the Multi-Hazard Vulnerability Risk Assessment (MHRVA).

In addition to in-person training, the project signed a contract with Coursera, an online platform, to provide training courses. A total of 200 licenses have been provided since September 2022 for two years, granting access to selected training courses from over 5,500 available online courses in English. An agreement was made with the Institute of Business in Timor-Leste, to translate selected Coursera courses from English to Tetum. As per data in the 2022 Annual Performance Report (APR), more than 100 staff from the project, target municipalities, and partner institutions have enrolled in the online courses.

Under Output 2 the project awarded two contracts to two NGO consortia to conduct catchment management and rehabilitation activities in 189 hectares of land through appropriate modalities such as agro-forestry, afforestation and reforestation. Given that the planting activity took place at the end of the rainy season, only 57.16 hectares were planted around 11 infrastructure schemes. The remaining part will be planted during the next rainy season. The selection of seedlings was based on farm plans developed by beneficiary farmers with project's assistance.

As er the ToR, Table 1 provides a rating for the progress towards results, project implementation and adaptive management, and the sustainability criterion.

Table 1: Interim evaluation rating

Measure	Interim evaluation rating[1]	Achievement Description
Progress towards results	MS	The logframe indicator for Outcome 1 is the number of revised policies, regulations, methodologies, and guidelines. The project is currently facing delays in implementing relevant activities. Guidelines for climate-resilient infrastructure have recently been developed and utilized

[1] HS: Highly satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; MS: Moderately satisfactory; MU: Moderately unsatisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory: HU: Highly unsatisfactory; L: likely; ML: Moderately likely; MU: Moderately unlikely: Unlikely. Annex VII reports a description of the rating scales

		for the design of GCF-funded projects. However, a broader adoption of the planning and design tools delivered by the project is yet to occur.
	Outcome 2 achievement rating: MU	The two logframe indicators for Outcome 2 are the number of staff trained and using funds supported tools, instruments and strategies and the number of people benefiting from climate resilient infrastructure. Training has been organised (overachieving the targets in terms of the number of people trained). However, the actual use of delivered tools remains unknown for a large part of training participants. Regarding training, the project has successfully organized sessions, surpassing the set targets for the number of individuals trained. Nevertheless, the extent of actual tool utilization by a significant portion of the participants remains unknown. Infrastructure rehabilitation has commenced, with a few projects successfully completed. However, the total count of beneficiaries is significantly below the mid-term target due to accumulated delays in project implementation.
	Output 1 achievement rating: MS	The logframe indicator for Output 1 is the number of hazard maps delivered. The project has achieved the target. Another relevant main product, the loss and damage data collection tool, is expected to be finalized soon. However, the chosen indicator is only partially relevant since it does not capture actual use. Indeed, the MHVRA has just been delivered, so not much use can be assumed for a product that has just been delivered.
	Output 2 achievement rating: U	Given accumulated delays, the project has completed only 4 infrastructures funded by the GCF, while the government conducted work on 8 infrastructures. The sum of the two is much lower than the mid-term target of 31 infrastructures.
Project implementation and adaptive management	MS	The project board meetings have been an effective mechanism to steer the project. However, insufficient managerial capabilities in the initial two and a half years of the project resulted in considerable delays. Nevertheless, UNDP has shown its adaptive capacity by making the necessary managerial restructuring decisions.
Sustainability	ML	A decree law has been approved by the government to allocate funds for road maintenance. Addiitonally, the programme of the current government includes infrastructure improvement as a key priority. However, despite funds allocation, road remains a recurring issue in Timor-Leste. Furthermore, staff turnover and limited coordination among line-ministries pose risks for sustainability that have already shown some signs of materialisation. Moreover, despite the utilization of bio-engineering techniques, agroforestry and government standard designs, extreme heavy rains and floods may still damage rehabilitated roads.

Conclusions

The project is relevant to the country's priorities and needs. It is also in line with the country's policy framework. However, choosing the 130 infrastructure projects at the design stage is questionable since it limits the needed flexibility during implementation to adapt to changing conditions and potentially leverage project planning tools effectively.

The vertical intervention logic is robust and coherent since activities, outputs and outcomes are logically linked. The indicators of the logical framework were coherent with the old GCF PFM but are no longer in line with the new GCF IPMF. Also, some of the current indicators are not properly relevant and measurable.

Despite substantial delays, the project is delivering what it is supposed to deliver. Some of the products under Outcome 1 have recently been delivered (such as MHVRA and SDI), while others are still in the process of being delivered (TERS and the review of ordinances, regulations, and guidelines). Progress in infrastructure development (under Outcome 2) remains limited. Given these circumstances, it is still too early to detect tangible signs of a "strengthened institutional and regulatory system for climate responsive planning and development" or of a "Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce exposure to climate change".

In principle the project can contribute to positive changes towards areas covered by the GCF six investment criteria. However, considering that the project is still far from achieving its EoP targets, it has yet to demonstrate concrete changes in its capacity to effectively contribute to those criteria.

While government ministries have been adequately and strategically engaged at the national level (with the key support of SSE) the operational management support has been lacking from the government side. Also, the lack of an active project director has implied that mobilisation of relevant government parties and agencies was left to UNDP.

At the local level, there has been active involvement from municipality heads, suco and village leaders. However, the participation of technical services at the municipality level, such as engineering and forestry departments in supervision has not been fully exploited. This may be a missed opportunity to promote ownership and capacity building. Also, MAF co-financing was not used in a strategic way to complement interventions in building resilience for rural infrastructure. Indeed, when planning co-funded planting activities, MAF forestry departments in municipalities did not receive orientations on areas to plant MAF-funded seedlings. Indeed, there is no evidence that MAF seedlings were planted around infrastructure to be protected.

Inadequate management capacities of the PMU during the first two years and half of project implementation caused significant delays and a consequent questionable quality of UNDP support in that period. However, adaptive capacity has been demonstrated by UNDP by taking the needed management restructuring decisions.

Implementation has now taken a proper pace. However, given the expected planned increase in infrastructure development, with the current number of project staff engineers, there is a serious risk of inadequate supervision for infrastructure schemes development.

It is still too early to assess sustainability prospects. Securing government buy-in will be paramount for ensuring sustainability, particularly regarding government allocations for infrastructure maintenance and the institutional adoption of the provided tools. A critical factor for the project sustainability is the potential turnover of government technical staff.

While the SSCP is certainly well positioned to use the loss and damage data collection tools that the project is developing, the potential of a widespread use of the MHVRS GIS is limited if it is owned only by the SSCP. In this regard, building needed technical and GIS and ICT capacity at the municipality level will be essential to ensure that delivered planning tools are effectively used to plan climate resilient infrastructure and land use.

The project is benefitting women adequately. Necessary measures have been taken to promote active participation of women. However, due to the higher representation of men in government staff and civil works, the project is currently offering more work and learning opportunities to men than to women.

Ownership has been clearly demonstrated from the government side. However, the recent change in government and the abolishment of the SSE has generated uncertainty regarding the future government leadership of the project.

The NGOs contracted by the project used different approaches to incentivize planting and caring for seedlings in selected areas. These different incentives will likely give rise to different survival rates for seedlings.

Recommendations summary table

#	Recommendation	To whom
1	Engage the new Minister of Tourism and Environment and request the appointment of a new national project director to support operational implementation aspects.	UNDP & MTE
2	The detailed list of 130 infrastructures included in the FAA should be interpreted with some degree of flexibility. Strict adherence to the list may restrict necessary adaptability during implementation. The project should consider discussing a formal change in the FAA with the GCF Secretariat to substitute the detailed list of 130 infrastructures with an updated list or even with targets formulated in terms of budget use, number of infrastructure or Km of roads to be rehabilitated without including a detailed list.	UNDP /PB
3	Actively promote the use of the MHVRA system with planning authorities at both municipal and national levels. This includes organizing GIS training sessions for the use of MHVRA at the municipal level, conducting a needs analysis of ICT equipment, and providing relevant ICT equipment to target municipalities where needed. A primary opportunity to test the use of the MHVRA as a planning tool is to utilize it to support discussions on the decision-making process regarding the replacement of the new 17 infrastructures.	UNDP & MSA
4	Improve coordination with MAF to ensure that MAF financing is utilized for planting seedlings in areas identified for safeguarding rehabilitated infrastructure.	UNDP,national project director and MAF
5	Increase supervision of works by staffing the project team with additional engineers. Moreover, the project should arrange for increased joint monitoring of infrastructure development, catchment management, and rehabilitation sites, involving relevant government technical officers, such as engineers and foresters.	UNDP
6	Actively encourage women's participation in both work activities and training sessions.	UNDP, MSA, MoPW
7	Review the logframe indicators in accordance with the specific details outlined in Table 4 of the main report.	UNDP/ PB
8	Utilize any project savings to pave erodible road surfaces also in sections with gentler gradients	UNDP
8	Clarify with the relevant authorities whether O&M responsibilities for water supply infrastructure lie with the national water supply public utility or SMASA.	UNDP & Bee TL
9	Conduct a study to assess and measure the diverse effects and impacts of the approaches used by contracted NGOs to promote planting and caring of seedlings.	UNDP
10	Ensure the usage of PPE by workers and establish proper disposal methods for plastics derived from polybags and other materials used in planting operations.	UNDP

2. INTRODUCTION

The document presents the results of the interim evaluation of the Safeguarding Rural Communities and their Physical Assets from Climate Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste.

2.1 Purpose, users, and scope of the evaluation

The purposes of this interim evaluation as follows:

- Assessing the implementation of the project and progress towards the achievement of the project outcomes as specified in the GCF Funded Activity Agreement (FAA)
- Assessing early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying necessary changes to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.
- Reviewing the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

By addressing the objectives mentioned above, the interim evaluation aims to identify areas requiring restructuring or adaptive management changes in project implementation. This approach intends to provide evidence-based, clear, and focused recommendations to enhance project implementation. The evaluation also seeks to derive lessons for new projects.

The primary user of this evaluation is the UNDP country office (CO) in Timor-Leste. Other users include the GCF and other offices of the Government of Timor-Leste.

Main findings, conclusions and recommendations are also expected to be presented at the next meeting of the project board.

Consistent with the evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) the evaluation team (ET) assessed the project through the following evaluation criteria:

- Project relevance and design
- Effectiveness and progress towards results
- Project implementation, adaptive management, and efficiency (including management arrangements, work planning, financing and co-financing, coherence with climate finance delivery of other multilateral entities, project monitoring and evaluation system, stakeholder engagement, social and environmental standards, reporting, and communication)
- Sustainability (including institutional framework and governance and financial, socio-economic, and environmental risks to sustainability)
- Country ownership
- Gender equity
- Innovativeness and results areas
- Unexpected positive and negative results
- Replication and scalability

The evaluative matrix (included in Annex II) details illustrative evaluative questions, methods of analysis and sources of data for each evaluation criterion.

The analysis of conclusions and findings for the evaluation criteria has informed recommendations and lessons learned.

2.1 Methodology

The project is deploying a comprehensive set of interventions with an ambitious scope. Given the nature of the questions and objectives outlined earlier, the evaluation team (ET) adopted a methodology aimed at delivering well-substantiated recommendations for future directions.

The ET employed a theory-based, utilisation-focused approach for this interim evaluation. Theory-based evaluations focus on analysing a programme's fundamental logic and causal relationships. Importantly, they recognise that multiple factors and interactions influence a programme's impact, aiming to identify the critical causal factors contributing to a programme's success. A utilisation-focused approach prioritises evaluations that are judged by their usefulness to intended users. Hence, the evaluations are planned and conducted to enhance the likelihood of utilising both findings and the process itself to inform decisions.

The evaluation used a qualitative design, employing data collection methods such as document reviews, key informant interviews (KII), and observations. Additionally, quantitative data collected by the project since its inception was also reviewed. These methods facilitated the analysis of the evaluation criteria.

Data were gathered from five out of the six municipalities where the project is implemented (Aileu, Liquiça, Ermera, Baucau, and Lautem) through KIIs and observations. Further details regarding the evaluation itinerary are available in Annex III.

As per UNDP's current practices and procedures, the ET was contracted by the project. More precisely, the evaluation was conducted by two independent consultants. The roles and responsibilities of each consultant are defined in their Terms of Reference (ToR). The ET took special measures to ensure independence, independently deciding on sites to visit for field observations and persons to interview. None of the ET members were previously involved in any project activity and none have any potential conflicts of interest. Triangulation was extensively used to confirm findings (see below). Additionally, the ET aligned with the principles established in GCF's Evaluation Policy and, the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations (including: impartiality, objectivity, unbiased, independent; relevance, utility; credibility; measurability; transparency, ethics, and partnerships).

The initial findings and recommendations were discussed in a dedicated meeting with the UNDP Resident Representative, the project manager and the head of the UNDP climate change unit. UNDP country office, the project manager and the UNDP regional technical advisor provided comments to the first draft of the report, thus contributing to quality assurance. A GCF reviewer also provided detailed comment to a second draft of the report.

The report is organised as follows: this section explains data collection tools and methods of analysis; the next section provides a description of the project and of the context. Section 4 describes main findings. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned are included in Section 5.

Document review

The ET benefited from a rich project document set. Prior to the initiation of fieldwork, the team reviewed the evaluation ToR, the funding proposal and FAA, APRs until the end of 2022, all monthly reports since January 2023, the inception report, the baseline assessment, financial reports and co-financing letters, ESIA/ESMP, minutes of the board meetings and of the sub-steering committee, monitoring data, reports from project team monitoring missions, guidelines for rural infrastructures, and reports of the Multi-Hazard Vulnerability Risk Assessment (MHVRA) tool. Additionally, the ET reviewed relevant policy documents and other relevant documents including the National Disaster Risk Management Policy, the National Climate Change Policy, the Timor-Leste Strategic Development Plan, the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC, the National Adaptation Plan, the Nationally Determined Contribution of Timor-Leste for 2022-2030, the Rural Road Master

Plan and the funding proposal (FP171) of a complementary project implemented by UNEP. This provided a useful overview of the diversity of activities undertaken by the project and allowed the team to develop targeted data collection tools. A list of documents reviewed for this evaluation is included in Annex V.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

The ET used a purposeful sampling approach[2] to identify candidates for KIIs. While the selection of key informants was informed by recommendations from UNDP, the ET also applied other criteria in the selection process, including the key informants' relative positions of authority within their respective organisations/communities, the degree to which they were beneficiaries of project support, and the value of the responses they were likely to provide to the evaluation effort.

KII protocols consisted of interview topics and questions that were derived from the evaluation questions (see evaluative matrix in Annex II), as well as from the ET's document review and discussions with UNDP. The ET conducted KIIs at locations selected by (and therefore convenient for) the interviewees.

In total, the ET conducted 52 interviews (including one-on-one and group interviews) with key informants, interviewing 103 individuals. Key informants are disaggregated in Table 2. Special attention was paid to reaching women's beneficiaries and stakeholders.

Table 2: Key informants by category and gender

Key informant type	Male	Female	Total
UNDP	11	10	21
Government central	9	0	9
Government services at local level	20	0	20
Suco / aldeia chiefs	13	1	14
Beneficiary / community members / construction workers	10	14	24
Works contractors	6	0	6
Service providers	5	1	6
Public utility	1	0	1
Other	2	0	2
Total	77	26	103

Observations

The ET concluded field observations. For each observation the ET documented notes and photos. Observations were used to ground-truth details shared during interviews and information from project documents. The ET conducted a total of 17 observations across the five municipalities, which included irrigation systems, agroforestry sites, roads funded by the GCF and roads rehabilitated by the government through co-financing. Additionally, the ET requested a demonstration of the Multi-Hazard Vulnerability Risk Assessment (MHVRA) system and the Timor Emergency Response System (TERS), which are two tools developed by the project.

[2] Purposeful sampling is a non-probability sampling technique that relies on judgement of the researcher to select units of analysis. It is widely used in qualitative research for the identification and selection of information-rich cases. This involves identifying and selecting individuals or groups of individuals that are especially knowledgeable about or experienced with a phenomenon of interest.

Data Analysis process

The ET members took notes during KIIs, and observations, sharing reflections on each data collection activity with other team members within two days of the data collection activity. These sessions allowed for discussions about the evidence collected, patterns, and discrepancies that helped answer the evaluative questions. Post-fieldwork, the team cleaned and shared electronic summaries of interview notes. During analysis, the team disaggregated data by sex and geographic location, when appropriate, to capture any differences across these categories.

The team captured preliminary findings and conclusions in an evaluation findings matrix that organized analysis and recommendations by evaluation question. This matrix served as a basis for the preliminary findings presentation conducted with UNDP CO on September 18, as well as for the evaluation report.

Triangulation

The ET's data analysis approach utilised data triangulation to cross-check results and provide evidence for the evaluation's findings and conclusions.

Analytical triangulation approaches were employed by the ET in developing findings and conclusions. Triangulation enabled the ET to cross-verify and validate the findings derived from various sources to identify correlations between them. Methodological triangulation further strengthened potential linkages and the accuracy of the data, especially if the results obtained through one method were less conclusive than those obtained through another method.

Data analysis methods

The ET employed several data analysis methods to identify key findings from the collected data, as well as to draw conclusions and make recommendations on sustaining the positive results of the project. Analysis methods included the following:

- Content Analysis – The ET conducted content analysis through intensive review of collected KII to identify and highlight notable examples of the project successes (or lack of successes) that contributed to (or inhibited) project's contributions to their identified objectives. This was triangulated with project documents/data and observations results.
- Contribution Analysis – It was conducted particularly using KII, focusing on questions that asked respondents to share changes observed since the beginning of the project
- Gender Analysis –It included disaggregation of data by gender and analyzing the effects of the project on men, women, and children. Also, the evaluation assessed to what extent the gender action plan has been applied.

2.3 Biases and other limitations

During fieldwork and data analysis, the ET was aware of several limitations and risks for bias. The ET took every effort to mitigate the risks below (listed in order of frequency with which the ET encountered them) over the course of the evaluation.

- Limited number of MAF respondents at the national level: the ET made several attempts to interview MAF representatives at the national level, who are key stakeholders. Eventually, it was not possible to interview the relevant directorate general. As a mitigation measure the ET interviewed MAF officers in municipalities and carefully assessed MAF interest through the minutes of the project board meetings.

- Response Bias: it is the risk that key informants may be motivated to provide responses that would be considered socially desirable or influential in obtaining donor support. Response bias is also connected to cultural and social norms and impacted by gender or social ranking. This was a risk identified during group interviews. If the first person who speaks in a group interview is the most senior in the group, other participants might take their cues from this person and only echo his/her responses. The ET effectively probed on programmatic challenges and limitations (asking specific questions about desired alternative courses of action), thus minimising this bias.
- Selection Bias: in the context of this evaluation there was the risk of collecting perceptions only of those who benefitted from the project and consequently report only positive aspects. It is an inherent risk when implementers help to facilitate contact with project stakeholders. The ET mitigated this risk by selecting respondents from a wide range of categories of stakeholders, including people who did not participate in training courses.
- Non generalizability: as explained above, purposive sampling was used to select respondents because the ET considers this sampling method most appropriate for the objective of this evaluation. However, due to the non-random nature of purposive sampling, the information provided by individual respondents cannot be generalized to a larger population. To mitigate this aspect, the ET targeted a wide range of respondents from various categories of project stakeholders.

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

Context

During the Australian summer monsoon (December to April), most of Timor-Leste experiences wet conditions. However, the dry season is often prolonged, lasting several months from May to November. In addition to the Australian monsoon, the climate in Timor-Leste is strongly affected by a range of global climate influences, including the El Niño Southern Oscillation, the Indian Ocean Dipole, tropical cyclones and the Madden-Julian Oscillation. These climatic factors produce a number of extreme events. For example, extreme drought years are usually associated with El Niño, extreme rainfall in the wet season is influenced particularly by tropical cyclones, and severe flooding and landslides by the Madden-Julian Oscillation.

Timor-Leste is a least developed country and a post-conflict society with a fast-growing population. Increasing climatic variability and unpredictability, particularly in relation to rainfall and extreme weather events, present significant risks to the lives and livelihoods of rural people. This is also because the country is dependent upon subsistence agriculture. Timor-Leste is prone to a number of climate-induced hazards including floods, landslides, and droughts, which result in frequent loss of lives and livelihoods. Impacts of intensified extreme events on critical rural infrastructure include damage and degradation of assets such as water supply and drainage structures, embankments river protections, and community-level feeder roads and bridges. These damages leave rural populations without basic services and often in full isolation.

UNDP conducted an assessment of the impact of climate-induced hydro-meteorological hazards on Timor-Leste using existing national-scale hazard maps and detailed socio-economic data on hazard receptors (including people, property, agriculture and infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and water supply). According to this assessment, it is predicted that there will be an increase in the number of areas and key infrastructure affected for all hazards. The area extension affected by climate change-induced meteorological hazards and the number and length of key infrastructure affected are likely to increase for all municipalities and for all hazards, with the worst affected municipalities being Baucau, Ermera, Aileu, Viqueque, Lautem and Liquiça.

Vulnerable small-scale rural infrastructure assets in Timor-Leste include water supply systems, rural roads and bridges, flood defences, and irrigation systems.

The typical design and application of existing infrastructure and construction standards are not climate resilient. Also, investment in operation and maintenance (O&M) is very limited. This exacerbates exposure to climate hazards for rural communities. Impacts include the isolation of communities when roads and bridges are damaged by localised extreme events, reduction in water yields due to droughts, contamination of unprotected water sources, and flooding of communities due to inadequate flood defences.

Project Description

The main objective of this project is to safeguard vulnerable communities and their physical assets from climate change-induced disasters. To achieve this objective, the project aims to strengthen the technical capacities of mandated institutions to assess and manage the risks of climate-induced physical damages and economic losses, and integrate climate-resilient measures into policies and planning. Additionally, the project is implementing climate risk reduction and climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructure to enhance the resilience of vulnerable communities in the municipalities of Baucau, Ermera, Aileu, Viqueque, Lautem, and Liquiça. Finally, the project is implementing complementary catchment management and agroforestry actions.

As described in the Theory of Change (ToC) included in the funding proposal (FP) the project has two main

outcomes, two outputs, and three activities per output. The formal definition of these elements of the intervention logic is reported below.

The **first outcome** is "Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate responsive planning and development".

The **second outcome** of the project is "Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risk".

The project intervention logic includes **Output 1**, which is formulated as follows: "Climate risk information is developed, monitored and integrated into policies, regulations and institutions to inform climate resilient small-scale rural infrastructure planning and management". This output comprises three activities:

Activity 1.1: "Develop and deliver climate risk information services and vulnerability mapping to all sectoral institutions".

Activity 1.2: "Establish a database system for monitoring, recording and accounting climate induced damages in order to inform climate risk reduction planning and budgeting".

Activity 1.3: "Refine ordinances, regulations and associated codes and standards to enable climate proofing small-scale rural infrastructure".

The other main output of the project is **Output 2**, which is "Climate risk reduction and climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructure are implemented to build the resilience of vulnerable communities in six priority districts". The following three activities are expected to contribute to these outputs:

Activity 2.1. "Climate risk reduction measures for small-scale rural infrastructure are fully integrated into the planning and budgeting cycles of Village and Municipal development plans".

Activity 2.2.: "Implementation of climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructure".

Activity 2.3.: "Supporting catchment management and rehabilitation measures to enhance climate resilient infrastructure and communities".

Project implementation arrangements

The project is implemented through UNDP's national implementation modality (NIM) with Country Office Support. The national implementing partner is the Secretary of State for Environment (SSE), which is supposed to implement the project in compliance with UNDP rules, regulations, policies and procedures, including NIM guidelines. After the parliamentary elections of May 2023 and the establishment of a new constitutional government the SSE was abolished, and its functions were absorbed by the Minister of Tourism and Environment, who also serves as the Vice-Prime Minister and the Minister Coordinator for Economic Affairs.

A well-articulated implementation structure was established to support the project. This structure includes a project board, a project director and a project management unit.

The project board (PB) comprises representatives from the SSE, UNDP, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fishery (MAF), the Ministry of Public Works (MoPW), the Ministry of State Administration (MSA) and the Secretary of State of Civil Protection (SSCP).

The PB has been co-chaired by the SSE and the UNDP Resident Representative, making It makes management decisions by consensus. The PB also approves the project workplans and budget.

UNDP provides quality assurance through UNDP CO, the UNDP regional office and the UNDP headquarter.

A national project director, appointed by the SSE, serves as the main focal point for the national partner. A project management unit (PMU) was established for day-to-day management and decision-making. Initially, the PMU was co-managed by a chief technical advisor (CTA) and a national project manager. However, following an internal restructuring effective from October 2022, the CTA role was not retained, and the national project manager's position was replaced by an international project manager.

Apart from the project manager, the PMU includes an international team leader for infrastructure and another for agroforestry. An international disaster risk management (DRM) expert joined in September 2022 but resigned in March 2023. Other PMU members consist of a GIS officer, a national DRM officer, a national social safeguarding, gender, and social inclusion officer, an environmental safeguard officer, three national engineers, a project monitoring officer, six field coordinators, an admin and finance officer, a procurement officer, an admin assistant, and four drivers.

Project timing and milestones

The project commenced in March 2020, with the inception workshop occurring in September 2020. The total project duration spans six years. This interim evaluation was conducted between August and October 2023, with the field visit taking place in September 2023.

Main stakeholders

Most relevant project stakeholders are included in Table 3.

Table 3:Main project stakeholders

Stakeholders	Short description	Role
Ministry of Tourism and Environment (now replacing the Secretary of State for the Environment)	The ministry is responsible for the design, implementation, coordination and evaluation of policies, defined and approved by the Council of Ministers for tourism and environment.	● Propose policies and draft legislation and regulations necessary for their areas of responsibility. ● Design, implement and evaluate tourism and environment policies. ● Support the implementation of the "Blue Economy" development strategy. ● Promote and implement environmental policy, provide the protection and conservation of nature and biodiversity, supervise activities potentially harmful to flora and fauna and ensure national development in an environmentally sustainable manner. ● Implement the environmental policy and evaluate the results achieved. ● Promote, monitor, and support strategies to integrate the environment into sectoral policies. ● Carry out a strategic environmental assessment of policies, plans, programmes, and legislation and coordinate environmental impact assessment processes for projects at the national level. ● Formally, it is the IP of the project and co-chairs the PB.
Ministry of State Administration (MSA)	It is in charge of administration management at the municipal level. MSA is responsible for he designing, implementing and evaluating the policy defined by the Council of Ministers for local governments and	● Coordination at the municipal level of the development of inherent and specific aspects of climate change policy implementation; ● Implementation of climate change related activities at the municipal, suco, and village level;

Stakeholders	Short description	Role
	administrative decentralisation. It supports community organisations, promotes local development and is in charge of organising elections.	● Coordination of disaster prevention and the response to related or exacerbated causes of climate change ● MSA's PNDS Directorate handles the procurement process for any project with a value up to US$ 75,000, while the PDIM handles procurement for projects up to US$ 500,000.
Ministry of the Interior - Secretary of State for Civil Protection (SSCP)	Design policies, regulations, and operational procedures for disaster risk management (prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery, and rehabilitation) throughout the country	● Provide improved early warning and forecasting systems for severe weather events, as well as, assistance to victims of natural and climate-induced disasters; ● Provide social assistance including emergency response and disaster recovery as part of DRM in Timor-Leste; ● Monitor climate change variability, extreme events and disasters such as floods, droughts, landslides, high winds, and coastal floodings; ● Integrate climate change into all disaster management policies, programmes and activities. ● It owns important project products such the data collection tools for losses and damages and a GIS system based on multi-potential hazards
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF)	The Directorate General of Forestry, Coffee, and Industrial Plants is in charge of developing, implementing, and enforcing laws and regulations. It also manages forest management and protection programmes	● Develop and implement laws and regulations for the management and protection of forest, flora and fauna resources; ● Manage reforestation programmes; ● Manage national parks and flora and fauna conservation programmes; ● Manage watershed maintenance and rehabilitation programme; ● Responsible for mangrove management, restoration and rehabilitation programmes, in close coordination with relevant stakeholders; ● Implement forest conservation plans and promote sustainable agroforestry practices throughout the country, including mapping and development of forest species inventories.
Ministry of Public Work (MoPW)	MoPW is the government entity responsible for the development, construction, and maintenance of vital infrastructure of the country. It has two departments which handle quality assessment and regulation of infrastructure, namely the national laboratory and quality control and department of codification, regulation, and standardisation.	● Develop and implement policies for flood prevention, urban planning, and urban building; ● Monitor and assess damages to infrastructure, including roads and canals affected by events caused and or aggravated by climate change; ● Protect offshore infrastructure from damage caused by waves or aggravated by sea level rise; ● Develop and build climate-proof infrastructure to protect water sources (e.g., springs, streams, and wells) to provide safe access to water for domestic use, sanitation, industry development, and ecosystem health.
The Presidents of the Municipal Authorities and the Municipality Administrators	The Presidents of the Municipal Authorities and the Municipal Administrators are in charge of executive functions at the municipality level.	● All public and private entities are required to cooperate with Presidents of Municipal Authorities and Municipal Administrators in performing their respective functions ● Municipal authorities submit projects to be funded to the MSA

Stakeholders	Short description	Role
Suco Council (Chief of Suco and Chief of aldeias)	Suco councils (composed of Chief of Suco, Chief of aldeias, youth and women representatives and ritual authorities) represent local interests, facilitate local consultations, are in charge of coordinating activities at local level and represent local functions. They are the most important and relevant governance entity at grassroot level.	● Chief of Suco is the community authority elected to direct the activities carried out by the community in a given Suco; ● Chief of Aldeia is responsible for implementing decisions approved by the Suco Council. He/she provides the Suco with necessary support at the village level.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Project strategy

Project design

The project design builds on the results of a previous project funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), titled "Strengthening the Resilience of Small-Scale Rural Infrastructure and Local Government Systems to Climatic Variability and Risks" (SSRI), which piloted small-scale resilience infrastructure development and capacity building in three municipalities (Baucau, Ermera and Liquiça). Essentially, this GCF-funded project intends to scale up the results of SSRI by developing more climate-resilient infrastructure in target districts, enlarging the intervention area to three other municipalities (Aileu, Lautem and Viqueue) and building institutional and human capacities at the national level.

The project was designed after extensive consultations with central and municipal governments, as mentioned in the FP and associated annexes. During these consultations, considerable attention was paid to addressing the needs of women. A gender analysis was conducted at the design stage, which also included the use of single-gender working groups while conducting community-based risk mapping. Additionally, a gender action plan was developed and annexed to the FP.

Risks and assumptions were identified in the FP both in the ToC diagram and in the dedicated risk analysis section. However, these two sets of risks differ. While the risks in the ToC include all relevant risks, the sections on risks of the FP miss important risks, including staff turnover among trained government staff, institutions not using climate risks maps for planning, lack of cooperation among government institutions, unmaintained software, and inadequate government maintenance for developed infrastructure.

Results framework and Theory of Change

The project has two outcomes. Outcome 1 involves a capacity-building component and includes interventions to strengthen the institutional and regulatory system. Under Outcome 2, the project deploys climate-resilience infrastructure and associated catchment management and rehabilitation interventions, aimed at reducing potential erosion and landslides in areas where developed infrastructures are located.

Overall, the ET finds the ToC convincing and the intervention logic coherent. No changes in the ToC are deemed necessary. The project outcomes and outputs are clear and the expected delivery of products is deemed feasible with available resources and within the project timeframe.

As requested in the ToR, a critical analysis of the logical framework indicators is proposed here. The logical framework was designed when the previous GCF performance management framework (PMF) was in place. Indicators selected at the fund-level impact were derived from the previous PMF. In June 2021, the GCF approved a new Integrated Performance Management Framework (IPMF) to address limitations from the previous framework. Consequently, the indicators outlined in the project's logical framework, originally aligned with the previous PMF, no longer conform to the new IPMF. A detailed analysis of the logical framework indicators is included in Table 4. This also includes an analysis of the alignment of the project indicators with those of the IPMF. It should be noted that the project does not necessarily have to use the indicators of the new IPMF since the project was approved before the IPMF became operational. Nevertheless, the table proposes a realignment of the project indicators with those of the IPMF since the new indicators of the IPMF are more relevant for this project and easier to measure.

Table 4: Logframe indicators analysis

Definition	Logframe indicator	Comment	Proposed change
Fund level impacts			
Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions	% reduction in losses of lives and economic assets (US$) due to impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention Midterm target: 25% reduction Final target: 75% reduction	This indicator was taken from the old GCF PMF and is very difficult to measure. Also, the target looks overambitious The new IPMF retains this indicator as a supplementary indicator and not as a core indicator.	If the project can collect proper data to measure it, it should be kept. Otherwise, it should be dropped. In case the indicator is retained, the target should be reduced since the project activities affect a minor part of the municipalities' assets
Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change	Total number of infrastructure units made climate resilient Midterm target: 31 Final target: 130	This indicator is slightly different from the formal definition of the old PFM. It is not completely relevant to the new IPMF since it does not capture the value of physical assets (as requested in the new IPFM). Targets look realistic	Coherently with the new IPFM, the proposed definition is the following: "Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effect of climate change" (IPMF core indicator 3).
	Total number of beneficiaries with access to climate resilient infrastructure units Midterm target: 75,000 Final target: 175,854	This indicator is only slightly different from the formal definition of the old PFM. It is measurable, specific and relevant. Using the project database on the number of beneficiaries per infrastructure it results that the targets are overambitious	Coherently with the new IPMF, the proposed new definition of the indicator is "direct and indirect beneficiaries reached" (core indicator 2). New proposed targets[3]: Midterm target: 33,500 Final target: 140,000
Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	Extent of ecosystems strengthened, restored and protected from climate variability and climate Midterm target: 100 Ha Final target: 300 Ha	This indicator is not relevant for the project since no intervention has been taken to strengthen eco-systems. Also, the target and the baseline chosen are not coherent (since the baseline captures deforestation rate while the target captures the number or hectares under forestry or agroforestry). So, changes in time over the baseline cannot be reflected. Targets (in terms of hectares) are realistic	Coherently with the new IPMF, the proposed new definition of the indicator is "hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low-emissions and/or climate resilient management practices" (IPMF core indicator 4). With this new definition the baseline value is zero.
Project level outcomes:			
Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate responsive planning and development	# of Institutional and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective implementation Midterm target: 6 policies/regulations and CR guidelines adopted	The definition of this indicator was taken from the old PMF. It is ill-defined and not relevant since it focuses on incentives, which the project does not provide.	The new proposed definition is: # of institutions that make use of the tools delivered by the project to improve climate resilience.

[3] These are proposed using the average number of beneficiaries per infrastructure as reported in the project monitoring system (which reports the number of beneficiaries for 42 infrastructure).

Definition	Logframe indicator	Comment	Proposed change
	Final target: same as midterm		
Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks	Use by public-sector services staff of Fund supported tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate change and variability. Midterm target: 100 staff Final target: 200 staff	The indicator definition is acceptable. However, the unit of measurement is not immediately clear from the definition. Targets look realistic	The proposed new definition is "number of public-sector services staff using Fund supported tools, instruments, strategies and activities to respond to climate change and variability.
	# of males and females reached benefiting from climate-resilient infrastructure Midterm target: 75,000 Final target: 175,840	This indicator is relevant, specific and measurable. However, the baseline figure is not relevant since it includes the beneficiaries of the SSRI project (while this new project is implemented in different villages) Using the project database on the number of beneficiaries per infrastructure it results that the targets are overambitious	The definition should be retained. The baseline figure should be zero. New proposed targets[3]: Midterm target: 33,500 Final target: 140,000
	Project level outputs		
Climate risk information is developed, monitored and integrated into policies, regulations and institutions to inform climate resilient small-scale rural infrastructure planning and management	# of hazard risk maps and information developed and adopted/ embedded into sectoral policies and legislations Targets: 4 maps	The indicator is partially relevant since the project developed a GIS (i.e., MHVRA) capable of producing maps for different risks and hazards. Target look realistic Also, an indicator is missing to reflect the loss and damage data collection tool developed by the project (i.e., TERS)	Two indicators are proposed: 1) # of institutions (including municipalities) using the MHVRA GIS system developed by the project (target and baseline should be updated coherently). 2) Use of the loss & damage data collection tool developed by the project. Suggested target: TERS is used by SSCP and municipalities to collect data on losses and damage.
Climate risk reduction and climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructure are implemented to build the resilience of vulnerable communities in six priority districts	# of infrastructure units built to new climate resilient standards Midterm target: 31 Final target: 130	The indicator is relevant and measurable. However, there is some confusion regarding the baseline. The figure included in the FP logframe is ("13 units per year non climate proofed infrastructure in each of target municipalities") is not coherent with the definition of the indicator, which reflects the number of infrastructure units with new standards. Targets look realistic	Change the baseline figure coherently with the target and with reality on the ground. One possible alternative is to change the baseline to 0. Another is to change the baseline to the number of infrastructures built in the period between the project design and the start of the project (e.g., 17 according to baseline). In the latter case the target should be the same as the baseline plus 130
	# Hectares of agroforestry implemented in target infrastructure catchments Midterm target: 75 Hectares Final target: 130 hectares	The indicator is relevant and measurable. However, the baseline (deforestation rate of 1.16% per year) is not coherent with the target (300 hectares). Targets look realistic	A change in the baseline figure to zero hectares is suggested.

The means of verification for each indicator are not included in Table *4*. Overall, the listed means of verifications in the logical framework of the funding proposal are appropriate.

The analysis presented in the table above indicates that some of the indicators taken from the previous PMF are neither measurable nor relevant. Additionally, not all potential positive effects of the project are captured by the logical framework indicators. An indicator is indeed missing for the expected use of the new loss and damage data collection tool developed by the project. Targets and baselines are not always coherent. Moreover, the chosen indicators do not reflect additional beneficial development effects, such as the number of short-term job opportunities created for men and women through infrastructure building.

4.2 Relevance

The country is vulnerable to a wide array of climatic threats. The growing variability and unpredictability of climate, especially concerning rainfall and severe weather occurrences, pose significant risks to the well-being and economic activities of rural inhabitants. Timor-Leste is exposed to various climate-related risks, including floods, landslides, and prolonged periods of drought, resulting in frequent loss of both lives and livelihoods. The intensified extreme events also have adverse effects on vital rural infrastructure, leading to the deterioration and destruction of assets like water supply and drainage systems, embankments, as well as local feeder roads and bridges. These impairments often leave rural communities devoid of essential services and frequently isolated.

Timor-Leste's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) for 2022-2030 underscores the increasing frequency of extreme rainfall events and the likelihood that longer and more intense droughts are likely to continue to exacerbate development challenges. Also, the rainfall trend analysis included in the 2020 Second National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) shows that most of the area in Timor-Leste experiences increasing trends in the frequency of daily rainfall above 20 mm/day. As specified in the Communication, the increase in the frequency of extreme rainfall above the threshold could impact in increase of climate-related disasters. Also, the Communication shows the country is not only experiencing an increase in the frequency and intensity of extreme rainfall, but also climate impact related to prolonged and intense drought. Overall, these changes exacerbate existing problems with drought, floods, and water quality. Water management infrastructure such as water storage, water supply and flood resistant infrastructure are increasingly exposed to climate change impacts, thus necessitating additional and more resilient infrastructure as climate patterns change.

In this climate change context, the country is in dire need of assistance to plan and implement climate-resilient infrastructure and disaster prevention interventions, which are areas this project intends to address.

The project is in line with the Climate Change policy approved in 2022. The policy emphasises that the anticipated impacts of climate change are likely to have negative effects on existing infrastructure such as bridges, roads and irrigation and stresses the role of the government in proposing the design and development of new infrastructure that take into account these new risks. Additionally, the policy highlights the importance of disaster risk management and reduction measures, including providing insights into how climate change can impact infrastructure, which is the topic of the project Output 1. Furthermore, the policy stresses that water related infrastructure should be protected and practices to better capture available water and make use of existing water sources should be implemented, aligning with the project's choice of targeting water supply systems and irrigation systems. The climate change policy also identifies a need for improving infrastructure and restoring natural vegetation to prevent landslides due to extreme weather events related to climate change.

The project is also coherent with the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) submitted to UNFCCC in 2021. The NAP lists priority programmes, including the infrastructure programme. This programme encompasses the development of climate-resilient infrastructure, enhancement of regulatory frameworks for climate-smart infrastructure, and the establishment of institutional and human capacity. These areas of focus closely correspond to the key intervention areas of this project.

The project's attempts to reduce risk exposure by developing risk assessment tools are in line with the Disaster Risk Management Policy, which recognizes the need for institutional capacity building and for the integration of the disaster management sector into all plans and development programmes of government institutions. This policy also emphasises the importance of risk analysis to identify and evaluate hazardous conditions to eliminate, reduce or control the risks posed by such conditions.

The project focus on infrastructure improvement is very relevant to the Timor-Leste Strategic Development Plan (SDP) for 2011-2030. The SDP places significant emphasis on the improvement of infrastructure and considers it one of the key components within the nation's strategic and sustainable development vision. While it does not explicitly state the importance of making these infrastructures resilient to climate change, the SDP underscores the necessity of constructing roads and bridges with advanced designs and engineering considerations to ensure they can withstand the impacts of landslides and erosions.

The project demonstrates coherence with the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2022-2025 and with the UNDP Country Programme for Timor-Leste. More precisely, it aligns with UNDP's Resilience "Signature solutions" outlined in its Strategic Plan, which aims to assist countries and communities in building resilience against various shocks and crises, including the challenges posed by climate change. The UNDP Country Programme Document for Timor-Leste for 2021-2025 includes a transformational strategy named "Resilience to climate change and sustainable management of ecosystems". This strategy intends to address the causes of vulnerability to climate change and offers technical and institutional capacity support to cross-sectoral ministries. Its objective is to enable the collection, analysis and utilisation of climate change data, ultimately enhancing evidence-based national planning, budgeting and coordination efforts on climate risk and ecosystem management at the municipal level. Notably, project planned deliverables under Output 1 are supposed to improve technical and institutional capacity needs.

While the main project outline is coherent with the national policy and the UN planning tools, the relevance of selecting infrastructures at the design stage is questionable. The Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) includes a detailed list of 130 infrastructure to be developed by the project with GCF funding or through government co-funding. For each infrastructure listed the FAA specifies the envisaged capital cost. Once the project started the list was not reviewed. The inclusion of such a high level of details in the FAA limits the needed flexibility during project implementation. This is because the list was developed at the design stage, well before the project started. Subsequently, when the project commenced, it became evident that the initial list was partially irrelevant. In fact, according to the baseline study, 17 of the 66 infrastructures to be built through GCF funding were already built by the government and other development partners at the time of the baseline study. The current PMU provides a different description of when those 17 infrastructures were actually built. In any case, given that they have already been built, the 17 infrastructures can no longer be part of the 66 target infrastructures to be built through GCF-funding and they will consequently have to be replaced. . Additionally, certain roads were found to be more severely damaged than initially estimated during the design phase, necessitating more extensive rehabilitation efforts over a longer stretch. Moreover, setting the list of infrastructure at the design stage limits the potential use of planning tools that the project is supposed to develop, like the multi-hazard vulnerability risk assessment (MHVRA). This is a GIS that identifies areas with different potential risks for various hazards and could in principle be used to select the location of infrastructure. The MHVRA is supposed to be delivered during the project implementation period, so it cannot inform location decisions made at the design stage.

4.3 Effectiveness and progress towards results

Under Output 1 the project has successfully delivered a MHVRA tool (based on GIS). Progress is underway to complete the TERS, which is a tool to collect loss and damage data. A Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI) laboratory was established at the National Command Operation Center (NDOC), within the Secretary of State for Civil Protection (SSCP) office. To ensure the effective utilisation of these tools and systems, a comprehensive training programme was executed for SSCP officials and municipal representatives. Training covered Disaster Risk Management (DRM), the utilisation of the MHVRA tool, the application of drones for data acquisition, the implementation of the Local Vulnerability & Risk Assessment (LoVRA) methodology, and testing of the TERS application.

At the time of the interim evaluation, nearly all main products outlined under Output 1 have been delivered, with the exception of those resulting from Activity 1.3 (redefinition of ordinances, regulations and associated codes to enable climate proofing small scale infrastructure). For this activity guidelines for the design of three types of rural infrastructures (roads, irrigation systems and water supply systems) were developed and are currently used by the project. However, there is still substantial work ahead to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and institutionalize the use of the guidelines for climate risk reduction measures in rural infrastructures. Overall, given that products under Output 1 have just been delivered (MHVRA) or are still in the process of being finalised (TERS) their current utilization is limited to a few project planning activities (e.g., for catchment management) and abroader institutional use is yet to be established.

Under Output 2, at the time of this interim evaluation, the project has just completed four infrastructures (all roads), out of an end-of-project (EoP) target of 66 infrastructure to be implemented through GCF funding. GCF-funded infrastructure schemes have been initiated for an additional 13 infrastructures. In addition, the government implemented eight infrastructures (out of an EoP target of 64) through co-funding.

The project has also prioritised capacity building by organising comprehensive training programmes. These programmes have benefited engineers from all municipalities involved in the project, as well as professionals from the Ministry of Public Works (MoPW) and the National Agency for Development (NAD). The training encompassed crucial aspects such as climate-resilient construction, bioengineering techniques, and labour-based technology. Other training sessions were held for municipal engineers, technical staff from the PDIM, MoPW, SSE, GCF project staff and contractors from municipalities and focused on topics such as environmental impact assessments, Environmental and Social management plans, compliance with social and environmental standards (SES)and protection from social exploitation and abuse.

To complement the in-person training and allow more flexibility for the participants, a contract was signed with Coursera, an online platform that provides training courses. A total of 200 licences have been provided by Coursera from September 2022 for two years to access and complete selected training courses from more than 5,500 courses available online in English. As per data included in the 2022 APR, more than 100 staff from the project, target municipalities and partner institutions have registered for the online courses. An agreement was reached with the Institute of Business in Timor-Leste, to translate selected courses on Coursera from English to Tetun.

Under Output 2 the project awarded two contracts to two consortia of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) for catchment management and rehabilitation of 189 hectares of risk prone areas through appropriate modalities of agroforestry, afforestation and reforestation . Given that the planting activity took place at the end of the rainy season only 57.16 hectares were planted around 11 infrastructure schemes. The remaining part will be planted during the next rainy season. The selection of seedlings to be planted was done according to farm plans that beneficiary farmers developed with the project assistance.

As requested by the ToR, the following table reports an analysis of the project's progress for each indicator of the logical framework. The table shows that for Outcome 2, the project is very far from the final or mid-term target.

Table 5: Progress Towards Results matrix

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 2nd APR[4]	Mid-term target	Final target	Interim level / assessment & rating[5]	Justification
Fund level impact A1.0: Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions	A 1.1 % reduction in losses of life and economic assets (US$) due to impacts of extreme climate disasters in the geo-graphic area of the GCF intervention	Economic loss equivalent to 11.5% of GDP	0	-25% reduction in economic losses in 6 target municipalities	-75% reduction in economic losses in 6 target municipalities	n/a	The project is not reporting data for this indicator. Given the lower number of infrastructures planned in comparison to the total number of infrastructures in the target municipality, the target is excessively ambitious
Fund level impact A3.0: Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change	A 3.1. Total number of infrastructure units made more resilient	13 units per year non-climate proofing infrastructure in each of the 6 target municipalities	13	31 climate resilient infrastructure assets built or improved by the project	130 infrastructure assets built or improved by project	U	12 Units completed (including 4 units implemented through GCF grants that have reached at least 90% of implementation and 8 additional units implemented though government co-funding). The actual figure (12) is just 39% of the mid-term target.
Fund level impact A3.0: Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change	A 3.2 total number of beneficiaries with access to climate resilient infrastructure units	33,000 beneficiaries in 3 of the target municipalities where SSRI has been implemented	17,897 (8,769 - female/49%)	75,000 beneficiaries direct beneficiaries (51% male, 49% female) of the 31 climate resilient infrastructure assets	175,840 direct beneficiaries (51% male, 49% female) of the 130 climate resilient infrastructure assets	U	The number of beneficiaries calculated by this interim evaluation is 9,228 (5,957 F), which is obtained by summing the number of beneficiaries reported in the project monitoring system for the 8 infrastructures completed with co-financing and the 4 infrastructure completed through GCF fund. The number of beneficiaries is just 12% of the mid-term target.
Fund level impact A4.0: Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	4.1 Extent of ecosystems strengthened, restored and protected from	Deforestation rate of 1.16% per year	Preparatory works have been completed for planting of 75 Ha and	100 ha of farm and state land is under agroforestry and	300 ha of farm and state land is under agroforestry and	MU	57.16 hectares planted in private land. However, the survival rate has not been calculated yet and is not expected to be very high since part of the seedlings were planted after the rainy season. The rating is based on the percentage of

[4] While the table included in the ToR suggested the use of the 1st APR this report this report uses the 2nd APR since it includes more recent figures.

[5] HS: Highly satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; MS: Moderately satisfactory; MU: Moderately unsatisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory: HU: Highly unsatisfactory; L: likely; ML: Moderately likely; MU: Moderately unlikely: Unlikely

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 2nd APR[4]	Mid-term target	Final target	Interim level / assessment & rating[5]	Justification
	climate variability and change		planting will start in January 2023	reforestation efforts	reforestation efforts		hectares planted with respect to the mid-term target
Project outcome 1: Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate responsive planning and development	5.1 # of Institutional and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective implementation	Outdated sectoral guidelines for infrastructure development that do not include climate risk considerations	0	6 national policies, regulations, revised methodologies and guidelines for CR infrastructure adopted	6 national policies, regulations, revised methodologies and guidelines for CR infrastructure adopted	MU	Guidelines for the design of climate resilient rural infrastructures have been developed. National and international consultants have been recruited to conduct further relevant activity, but concrete work for institutionalize changes in regulations and guidelines still has to start
Project outcome 2: Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks	7.1: Use by public-sector services staff of Fund supported tools, instruments, strategies and activities to respond to climate change and variability	0	0	100 staff in MSA, MSS and MAF in central and local government using new tools and technologies	200 staff in MSA, MSS and MAF in central and local government using new tools and technologies	S	The project has trained 350 staff, thus overachieving the target. However, no survey was conducted to assess to what extent the new tools and knowledge has been actually used.
	7.2 # of males and females reached benefiting from climate- resilient infrastructure	33,000 beneficiaries in 3 of the target municipalities where SSRI has been implemented	0	75,000 beneficiaries' direct beneficiaries (51% male, 49% female) of the 31 climate resilient infrastructure assets	175,840 direct beneficiaries (51% male, 49% female) of the 130 climate resilient infrastructure assets	U	This indicator is also included at impact level. See above for a justification of the rating
Project Output 1. Climate risk information is developed, monitored and integrated into policies, regulations and institutions to	1.1 # of hazard risk maps and information developed and adopted/	Coarse resolution UNDP indicative national hazard maps for 4 major	4	4 sets of national hazard maps covering all of Timor-Leste for floods, landslide,	4 hazards maps covered all Timor-Leste territory	S	The project developed a GIS system, through which maps for 9 different hazards can be created. The contractor has just delivered required outputs. As a result, the utilisation of this system has not commenced at this time.

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 2nd APR[4]	Mid-term target	Final target	Interim level / assessment & rating[5]	Justification
inform climate resilient small-scale rural infrastructure planning and management	embedded into sectoral policies and legislations	hydromet hazards		erosion and drought			
Project output 2: Climate risk reduction and climate-proofing measures for small scale rural infrastructure are implemented to build the resilience of vulnerable communities in six priority districts	2.1 # of infrastructure units built to new climate resilient standards	13 units per year non-climate proofed infrastructure in each of the 6 target municipalities	31	31 climate resilient infrastructure units (20 roads; 11 water supply units;)	130 climate resilient infrastructure units (38 water supply units, 25 Irrigation systems, 20 flood protection units. 47 Rural roads)	U	This indicator is also included at impact level. See above for a justification of the rating
	2.2 # Hectares of agroforestry implemented in target infrastructure catchments	Deforestation rate of 1.83% per year	0	75 hectares	300 hectares	MU	57.16 hectares have been planted, for contracts that cover 189 hectares (the remaining part will be planted during the next rainy season). Survival rate is not expected to be extremely high since part of the seedlings was planted after the rainy season.

At the time of this interim evaluation, the primary products of Output 1 have recently been delivered or are still in the process of implementation, and thus have not yet been integrated into the operations of government personnel and institutions. Additionally, the achievements related to infrastructure development remain considerably distant from the targets. Consequently, there is currently no concrete evidence suggesting the establishment of a "Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development" (as defined in Outcome 1), or of "Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risk" (as defifined in Outcome 2).

Remaining barriers hindering the achievement of project outcomes include the actual institutionalisation of the tools developed by the project for infrastructure planning, including the utilization of new guidelines for infrastructure development, which the project is yet to deliver.

As per the ToR, this section also evaluates the effect of COVID-19 on the project. The government-imposed restrictions following the outbreak of COVID-19 were significant contextual circumstances contributing to delays in 2020 and 2021. These delays encompassed various project activities, including the postponement of training sessions, setbacks in activities such as technical assessments for infrastructure design preparation, delays in the pre-qualification of local contracting companies, and the implementation of catchment management and rehabilitation interventions. Furthermore, the mobilisation of experts for vulnerability mapping was also adversely affected. Aside from impeding project activities, COVID-19 notably impacted increased shipment costs for procured IT infrastructure from abroad.

4.4 Efficiency, project implementation and adaptive management

Project governance

Most important decisions are made by the project board (PB), which has met five times since the project started. The PB approves the project workplans and budget. So far, the PB has been co-chaired by the SSE (as the project IP) and by the UNDP Resident Representative. An analysis of the minutes of the PB meetings and interviews with the PB members reveals that PB meetings were actively participated in by ministers or their delegates and that, overall, the PB has proven to be an effective governance mechanism to engage high-level ministerial commitment.

Relevant ministers have regularly participated in the PB meetings. These include the Minister of State Administration, the Minister of Public Works, and the Secretary of State for Civil Protection. Other participants include the President of the Civil Protection Authority (CPA), the Director General of Forestry from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fishery (MAF) and the Director-General of Multilateral and Regional Affairs from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Project management

The SSE was reported to have a crucial role in mobilizing ministers. Under the SSE a national project director was appointed. The FP specifies that the national project director, serving as the focal point for the IP for management aspects, is responsible for the overall project direction and strategic guidance. However, interviews revealed that the national project director did not play an active role in day-to-day management. As a consequence, the mobilisation of relevant government parties was left to UNDP.

The project is implemented through UNDP's national implementation modality (NIM) with Country Office Support. The national implementing partner (i.e., the SSE) is supposed to implement the project in compliance with UNDP rules and regulations, policies and procedures, including NIM guidelines. The MSA handles the

procurement of local construction companies, while UNDP is responsible for making payments. In practice, GCF financial resources are entirely managed by UNDP.

Inadequate management capacities in the UNDP project management unit (PMU) during the first two and half years of the project were the cause of significant delays, along with a lack of previous experience with GCF funding in the UNDP CO. A limited understanding of the GCF contractual requirements for disbursement conditions for the disbursement in the 2nd tranche by the GCF. Indeed, as per the legal agreement between the GCF and UNDP, tranches following the first are disbursed when at least 70% of accumulated previous disbursements are spent. However, the initial understanding from UNDP was that committed financial resources (as outlined in contracts) could be considered to reach the 70% threshold when, as per legal agreements, only actual expenditures should be counted. UNDP initially requested disbursement in February 2022. Extended discussions between UNDP and the GCF took place since the project could not reach the 70% threshold without counting committed resources. The issue was eventually resolved through a FAA waiver and the actual disbursement took place in the first days of June. The disbursement of the 3rd tranche was much smoother, with no issues reported.

Due to the limited progress of the project, during the 3rd year of the project implementation UNDP took corrective actions by changing project management.

Another main reason for delays was the social and environmental safeguards (SES) requirements set by the GCF for infrastructure. The project is supposed to develop environmental and social impact assessments (ESIA) and environmental and social management plans (ESMP) for implemented infrastructure, which need to be approved by the GCF on top of the social and environmental assessment submitted to the national government agency in charge of environmental licensing (named Autoridade Nacional de Licenciamento Ambiental). Complying with GCF SES requirements proved to be a very challenging task for the project team, with continuous requests for amendments and clarifications by the GCF Secretariat. This was also because the project initially decided to develop one ESIA and ESMP for each individual infrastructure. In order to develop the needed ESIA/ESMP, the project made use of two international consultants. However, this solution did not expedite the process since many aspects had to be clarified by in-country knowledge. It should be noted that the infrastructure developed by the project are small-scale interventions, with minimal negative impacts on the environment or on people. Clearly, preparing one ESIA/ESMP for each of the 130 infrastructure schemes (as initially requested by the GCF) would require an excessive workload, which is hardly justifiable given the small-scale of the planned infrastructures. For the schemes to be developed by the government, the regular governmental procedure for environmental licensing were used. For the schemes to be developed by UNDP (with GCF financial resources) the PMU has now developed one single ESIA/ESMP for each category of infrastructure (roads, irrigation schemes, and water supply systems), instead of preparing an ESIA/ESMP for each infrastructure. The three ESIA/ESMP have been submitted to the GCF for approval. Further clarifications have been requested through different rounds of comments from the GCF. As of this interim evaluation, the three ESIA/ESMPs have not yet been approved. Many of the comments provided by the GCF are simple requests for clarification. As evaluators, it is hard to understand why simple requests for clarifications and recommendations have stalled the approval process for very small infrastructure projects with minimal expected environmental and social impacts.

Work planning

The project has experienced significant delays. For Outcome 1, according to the implementation plan included in the FAA, the maps developed through the MHVRA were supposed to be delivered during the first quarter of 2021, while the MHVRA was delivered more than two years later. The damage and loss data collection tool (TERS) was supposed to be delivered during the first half of 2021 and, at the time of this evaluation (more than 2.5 years later), has not yet been delivered. The work on ordinances, regulations and guidelines on infrastructure was supposed to be delivered during the first half of 2021, but it just started when this evaluation took place. Also,

for Outcome 2 a comparison of the original implementation plan included in the FAA with the actual delivery time reveals important delays: the implementation of infrastructure was supposed to start in 2021, while it started one year later and only a minor part of the area to be planted with agroforestry seedlings has been planted (57.16 hectares against a mid-term target of 75 hectares).

Delays stemmed from a combination of internal factors and contextual circumstances. Internal reasons included, in addition to the management issues described above, the timing for the implementation of infrastructure works, the timing for planting seedlings and the limited number of engineers in the PMU. During the rainy season (which typically occurs from December to April) rains are so intense that contracted construction companies had to interrupt construction works. Seedlings have to be planted during the rainy season. Contracts with the two consortia of NGOs for catchment management and rehabilitation were signed relatively late with respect to the planting period, so planting activities had to be stopped soon and rescheduled for the next rainy season. The project PMU includes one international engineer and three national engineers. Given the high number of infrastructure projects to be designed and supervised, the number of engineers was reported to be inadequate. This is also because, for a long period of time, health problems prevented the active participation of the international engineer (a new international engineer recently joined the PMU). COVID-19 was the main contextual cause of delays during 2020 and 2021 (further details reported above).

Corrective measures were taken to speed up the implementation of the project. The project management was changed. Also, the project recruited a new international engineer and is now considering the recruitment of one additional national engineer. Activities have been rescheduled, and despite accumulated delays, the PMU is convinced that all products will be delivered by the end of the project.

Financing and co-financing

The project uses UNDP financial management procedures and appropriate financial control systems are in place.

Excluding one-week training for NGOs and community-based organisations with 117 participants, resources have been properly managed. The mentioned training was intended to train potential NGOs that had submitted expressions of interest to participate in the catchment management and rehabilitation activities. It was only after the training was conducted that the necessity for a competitive procedure (as per contractual requirements agreed with the GCF) was understood and that a simple Letter of Agreement with NGOs could not be used.

The ET had access to financial records from the start of the project up to the end of July 2023 (see Table 6), which accounts for 57% of the project life. , which accounts for 57% of the project's duration. During this period, the project expended 24% of the GCF-funded budget. This considerable variance can be attributed to the fact that the largest allocation of the budget is reserved for the implementation of infrastructure works, which initially involves engineering design and other preliminary activities that are softer and less costly (e.g., community consultations). However, this substantial difference indicates that the project is underspending, a consequence of the aforementioned accumulated delays. As depicted in Table 6 , the lowest level of budget execution was under Output 2, which encompasses the infrastructure works and support for catchment management.

Table 6: Expenditures by activities

Activity / Output	Project budget	Total expenditures	Perc of exp. over total budget
1.1 Develop and deliver climate risk information services and vulnerability mapping to all sectoral institutions	1,883,515	1,488,902	79.0%
1.2 Establish a database system for monitoring, recording and accounting climate induced damages in order to inform climate risk reduction planning and budgeting	790,511	809,287	102.4%
1.3 Refine ordinances, regulations and associated codes and standards to enable climate proofing small-scale rural infrastructure	573,234	204,506	35.7%

Output 1	3,247,260	2,502,695	77.1%
2.1 Climate risk reduction measures for small-scale rural infrastructure are fully integrated into the planning and budgeting cycles of Village and Municipal development plans	1,186,049	262,671	22.1%
2.2 Implementation of climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructure	14,128,803	1,606,233	11.4%
2.3 Supporting catchment management and rehabilitation measures to enhance climate resilient infrastructure and communities	3,129,732	585,308	18.7%
Output 2	18,444,584	2,454,212	13.3%
Project Management (GCF funds)	664,961	329,851	49.6%
Total GCF funds	22,356,805	5,286,758	23.6%
Project Management (UNDP funds)	400,000	263,257	65.8%
Total GCF + UNDP	22,756,805	5,550,015	24.4%

Source: project financial system data

The GCF disbursed three tranches to the project so far. For the second disbursement, the project experienced significant delays (a timeline is reported above along with reasons for delays). Notably, during that period, the UNDP CO covered the project's running costs (mainly salaries) and payments that could not be postponed to compensate for the lack of project funds.

In-kind co-financing has been made available to the project by relevant ministries. Details are reported in Annex VI. As of 31 December 2022, the total co-financing provided by the government (all in-kind) was US$ 8,306,727.08, while the co-financing provided by UNDP was US$ 237,744.70. Co-finance conditions and co-covenants (as specified in the FAA) have been fulfilled. However, the use of government co-financing resources has not always been strategic in achieving the project outcomes. An analysis of co-financing letters provided by the government reveals that while the MSA has provided resources to build or maintain infrastructures included in the project's targeted 130 infrastructures, the MAF has provided co-financing for nurseries that the project has not utilized and for planting seedlings in areas that have not been coordinated with the project. Additionally, a significant portion of the co-financing resources provided by SSCP were for the food and non-food items needed for the emergency response that followed floods in 2021 and 2022. This is only partially related to the capacity-building activities that the project promotes to improve the preparedness of the SSCP.

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

The project is synergistic with another GCF-funded intervention (FP171) implemented by UNEP and the SSE. This UNEP-implemented project aims to improve the early warning capacity (EW) systems for hydro-meteorological hazards. The linkage between this UNDP-implemented project and the UNEP project is clearly stated in the FP of the UNEP project. Indeed, the UNEP project intends to use the MHVRA to further develop the EW systems of the country. Also, the data collected by the UNEP project (mainly sourced locally) is supposed to improve the MHVRA database, which is currently mainly based on global data sources.

The UNDP project team is also promoting the use of the MHVRA with other donors and projects focused on infrastructure development. This is the case with the "Partnership to Strengthen Village Development and Municipal Administration" project funded by the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFAT) of the Australian Government.

The integration of project activities with government policies and programmes is still very limited. The ET found no evidence of coordination with MAF for the selection of planting sites. The planned project activity on the

development of guidelines, ordinances, and regulations has just delivered three guidelines at the time of this interim evaluation, which are used by the project team. However, the project is still to develop relevant SOPs and promote actions to institutionalize the use of the developed guidelines.

Project level monitoring and evaluation systems

A monitoring system has been set up to monitor activities funded by the GCF. Activities funded by government co-financing are not monitored by the project.

A reference manual explaining how each indicator needs to be informed has not been developed. So, indicators are informed on the basis of the instructions provided by the project manager. No specific quality assurance mechanisms (e.g., ISO or other accredited systems) are used.

As mentioned above, baseline figures have not been updated with respect to figures included in the FP.

While the project is properly monitoring activities, the actual use of the delivered products by government trained staff is not adequately monitored. More precisely, while the project is collecting data on the number of staff trained, no survey has been organised to assess to what extent the new knowledge acquired is actually used (as the definition of the relevant indicator suggests).

The project budget includes provisions for the employment of engineers, who are in charge of monitoring and supervising works. The project currently employs four engineers (three national and one international expert), who participate in the design and supervision of works. Given the high number of infrastructures, this number is considered inadequate for a proper monitoring and supervision of works. Given the current low number of project engineers, instructions to company supervisors regarding the implementation of work (or rectification of work already completed) are provided with insufficient frequency. This is a cause of works delays.

While monitoring and supervision of works is understaffed, adequate resources have been budgeted for the planned evaluations.

The project issues a factsheet on an annual basis with main achievement. The factsheet makes reference to project alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) # 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15. In principle, the data and information provided by the project can potentially serve as a valuable resource for relevant statistical authorities in reporting SDG indicators.

Stakeholder engagements

The SSE has shown an active role. However, following the parliamentary elections that took place in May 2023 and the establishment of a new government, the SSE was abolished. Its mandate and functions have been absorbed by the Minister of Tourism and Environment. UNDP had just met the new minister when this evaluation took place. So, at this stage it is still too early to assess the engagement of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment.

Overall, the project has managed to develop the necessary and appropriate partnerships with all needed stakeholders, mainly government ministries and agencies. Relevant ministers and high-level ministry directors have been properly engaged through the PB.

In terms of operational coordination, the MSA and SSCP have been adequately involved. Indeed, a large part of trained engineers is part of MSA staff. Additionally, the MSA conducts procurement activities for the works to be implemented. SSCP has actively participated as the recipient of products delivered under Outcome 1. MAF

involvement was limited to meetings in the project board. Coordination with MAF has been very limited for field activities implementation since MAF's co-funding is not used to plant seedlings around infrastructure implemented by the project.

Engineers from municipalities have been designated for each infrastructure project to supervise works. And the PMU is promoting joint monitoring visits to developed infrastructures. However, interviewed contractors reported minimal or no supervision from municipality engineers. Also, the PMU provided municipalities with the option to cover the cost of fuel for engineers' work supervision. This was in response to the frequently reported issue of municipalities struggling with insufficient fuel and mobilization resources, which hindered their ability to transfer engineers to works locations. However, the project received a minimal number of requests for reimbursement. So, the level of engagement of municipality engineers remains unclear.

Community consultations are extensively conducted as part of the feasibility study of infrastructure. In addition, communities are involved during the construction phase, as construction companies are required to employ individuals from beneficiary communities.

Grievance mechanisms are in place for each village (suco) where the project is implemented.

Social and environmental standards

Environmental permits have been issued by the relevant government authority, named Autoridade Nacional de Licenciamento Ambiental (ANLA) for all implemented infrastructure. Specifically, by the end of 2022, ANLA licences were issued for 14 infrastructures.[6]

One ESIA and ESMP was approved by the GCF for one road. Due to the small scale of planned infrastructure and the fact that planned infrastructures share very similar characteristics, instead of developing one ESIA/ESMP for each of the remaining 65 infrastructure projects, the PMU submitted three main ESIA/ESMP for three main categories of infrastructure (roads, water supply systems and irrigation systems). The GCF has provided different rounds of comments and requests for clarifications. At the time of this evaluation, the three ESIA/ESMP have not yet been approved.

The ESIA study aimed to identify risks and impacts, while the ESMP was developed with mitigative and associated management measures in compliance with UNDP SES policy. Management of the environmental and social risks and impacts arising from the project also aligns with the recommendations, requirements, and procedures set forth in the Environmental and Social Management Framework, which was provided to the GCF as part of the approved FP package.

The ET reviewed the ESIA/ESMP of the three categories of sub-projects. It is the opinion of the ET that the risks reported in the ESIA/ESMP for the three categories of sub-projects have been properly identified and no further revisions are needed.

However, during field observations, the ET observed a very limited use of personal protective equipment (PPE) by construction workers. Additionally, in one agroforestry site, the ET observed that plastic litter resulting from polybags used for seedlings has been abandoned on the site without proper management.

Reporting and communications

[6] Five licences for rural roads issued in 2021. In 2022 four permits were issued for rural roads and four permits for irrigation projects.

The ET had access to the minutes of the PB meetings. All management changes were reported and shared with the PB.

The APRs are informative and correctly reflect the project's conducted activities. However, the table on the progress update at the project level indicators includes confusing figures for the baseline and the current value for Indicator 2.1 (# of infrastructure units built to new climate resilient standards)[7] since the baseline and the current value are not comparable (see Table 4).

In addition to APR, monthly reports have been developed and shared with the National Designated Authority (NDA).

The PB meetings serve as the primary forum to share important communication with the project responsible parties. Communication with the NDA mainly occurs through monthly reports and ad-hoc meetings.

Communication at the community level is facilitated through consultations and direct interactions with village authorities. Extensive consultations have been conducted at the village level before a project is implemented. These consultations are duly reported by the project team. Interviewed beneficiaries reported satisfaction was reported by interviewed beneficiaries regarding consultations and information received.

The only established mechanism for external communication is a factsheet that the project develops on an annual basis. Additionally, the UNDP website includes project information. However, the information provided is incorrect[8] and not up-to-date.[9]

4.5 Sustainability

As requested in the ToR, a detailed assessment of project risks is included in this section along with considerations of four main categories of risks.

The FP and the FAA include seven selected risk factors in a dedicated section (i.e., Section G.2). These risk factors are all relevant. A different set of risks is included in the ToC diagram featured in the FP. This second set of risks is more comprehensive than the risks included in Section G.2 and includes serious risks that have already materialized. For instance, staff turnover among trained government officers (interviews with municipality officers revealed that at least two trained PDIM engineers in one target municipality have already resigned) or lack of cooperation among government institutions on implementation (there has not been a real operational collaboration with MAF to plant seedlings around the selected 130 infrastructures). Another important risk not included in the relevant section of the FP is the government's inability to secure adequate maintenance resources for the 130 infrastructure units.

In the opinion of the ET, among the seven risks included in the dedicated section of the FP, five have been correctly rated, while the rating of two risks has not been assigned properly. Indeed, the risk that project-implemented infrastructure is destroyed by catastrophic hazardous events was rated as low in the FP. Given the increasing frequency of floods and that only the steepest sections of roads are paved, it is likely that the current rating is overly optimistic. In this regard, one of the deliverables developed by the international consultant in

[7] Both the baseline and the current value included in the report is 13. More precisely, the baseline figure reports "13 per year non-climate proofed infrastructure in each of the six target municipalities", while the current figure, as per indicator definition, should reflect the number of climate units built to new standards. The latter is not 13 (as reported in the APR) since, at the end of 2022, the project had not yet completed infrastructure with GCF-funding, while the number of infrastructures completed with government co-funding was 8.

[8] As major project achievements the website lists planned products, which have not yet been delivered.

[9] It includes a link to the 2021 factsheet only

charge of reviewing guidelines and regulations for rural infrastructure mentions that it is appropriate to use non-erodible surfaces on gentler gradients and in areas of less rainfall than is currently required in design standards.

Additionally, the risk that agroforestry is implemented on land used primarily for agriculture is rated low. During an observation conducted by the ET, it was evident that seedlings were planted in an area currently used for pasture. In this area, seedlings were not protected, resulting in visible instances of dead seedlings. In hindsight, this risk should have been evaluated as higher than the "low" rating initially assigned.

Financial risks to sustainability

The government's approval of a decree law allocating state budget funds for road maintenance is a positive sign for financial sustainability. Nevertheless, road maintenance has historically posed challenges in Timor-Leste. Consequently, there remains a risk that the GCF-supported roads may not be given the necessary priority.

Following the parliamentary elections in May 2023, a change occurred in the government. UNDP met with the new relevant minister once. Operational and co-financing aspects have not been discussed yet. Given that the co-financing to be provided by the government is very high for this project (US$ 36.69 million against US$ 22.36 million provided by the GCF) the availability of co-financing resources should not be taken for granted.

Socio-economic risks to sustainability

Government buy-in is crucial for the project's long-term success. Although there was robust government support before the recent parliamentary elections, it's uncertain how the new relevant ministries will engage with the project.

Road development and maintenance typically hold a significant place on any government in Timor-Leste's agenda. Moreover, the current government program prioritizes infrastructure improvement as a key focus area.

Institutional framework and governance

The legal framework and policies do not pose any risks to the sustainability of the project. However, there are still some concerns related to government staff retention, limited ICT capacity, and reduced coordination among government services. Due to the low salary levels of government employees and the overall high turnover among government staff, there is a risk that trained government personnel may not be retained.

To avoid challenges caused by limited internet connectivity the project recently begun sharing off- line access to MHVRA database with municipalities.

The lack of coordination between infrastructure design services and the planting of seedlings distributed by MAF has already materialized as a significant risk.

There are two potential institutions responsible for the operation and maintenance (O&M) of potable water supply systems: the national public utility (named Bee Timor-Leste) and the Municipal Service for Water, Sanitation, and Environment (SMASA). Responsibility for the O&M of the water system developed by the project has not been clarified yet. Nonetheless, the project is actively promoting coordination with SMASA for joint planning of the water supply systems to be implemented in 2024.

Environmental risks to sustainability

Among the various investments funded by the project, road development constitutes the largest allocation of GCF financial resources. Despite adhering to government road design standards, implementing bioengineering conservation techniques, and planting perennial trees above developed infrastructure to mitigate erosion and

flood risks, the project still faces the risk of road damage from heavy rains and floods. The project utilized gravel and unlined drains for areas with low gradients, while concrete and lined drains were used in regions with steeper gradients. A 10% threshold was applied to differentiate between these terrains, although this threshold was adjusted based on the typical annual rainfall in the specific implementation area. Such an approach aligns with the specifications of the Rural Roads Master Plan, but it might not offer the most durable technical solution in a country prone to frequent heavy rains and floods.

The ET had access to the list of contract values for 16 infrastructure construction units, including 10 roads. The cost of infrastructure rehabilitation or construction by the project was determined at the design stage. The actual unit cost per kilometer (Km) of rehabilitated road varies from US$ 32,336 to US$ 203,211, with an average value of US$ 91,063 per Km. Out of the 10 roads considered, only two exceed the minimum indicative cost of US$ 115,000 specified in the Timor-Leste Rural Roads Master Plan.[10] Despite the road design conforming to government specifications, the discrepancy in unit costs between the project's rehabilitated roads and indicative unit costs may suggest that the provided design might not be the most resistant to heavy rain. Notably, only the steepest sections of roads have been paved.

4.6 Country ownership

The project is well aligned with Timor-Leste's NDC 2022-2030, the Climate Change policy approved in 2022, the NAP submitted to UNFCCC in 2021, the DRM Policy, and the SDP for 2011-2030 (further details provided in Section 4.1).

Country ownership is evident through the active participation of ministers and directors-general in the PB meetings. However, the recent abolition of the SSE raises concerns about future institutional leadership from the government's side.

Overall, satisfaction was reported by all interviewed stakeholders. However, a common concern raised was the slow progress of the project in infrastructure implementation (refer to Section 4.4).

The SSCP expressed satisfaction with the support provided. Capacity-building initiatives were organized for SSCP personnel. Additionally, the project provided the SSCP with SDI and the MHVRA, and is in the process of finalising the loss and damage data collection tools (TERS). Although the SSCP is considered the relevant institution to own the TERS, the ET believes that the SSCP might not be optimally positioned to exploit the full potential of the MHVRA. The MHVRA appears to be more suited for urban and land use planning than as a support system for hazard anticipation and preparation. Discussions are ongoing with the SSP to potentially host the MHRVA on a different server, enabling more stakeholders to access it while keeping the SSCP as the reference agency for the MHVRA.

At the local level, interviewed municipality administrators, and suco and aldeias leaders reported satisfaction and proper involvement. However, there remains uncertainty about the ownership of municipalities' engineers in the design and supervision of works (refer to the section on stakeholder engagement).

The project contracted two different NGO consortia for the catchment management and rehabilitation component. These NGOs are utilizing different incentive systems to encourage both the planting and ongoing care of seedlings. Specifically, one NGO has committed to providing a payment of US$ 0.50 for each surviving

[10] The unit cost rates for rehabilitation included in the master plan are the following: US$ 125,000 in flat terrains, US$ 165,000 in rolling terrains and US$ 220,000 in mountain terrains

seedling, while the other has not made such a commitment. These different approaches are likely to yield varying results that warrant comparison.

4.6 Innovativeness in results areas

The project design includes the deployment of different approaches and products that are innovative in the context of Timor-Leste. The integrated use of bioengineering techniques, agroforestry and engineering designs for rural infrastructure is certainly a new way of developing infrastructure in Timor-Leste.

The use of a GIS-based multi-hazard vulnerability assessment tool to plan the location of infrastructure and land use is another innovative potential element. However, so far, the MHVRA has not been used in this way (this is also because the MHVRA has just been delivered).

The dedicated loss and damage data collection tool that the project is developing is also innovative since it intends to replace more generic tools used by NGOs and government agencies. Despite the tool not being finalized yet it is raising expectations among government authorities. Indeed, the ET was reported that the government plans to present it at the next Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC.

4.7 Unexpected results

The project caused no positive or negative unexpected results.

4.8 Replication and scalability

The overall project rationale hinges upon the replication potential of the interventions proposed. Given the limited progress of the project interventions under Output 2 and the fact that the products under Output 1 have just been delivered or are still in the process of being delivered, it is too early to observe indications of replications and scaling of the project interventions.

At this stage, only considerations on the potential scalability and replication can be provided. For Output 1, the project has started sharing the MHRVA dataset for offline use with municipalities where ICT equipment has been provided by another UNDP-implemented project (funded by the EU). This is supposed to overcome constraints caused by limited internet connectivity in municipalities. However, the limited skills in GIS and poor internet connectivity at the municipality level will likely be a barrier for the widespread adoption of the MHVRA for climate-resilient infrastructure design and the promotion of land use changes to prevent soil erosion or floods. A key informant (in Bacau) even requested a printed version of maps due to the perceived inadequacy of ICT capabilities. Therefore, a key factor to pay attention to during the remaining project's lifespan is the development of proper GIS skills in target municipalities.

Overall, government buy-in will be pivotal for expanding the project's promoted approaches and methodologies, as well as for advocating among the donors' community the utilization of supported planning tools, such as MHVRA, and data collection tools for loss and damages, such as TERS. This is because Timor-Leste is largely dependent on donors' support for investment in rural infrastructure.

4.9 Gender equity

All interviewed women reported satisfaction regarding the potential benefits of the implemented infrastructure. Specifically, rural roads are expected to enhance access to markets, enabling the purchase of essential daily items

and the sale of agricultural products. Additionally, water supply systems are anticipated to alleviate the burden on women and children, who previously had to fetch water daily.

An analysis of the number of inhabitants per suco shows that in the 12 sucos where the project has completed infrastructure works women represent 65% of the total inhabitants.

Construction companies are requested to employ people from the communities where works are conducted. Collected data show that women's participation was minimal in construction works. This is understandable since construction works are heavy jobs and are typically done by men. The PMU has made use of sex-disaggregated data to actively promote more women's participation in infrastructure works for needed land clearing operations (manually). Although women's participation has remained low, interviews with contractors revealed that some construction companies managed to increase the number of women working in infrastructure development by including them in other needed non-heavy tasks, in addition to manual land clearing of the construction site.

The project staff and contractors' managers and supervisors have been trained in the prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation.

A gender action plan (GAP) was annexed to the FP submission package. Ongoing monitoring of the GAP's implementation progress is conducted, and the Annual Performance Report (APR) features a dedicated section that outlines the advancements made in relation to the GAP's indicators.

A GAP and an Indigenous People's Plan were prepared and included in the ESIA/ESMP for rural roads, irrigation systems and water supply systems.

As per ANLA guidelines, the prevailing social, environmental, and gender-related issues, along with the associated risks and their potential impacts, were identified through a comprehensive process of consultation and assessment. Relevant measures for mitigation were also proposed.

While for the socio-economic survey of the Local Vulnerability and Risk Assessment the project managed to include a relatively high number of women (36% from more than 2,000 respondents), the participation of women has been quite low in consultative workshops (15%) and in training programmes (10-15%). The 30% target set in the GAP for women participation in training was probably too ambitious. This is because training was mainly organised for government officers, who are generally men. The project has made deliberate efforts to involve more women in training sessions by asking relevant government offices to nominate women to participate in training courses. In this regard, the project monitoring data show a slight increase in the number of trained women (the current level of women's participation in training is 18%, while the 2022 APR report 10-15%).

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Conclusion 1 (C1):

The project is relevant to the country's priorities and needs. It is also in line with the country policy framework. However, choosing the 130 infrastructure projects at the design stage is questionable since it limits the needed flexibility during implementation to adapt to changing conditions and potentially leverage project planning tools effectively.

The vertical intervention logic is robust and coherent since activities, outputs and outcomes are logically linked. The indicators of the logical framework were coherent with the old GCF PFM but are no longer in line with the new GCF IPMF. Additionally, some of the current indicators are not properly relevant and measurable and baseline figures have not been updated at the inception stage (see Table 4 in the main report for a detailed assessment of each indicator).

Conclusion 2 (C2):

Despite substantial delays, the project is gradually delivering what it is supposed to deliver. However, it's important to note that some of the products under Outcome 1 have recently been delivered (such as MHVRA and SDI), while others are still in the process of being delivered (TERS and the review of ordinances, regulations, and guidelines). Progress in infrastructure development remains limited. Given these circumstances, it is still too early to detect tangible signs of a "strengthened institutional and regulatory system for climate-responsive planning and development" (to recall the definition of Outcome 1) or of a "Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce exposure to climate change" (to recall the definition of Outcome 2).

In principle, the project can contribute to positive changes towards areas covered by the GCF six investment criteria.[11] However, considering that the project is still far from achieving its end-of-project targets, it has yet to demonstrate concrete changes in its capacity to contribute effectively to the GCF investment criteria.

Conclusion 3 (C3):

While government ministries have been adequately and strategically engaged at the national level (with the key support of SSE), operational management support has been lacking from the government side. Also, the lack of an active project director has implied that the mobilisation of relevant government parties and agencies was left to UNDP.

At the local level, there has been active involvement from municipality heads, suco leaders, and village leaderships. The participation of technical services at the municipality level (engineering and forestry) has been

[11] These are: 1) impact potential for adaptation, 2) paradigm shift potential to contribute to an enabling environment, to the regulatory framework and policy and to the climate resilient development pathways consistent with the country's climate change adaptation strategies and plans, 3) sustainable development potential for economic and environmental co-benefits or gender sensitive development impacts, 4) needs of the recipient in terms of strengthening institutions and implementation capacity and vulnerability of the country, 5) country ownership in terms of coherence and the existing policies and existence of a national climate change strategy, and 6) effectiveness and efficiency in terms of the amount of co-financing and cost-effectiveness.

actively promoted, but the level of engagement of local technical services remains unclear to the ET. Additionally, the MAF co-financing was not used in a strategic way to complement interventions building resilience for rural infrastructure.

Inadequate capacities of senior management of the PMU during the first two and a half years of project implementation caused significant delays and a consequent questionable quality of UNDP support in that period. However, adaptive capacity has been demonstrated by UNDP by taking the needed management restructuring decisions.

Implementation has now taken a proper pace. However, given the expected planned increase in infrastructure development, with the current number of project staff engineers, there is a serious risk of inadequate supervision for infrastructure schemes development.

Conclusion 4 (C4):

Given the limited project progress, it is still too early to assess sustainability prospects. Securing government buy-in will be paramount for ensuring sustainability, particularly regarding government allocations for infrastructure maintenance and the institutional adoption of the tools provided by the project. A critical factor is the potential turnover of government technical staff, which could significantly impact the project's long-term sustainability.

The lack of clear delineations of responsibilities for the operations and maintenance (O&M) of water supply systems may easily hinder the needed O&M once water infrastructures are delivered to communities.

The SSCP is certainly well-positioned to use the loss and damage data collected by tools that the project is developing. Also, the project is making efforts to enlarge the use of the MHVRA beyond the SSCP. However, the potential for widespread use of the MHVRS GIS is limited if it is owned only by the SSCP. In this regard, building needed GIS skills and ensuring that ICT capacity at the municipality level is available will be essential to ensure that delivered planning tools are effectively used to plan climate resilient infrastructure and land use.

Conclusion 5 (C5):

The project is benefitting women adequately. Necessary measures have been taken to promote active participation by women. However, due to the higher representation of men in government staff and civil works, the project is currently offering more work and learning opportunities to men than to women. Addressing gender disparities in these areas remains a crucial aspect of promoting gender equality and inclusivity within the project.

Conclusions 6 (C6):

Ownership has been clearly demonstrated from the government side. However, the recent change in government and the abolishment of the SSE has generated uncertainty regarding the future government leadership of the project.

At the local level, ownership has been promoted by engaging municipalities, sucos and aldeias authorities.

The NGOs contracted by the project used different approaches to incentivize planting and caring for seedlings in selected areas. This may potentially offer learning opportunities since different incentives will likely give rise to different survival rates for seedlings.

Conclusions 7 (C7):

Overall, the project is properly managing social and environmental safeguards. Risks identified in ESIA/ESMP are valid. However, the actual use of PPE for workers of civil works is very limited. Additionally, the management of used polybags in agroforestry sites has not always been handled properly, which could exacerbate the existing challenges associated with plastic litter management in the designated areas.

Conclusion 8 (C8):

It is still too early to draw conclusions on the sustainability of the project. However, important sources of risks include future government financial allocations for the maintenance of rural infrastructure and the effects of heavy rains on erodible road surfaces.

5.2 Recommendations

Table 7: Recommendations

#	Linked to conclusion	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority	Timeframe
1	C3 & C4	Engage the new Minister of Tourism and Environment and request the appointment of a new national project director to support operational implementation aspects	UNDP and Ministry of Tourism and Environment	High	Immediately
2	C1	The detailed list of 130 infrastructures included in FAA should be interpreted with some degree of flexibility. Strict adherence to the list may restrict necessary adaptability during implementation, especially considering that 17 infrastructures were already implemented by the government before the project started. The project should consider discussing a formal change in the FAA with the GCF Secretariat to substitute the detailed list of 130 infrastructures with an updated list or setting targets formulated in terms of budget use, number of infrastructure or Km of roads to be rehabilitated without including a detailed list.	UNDP and project board	High	Before the next project board
3	C4	Actively promote the use of the MHVRA system with planning authorities at both municipal and national levels. This includes organizing GIS training sessions for the use of MHVRA at the municipal level, conducting a needs analysis for ICT equipment and	UNDP & MSA	High	During year 3, 4 and 5 of the project

#	Linked to conclusion	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority	Timeframe
		providing relevant ICT equipment to target municipalities where needed. A first opportunity to test the use of the MHVRA as a planning tool is to employ it to support discussions on the decision of the new 17 infrastructures that need to be replaced.			
4	C3	Improve coordination with MAF to ensure that MAF-financing is utilized for planting seedlings in areas identified by hazard maps and for safeguarding rehabilitated infrastructure.	UNDP, new national director and MAF	High	before the next planting season
5	C3 & C4	Increase supervision of infrastructure works by staffing the project team with additional engineers. The project should also organise more joint monitoring for infrastructure development and agroforestry sites with relevant government technical officers (i.e., engineers, foresters).	UNDP	Medium	As soon as possible
6	C5	Actively promote women's participation in infrastructure works and in training.	UNDP, MSA and MoPW	Medium	As soon as possible
7	C1	Review logframe indicators as per details suggested in Table 4.	UNDP and project board	Medium	Before the next project board
8	C8	Use any project savings to pave erodible road surfaces also in sections with gentler gradients.	UNDP	Medium	by the end of the project
9	C4	Clarify with relevant authorities whether O&M responsibilities for water supply infrastructure lie with the national water supply public utility (Bee Timor-Leste) or SMASA.	UNDP and Bee Timor-Leste	Medium	During year 3, 4 and 5
10	C6	Conduct a study to measure the different effects and impacts of the approaches used by contracted NGOs to promote planting and caring of seedlings.	UNDP	Low	By the end of the project
11	C7	Ensure that workers use PPE and that plastic needed for seedlings and other planting operations (such as polybags) is properly disposed of.	UNDP	Low	Immediately

5.3 Lessons learned

Lesson 1:

One main reason for the project delays was the limited understanding and capacities of the PMU on the GCF social and environmental safeguard (SES) requirements. Given the increasing importance that SES have for different donors and the growing role of the GCF in funding projects to UNDP in Timor-Leste, UNDP should consider establishing a permanent in-country capacity to address SES requirements, rather than opening project-based positions or contracting consultants.

Lesson 2:

The contractual conditions set in the Accreditation Master Agreement (AMA) and in the FAA were not initially understood by UNDP CO. Also, some contractual conditions proved to be particularly challenging for the project. This is for instance the case of the requirement whereby the project should reach at least 70% of actual expenditures (including for co-financing, which in this project is very high) rather than on contracted commitment (as for other donors). UNDP should conduct periodic reviews of the AMA and should take into account lessons learned from projects to negotiate contractual requirements of FAAs. Most importantly, UNDP should ensure that PMUs are well informed and fully understand all relevant contractual requirements.

Lesson 3:

The detailed list of infrastructure included in the FAA limits the needed flexibility for a project to accommodate needs and adapt to changing conditions with respect to the moment when the project was designed. In new project accredited entities and the GCF should consider establishing more generic targets (e.g., in terms of budget use or Km of roads) rather than detailing lengths and specifications of each planned infrastructure.

Annex I: Interim evaluation ToR

GCF FP109 Interim Evaluaton TOR.pdf

Annex II: Interim evaluation evaluative matrix

Evaluative questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project strategy: to what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Relevance - How well the project addresses country priorities? - To what extent is the project in line with the UNDP strategic plan, the UNDP country programme and SDGs? - How well the project addressed identified problems? Were assumptions correctly identified? This includes a review of the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the funding proposal. - Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation? - To what extent were perspectives of those who would be affected by the project taken into account at the design stage? How well were perspectives of those who could contribute information or other resources were taken into account during the project design process?	- Degree to which problems were properly analysed in the funding proposal and in the feasibility study - Degree to which consultations were properly conducted at the design stage	- Funding proposal and its annexes - UNDP staff - Beneficiaries	- Review of project documents - Interview with project staff - Interview with beneficiaries
Project design and theory of change (ToC) - To what extent are logframe indicators appropriate? - To what extent the results framework and monitoring practice capture beneficial development effects (i.e,. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.)? - How well the project indicators (gender-disaggregated) are also aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the GCF programming manual?	- Degree of coherence of the vertical intervention logic of the project (long term goal, objective, outcomes and outputs) - Evidence of adjustment of activities during the implementation due to newly available information on challenges or concerns - Credibility of stated risks and assumptions - Feasibility and credibility of the proposed outputs and outcomes -	- Funding proposal -Implementing partner and responsible parties - UNDP	- Review of project documents - Review of national policies or strategies - Review of websites - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - Focus group discussion with beneficiaries - Data analysis - Theory of change reconstruction
Results framework and lograme - To what extent are logframe indicators appropriate? This include a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets to	- Appropriateness of identified indicators and targets -	- Project documents - Project staff	- Review of project documents

Evaluative questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), with suggestions on specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary - To what extent the results framework and monitoring practice capture beneficial development effects (i.e., income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance, etc.)? - How well the project indicators (gender-disaggregated) are also aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the GCF programming manual?		- Project partners	- Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - Data analysis - Theory of change analysis
Effectiveness and Progress Towards Results: to what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
- How much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)? - To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved FP) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)? - To what extent has the total number of beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries been properly calculated? - Which are the remaining barriers to achieve the project objectives? - Which was the impact of COVID-19 on the project implementation and on results delivery? Were corrective measures properly taken? - How well does the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?	- Results framework indicators - Perceptions of stakeholders and evidences as to whether the project achieves its intended outcomes - Risk analysis - Assessment of the COVID 19 impact on project implementation	- Project documents - Project staff - Project partners - Project beneficiaries	- Review of project documents - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - Focus group discussion with beneficiaries - Data analysis - Theory of change analysis / reconstruction
Efficiency: has the project been implemented efficiently, cost- effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?			
Management arrangements - How effective has the overall effectiveness of project management been as outlined in the FAA/Funding proposal. Have changes been made and have these been approved by GCF? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Are the project’s	- Evidence of clear roles and responsibilities for operational and management structure - Degree of fulfilment of goals according to results framework	- Project documents - Project staff - Project partners	- Review of project documents - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners

Evaluative questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
governance mechanisms functioning efficiently? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? - Which has been the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s)? - Which has been the quality of support provided by UNDP?	- Stakeholder satisfaction with project staff: accessibility, capabilities & skills, expertise applicable knowledge, efficiency and timeliness	- Project beneficiaries (communities) - Financial reports - Audit report	- Focus group discussion with beneficiaries
Work planning - Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Are they supportive of the ToC and pathways identified? - Has the project encountered any delays in the project start-up or implementation? Which were the main causes? Were they resolved? - Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced properly to efficiently deliver the expected results? - To what extent has the project's results framework/ logframe been used as a management tool? This includes a review of any changes made to it since the project started.	- Evidence of the use of the results framework as management tool - Perceptions of stakeholders and evidences as to whether the project activities are on track - Extent of compliance with the expected work plan - Budget execution rate	- Project documents - Project staff - Project partners - Project beneficiaries (communities) -Financial reports - Audit report	- Review of project documents - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - Focus group discussion with beneficiaries - Analysis of financial reports and project execution rate
Financing and co-financing - To what extent were financial resources properly managed? - To what extent were budget revisions (if any) appropriate and relevant? - To what extent have project resources been utilised in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)? - Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds? - Which were the main factors that contributed to a low / high expenditure rate and impact on the project? - To what extent is co-financing used strategically to help the objectives of the project? This includes the use of a co-financing monitoring table, as well as, an analysis of materialised co-financing and implications for project scope and results and comments on co-financing, on the use of different financing	- Perceptions as to cost-effectiveness of programme - Level of execution of programme budget - Evidence of use of finance resources to make management decisions/adaptive management - Use of co-financial resources	- Project documents - Project staff - Project partners -Financial reports - Audit report	- Review of project documents - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - Analysis of financial reports and project execution rate

Evaluative questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
streams (parallel, leveraged, mobilised) as applicable and a discussion on weather co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, has been fulfilled, as applicable.			
Coherence with climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities - Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment? - Is there coherence and complementarity with other actors for other local climate change interventions? - To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts? - To what extent has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)?	- Extent to which the project complemented other synergic interventions - Coherence with other actors' interventions on climate change interventions	- project documents - Project staff - project partners - Other stakeholders	- Review of project documents - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - interview with other stakeholders
Project monitoring and evaluation system - To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results? - Are there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmarks for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how does the project apply adaptive management? - To what extent the monitoring tools being used provide necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive? - Does the project make use of quality assurance mechanisms (e.g., ISO standard, government accreditations, international certificates, etc.)? To what extent is their use conducive to a proper project monitoring and implementation?	- Evidence of use of M&E information to make management decisions/adaptive management, inform strategy and planning - Percentage of budget spent on M&E systems - Evidence of incorporation of gender issues in monitoring systems - Coherence of the M&E system with SDGs, NDC and national reporting system.	- Project documents - Project staff - Project partners - Monitoring system	- Review of project documents - ATLAS Project Management Module (project output indicator reporting) - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners

Evaluative questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
- Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems? - To what extent are resources sufficiently allocated to monitor and evaluate the project? Are these resources being allocated effectively?			
Stakeholder engagement - Project management: To what extent has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders? - Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation? - Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? - Is a gender aware grievance mechanism in place? If so, is it effective given the local context?	- Extent to which the implementation of the Project has been inclusive towards stakeholders and collaborative with partners - Stakeholder satisfaction with the level of their engagement in project decision making mechanism - Existence and use of grievance mechanisms	- Project documents - Project staff - Project partners - Project beneficiaries	- Review of project documents - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - Focus group discussion with beneficiaries
Social and environmental standards (safeguards) - To what extent are risks identified in the project's most current SESP/ESIA and ratings valid? Are any revisions needed?	- Extent to which SESP /ESIA ratings are still valid - Progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures	- Project documents - SEPS, ESMP	- Review of project documents - Interview with project staff
Reporting - To what extent have adaptive management changes been reported properly by the project management and shared with the Project Board? - To what extent have the project team partners undertaken and fulfilled GCF reporting requirements (i.e., how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable)? - How well lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented and shared with key partners and internalised by partners. - How efficient, timely and adequate have reporting requirements been?	- Extent to which lessons learnt have been communicated to project stakeholders - Evidence of use of reporting information to make management decisions/adaptive management, inform strategy and inform planning - Extent to which project GCF reporting requirements were fulfilled - Quality of reports	- Project documents - Project staff - Project partners	- Review of project documents - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners

Evaluative questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Communications - Internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results? - External project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public? Is there a web presence, for example? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?	- Project internal communication and feedback loops generating information useable in decision making - Extent to which the project information, (internal and external) is effectively managed and disseminated.	- Project documents - National policies and strategies - Project staff - Project partners - Project beneficiaries	- Review of project documents - Review of communication products - Interviews with project staff - Interviews with project partners - Focus group discussion with beneficiaries

Annex III: Mission itinerary

31 August 2023

- First meeting with Adeline Carrier (Deputy Resident Representative), Jehangir Khan (Project Manager), Domingos Lequi Siga (Head of Climate Change Unit, UNDP), and Honorina Sarmento in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Jehangir Khan (Project Manager, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Petronilo Muñez (Team Leader agroforestry, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Sher Hassan (Team Leader Infrastructure) and Juliana Rangel (GCF Engineer for Cluster A) in Dili municipality

01 September 2023

- Meeting with Herminio Anamias (Supervisor, Superior Lda) and Julio dos Santo Da Silva (Engineer, Superior Lda) in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça municipality
- Meeting with Abel Lobo da Costa (Local staff, Raebia) in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça municipality
- Group meeting with Saturlina dos Santos (Beneficiary / community member), Aleixo Soares (Construction worker), Mariano dos Santos (Contruction worker), and Martino Lopes (Construction worker) in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça municipality
- Field visit to Road rehabilitation in Kaigeremeta (L-RR-06) in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça municipality
- Field visit to agoreforestry site in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça municipality
- Meeting with José Pinto (Field Coordinator, UNDP) in Suco Lauhata, Liquiça municipality

02 September 2023

- Group meeting with Adelino G. Pereira (Chief of Suco), Carlos de Deus (Chief of Aldeia), Elias Gomes (Supervisor, Ermera Tuan. Unip Lda.), Jose Gomes (Farmer), Ernestina dos Reis (Farmer), Helena Amaral (Farmer), Adriva dos Reis (Farmer), Natalina Soares (Farmer), and Vergina M. Gomes (Farmer) in Suco Malabe, Ermera municipality
- Field visit to irrigation scheme in Malabe (E-IS-04) in Suco Malabe, Ermera municipality
- Group meeting with Fernando Soares (Chief of Suco Batumanu), Alarico Moniz (Chief of Aldeia Batumanu), Filipe Ponte Martins (Community, Suco Batumanu), Pedro Marcal (Supervisor, Hamutuk Hatutan, Unip. Lda), Felisberto Soares (National Policy Officer), Paul Monis (Staff, Hamutuk Hatutan, Unip. Lda), Faustino Rofince (Community, Suco Batueru), and Juli Monteiro (Chief of Aldeia Batueru) in Suco Batumanu, Ermera municipality
- Field visit to Road rehabilitation and construction of drain and culverts in Batumanu (E-RR-06) and agroforestry site in Suco Batumanu, Ermera municipality

04 September 2023

- Group meeting with Abilio do Rego Amaral (Chief of Suco) and Francisco Pinto (Chief of Aldeia Akadiru in Suco Tohumeta, Aileu municipality
- Group meeting with Laurinda Martins (Farmer), Eva da Conceicao (Farmer), Denciana Colo (Farmer), Amelia Fatima dos Santos (Farmer) Agrefina de Jesus (Farmer) in Suco Tohumeta, Aileu municipality
- Field visit to new road from Tohumeta to Akadiru (A-RR-12) in Suco Tohumeta, Aileu municipality
- Group meeting with Afonso Marques Henrique (Chief of Suco), Alcino de Fatima (Chief of Suco Manufoni), Adao Lizerio (Farmer), Delfina da Silva Aleixo (Youth representative), and Caisimira Granadeiro (farmer) in Suco Madabeno, Aileu municipality
- Field visit to new road from aldeia Manufoni to aldeia Lismori (A-RR-13) in Suco Madabeno, Aileu municipality

- Meeting with Domingos Mesquita (Chief of Suco) in Suco Lahae, Aileu municipality
- Meeting with Paulo Laka (Chief of Aldeia Eralolo) in Suco Lahae, Aileu municipality
- Field visit to road rehabilitation Lahae - Eralolo (A-RR-05) and agroforestry in Suco Lahae, Aileu municipality

05 September 2023

- Meeting with Leonel Bere (Field Coordinator, UNDP) in Aileu Villa, Aileu municipality
- Group meeting with Angelino da Neves (Chief of Department of Territorial Representative of Forestry in Aileu) and Francisco Jose Tilman (Technical staff) in Aileu Villa, Aileu municipality
- Meeting with Pedro G.D.S Marçal da Costa (President, NDA) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Ivo J. Dos Santo Cancio (Consultant for GCF and CDM, NDA) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Domingos Lequi Siga (Head of Climate Change and Environment Unit, UNDP Timor-Leste) in Dili municipality

06 September 2023

- Meeting with Liboria Fatima Savio (Admin and Finance Officer, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Rosito Guterres (General director for Rural Development, MSA) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Sergio Gaspar Borromeu in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Simon Done (Consultant, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Simanchal Pattnaik (CTA, UNEP) in Dili municipality
- Group meeting with Geraldo de Viana Soares (Chief of Suco), José da Costa Pereira (Community), João Viana (Community), and José de Araújo Morais (Community) in Suco Lavateri, Baucau Municipality
- Field visit to road rehabilitation Road rehabilitation from Suco Lavateri to Aldeia Onor Tibalari (B-RR-06) and agroforestry site in Suco Lavateri, Aileu municipality
- Meeting with Francisca Monica de Fatima Soares (Chief of Suco) in Suco Soba, Baucau Municipality

07 September 2023

- Meeting with Yasu Hiromi (Team leader, Nippon Kokei) in Dili municipality
- Group meeting with Mariano Ana Lopez (Deputy operations, SSCP), Nuno Romulado Gomez (National commander, SSCP), and Joao De Souza Felipe (Head of communication, SSCP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Ines Soares Pereira (Environmental officer, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Nidia Alves da Costa (Social Safeguard and Inclusion Officer, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Bernadette De Fonseca (Former Project Manager, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Olivio Freitas (President of Authority of Baucau Municipality, MSA) in Baucau municipality
- Meeting with Pascoal Afonso Belo (Chief of Department of Territorial Representative of Forestry, MAF) in Baucau municipality
- Meeting with Hermenegildo Rodrigues Fraga (Director of PDIM in Baucau Municipality) in Baucau municipality
- Meeting with Nelson Abilio Soares Nunes (Director of Disaster Risk Management of Baucau Municipality) in Baucau municipality
- Meeting with Sidalio Freitas (Chief of Suco) in Suco Bauro, Lautem Municipality
- Field visit to road rehabilitation from Bauro to Nanafoe (La-RR-04) in Suco Bauro, Lautem municipality

08 September 2023

- Meeting with Ernesto dos Santos (GIS officer, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Crissantos da Conceiçao (DRM officer, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Ismael da Costa Babo (President, SSCP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Abel Pires (Former Minister, MPW) in Dili municipality
- Group meeting with Justino Vila Nova (Executive Director of Prospect), Napoleão Martins (Field Coordinator from Prospect/Fraterna Consortium) and Antonio Pinto (Project facilitator from Prospect/Fraterna Consortium) in Lospalos Villa, Lautem municipality
- Field visit to agroforestry site in Suco Bauro, Lautem municipality
- Meeting with Adolfo Dias Marçal (Co-Director, Amadora Lda.) in Suco Soba, Baucau Municipality
- Field visit to construction of irrigation channel at aldeia Lague to Batufalo (B-IS-06) in Suco Soba, Baucau municipality
- Field visit to Afaça-Uaitame road construction in Suco Afaça, Baucau municipality

11 September 2023

- Meeting with Gustavo Da Cruz (Vice-Presidet, BTL) in Dili municipality

12 September 2023

- Meeting with Catilin Wiesen (Resident Representative, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Nelson Vicente Pereira (National Engineer for Cluster B, UNDP) in Dili municipality
- Meeting with Nelia dos Reis Magno (National Engineer, UNDP) in Dili municipality

13 September 2023

- Meeting with Augusto Pinto (National Project Director, Ministry of Tourism and Environment) in Dili municipality
- Group meeting with Delio das Silva F. dos Santos (Director of PDIM), Nicodemos S. dos S.P. (Chief of department of PDIM), Armindo Soares (Chief of department of PDIM), Francisco dos Santos (PDIM Engineer), Jose Antonio de Arauj (PDIM Engineer), Ezequiela Tavares dos Santos (PDIM Engineer), Ercio dos S. Goncalves (PDIM Engineer), Pedro Pereira Tilman (PDIM Engineer), Joaquim J. M. Vieira Goncalves (PDIM Engineer), Teodosio Gil Soares da Costa (PDIM Engineer), Gibson Rulby Oliveira Sarmento (PDIM Engineer), and Constantino dos Santos Alves (PDIM Engineer)in Liquiça municipality
- Meeting with Antoninho Marque de Deus (Chief of Department of Territorial Representative of Forestry in Liquiça Municipality, MAF) in Maubara, Liquiça municipality
- Meeting with Teresa dos Santos (Farmer) in Suco Lauhata, in Liquiça municipality

14 September 2023

- Meeting with Mateus Soares Maia (Deputy Executive Director, RAEBIA) and Josefa Esperance Guterres (Staff, RAEBIA) in Dili municipality

18 September 2023

- Presentation of preliminary results to UNDP. Participants included Catilin Wiesen (Resident Representative, UNDP), Domingos Lequi Siga (Head of Climate Change Unit, UNDP), and Jehangir Khan (Project Manager, UNDP) in Dili municipality

21 September 2023

- Virtual meeting with Keti Chachibaia (Technical Advisor on Climate Change Adaptation, UNDP)

Annex IV: Lists of persons interviewed

Name	Organization	Position
Adeline Carrier	UNDP	Deputy resident representative
Jehangir Khan	UNDP	Project manager
Petronillo P Munez	UNDP	Team leader agroforestry
Sher Hassan Khan	UNDP	Team leader infrastructure
Juliana C. Rangel	UNDP	National engineer
Domingos Lequi Siga	UNDP	Head of climate change and environment unit in Timor Leste
Pedro G.D.S Marçal da Costa	NDA	President
Ivo J. Dos Santo Cancio	NDA	Consultant for GCF and CDM
Simanchal Pattnaik	UNEP	CTA
Yasu Hiromi	Nippon Kokei	Team leader
Herminio Anamias	Superiory	Supervisor
Julio dos Santo Da Silva	Superiory	Engineer
Abel Lobo Da Costa	Raebia	Local staff
Ermezinda Freitas	UNDP	Operation and procurement officer
Liboria Fatima Savio	UNDP	Admin and finance officer
Rosito Gutierres	MSA	General director for Rural Development
Simon Done	UNDP	Consultant
Sergio Gaspar Borromeu	UNDP	M&E officer
Mariano Ana Lopez	SSCP	Deputy operations
Nuno Romulado Gomez	SSCP	National commander
Joao De Souza Felipe	SSCP	Head of communication
Ines Soares Pereira	UNDP	Environmental officer
Nidia Alves da Costa	UNDP	Social Safeguard and Inclusion Officer
Bernadette De Fonseca	UNDP	Previous project manager
Ernesto Dos Santos	UNDP	GIS officer
Crissantos Da Conceiçao	UNDP	DRM officer
Ismael Da Costa Babu	SSCP	President
Abel Pires	MoPW	Ex Minister
Gustavo Da Cruz	Bee TL	Vice president
Catilin Wresen	UNDP	Resident representative
Nelson Vicente Pereira	UNDP	National engineer for cluster B
Neila dos Reis Magno	UNDP	National dos Reis Magnos
Augusto Pinto	NDCC	National project director
Mateus Soares Maia	Raebia	Deputy Executive Director of RAEBIA
Josefa Esperance Guterres	Raebia	Staff of RAEBIA
Saturlina dos Santos	Suco Lisadilla	Beneficiary in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça Municipality
Aleixo Soares	Suco Lisadilla	Construction worker in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça Municipality
Mariano dos Santos	Suco Lisadilla	Construction worker in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça Municipality
Martino Lopes	Suco Lisadilla	Construction worker, agroforestry beneficiary in Suco Lisadilla, Liquiça Municipality
José Pinto	UNDP	Field coordinator, Liquiça Municipality
Adelino G. Pereira	Suco Malabe	Chief of Suco Malabe, Ermera Municipality
Carlos de Deus	Suco Malabe	Chief of Aldeia Malabe,Ermera Municipality
Elias Gomes	Ermera Tuan. Unip Lda.	Supervisor, Ermera Municipality
Jose Gomes	Suco Malabe	Farmer, Ermera Municipality
Ernestina dos Reis	Suco Malabe	Farmer, Ermera Municipality

Name	Organization	Position
Helena Amaral	Suco Malabe	Farmer, Ermera Municipality
Adriva dos Reis	Suco Malabe	Farmer, Ermera Municipality
Natalina Soares	Suco Malabe	Farmer,Ermera Municipality
Vergina M. Gomes	Suco Malabe	Farmer, Ermera Municipality
Alarico Moniz	Suco Batumanu	Chief of Aldeia Batumanu, Ermera Municipality
Fernando Soares	Suco Batumanu	Chief of Suco Batumanu, Ermera Municipality
Filipe Ponte Martins	Suco Batumanu	Community,Ermera Municipality
Pedro Marcal	Hamutuk Hatutan, Unip.Lda	Supervisor, Ermera Municipality
Felisberto Soares	Suco Batumanu	National Policy Officer, Ermera Municipality
Paul Monis	Hamutuk Hatutan, Unip.Lda	Staff of company, Ermera Municipality
Faustino Rofince	Suco Batueru	Community member, Ermera Municipality
Juli Monteiro	Suco Batueru	Chief of aldeia Batueru, Ermera Municipality
Abilio do Rego Amaral	SucoTohumeta	Chief of Suco Tohumeta, Aileu Municipality
Francisco Pinto	SucoTohumeta	Chief of Aldeia Akadiru,Aileu Municipality
Laurinda Martins	SucoTohumeta	Farmer, Aileu Municipality
Eva da Conceicao	SucoTohumeta	Farmer, Aileu Municipality
Denciana Colo	SucoTohumeta	Farmer, Aileu Municipality
Amelia Fatima dos Santos	SucoTohumeta	Farmer, Aileu Municipality
Agrefina de Jesus	SucoTohumeta	Farmer, Aileu Municipality
Delfina da Silva Aleixo	Suco Madabeno	Youth representative, Aileu Municipality
Caisimira Granadeiro	Suco Madabeno	Farmer, Aileu Municipality
Afonso Marques Henrique	Suco Madabeno	Chief of Suco Madabeno, Aileu Municipality
Alcino de Fatima	Suco Madabeno	Chief of Suco Manufoni, Aileu Municipality
Adao Lizerio	Suco Madabeno	Farmer, Aileu Municipality
Domingos Mesquita	Suco Lahae	Chie of Suco Lahae, Aileu Municipality
Paulo Laka	Suco Lahae	Chief of Aldeia Eralolo, Aileu Municipality
Leonel Bere	UNDP	Field coordinator, Aileu Municipality
Angelino da Neves	MAF	Chief of Department of Territorial Representative of Forestry, Coffee, and Industrial Plants in Aileu Municipality
Francisco Jose Tilman	MAF	Technical professional of forestry in Aileu Municipality
Geraldo de Viana Soares	Suco Lavateri	Chief of Suco of Lavateri, Baucau Municipality
José da Costa Pereira	Suco Lavateri	Beneficiary in Suco of Lavateri, Baucau Municipality
João Viana	Suco Lavateri	Beneficiary in Suco of Lavateri, Baucau Municipality
José de Araújo Morais	Suco Lavateri	Beneficiary in Suco of Lavateri, Baucau Municipality
Francisca Monica de Fatima Soares	Suco Soba	Chief of Suco of Soba, Baucau Municipality
Olivio Freitas	Ministry of State Administration	President of Authority of Baucau Municipality
Pascoal Afonso Belo	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	Chief of Department of Territorial Representative of Forestry, Coffee, and Industrial Plants in Baucau Municipality
Hermenegildo Rodrigues Fraga	Ministry of State Administration	Director of PDIM in Baucau Municipality
Sidalio Freitas	Suco Bauro	Chie of Suco of Bauro, Lautem Municipality
Nelson Abilio Soares Nunes	Ministry of State Administration	Director of Disaster Risk Management of Baucau Municipality
Antonio Pinto	Prospect	Project facilitator from Prospect/Fraterna Consortium, Lautem Municipality

Name	Organization	Position
Napoleao Martins	Prospect	Field Coordinator from Prospect/Fraterna Consortium, Lautem Municipality
Justino Vila Nova	Prospect	Executive Director of Prospect, Lautem Municipality
Adolfo Dias Marcal	Amadora	Co-Director of Company Amadora in Baucau Municipality
Delio das Silva F. dos Santos	MSA	Director of PDIM in Liquiça Municipality
Nicodemos S. dos S.P.	MSA	Chief of department of PDIM in Liquiça Municipality
Armindo Soares	Ministry of State Administration	Chief of department of PDIM in Liquiça Municipality
Francisco dos Santos	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Jose Antonio de Araujo	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Ezequiela Tavares dos Santos	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Ercio dos S. Goncalves	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Pedro Pereira Tilman	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Joaquim J. M. Vieira Goncalves	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Teodosio Gil Soares da Costa	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Gibson Rulby Oliveira Sarmento	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Constantino dos Santos Alves	MSA	PDIM Engineer in Liquiça Municipality
Antoninho Marque de Deus	MAf	Chief of Department of Territorial Representative of Forestry, Coffee, and Industrial Plants in Liquiça Municipality
Teresa dos Santos	Suco Lauhata	Farmer in Suco Lauhata, Liquiça Municipality
Keti Chachibaia	UNDP	Technical advisor on climate change adaptation

Annex V: Lists of documents reviewed

Ministry of Social Solidarity, Secretary of State for Social Assistance and Natural Disasters, National Disaster Management Directorate, 2008, National Disaster Risk Management Policy

Timor-Leste Government Resolution No 8/2022 of March 1, National Climate Change Policy

Government of Timor-Leste (2015), Rural Roads Master Plan: Investment Strategy 2016-2020. Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications

Project Environmental and Social Management Framework (2018) for Safeguarding communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

Funded Activity Agreement between UNDP and GCF – FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

Government of Timor-Leste, National Determined Contribution Timor-Leste 2022-2030

Government of Timor-Leste (2015), Rural Roads Master Plan: Investment Strategy 2016-2020. Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (2021). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 2nd tranche from Directorate for Forestry, Coffee and Industrial Plants, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries for FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (2023). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 3rd tranche from Directorate for Forestry, Coffee and Industrial Plants, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Ministry of Social Solidarity, Secretary of State for Social Assistance and Natural Disasters, National Disaster Management Directorate, 2008, National Disaster Risk Management Policy

Ministry of State Administration (2021). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 2nd tranche from Ministry of State Administration

Ministry of State Administration (2023). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 3rd tranche from Ministry of State Administration for FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

Kumalahadi, Kuncara, Sugeng Pamudji & Partners, Public Accountant Firm (2022). Independent Auditor's Report of the Ministry of State Administration: UNDP Internal Control Audit

Secretary of State for Environment, Democratic Rep. of Timor-Leste, Second National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change, November 2020

Secretary of State for Environment, Democratic Rep. of Timor-Leste, Timor-Leste's National Adaptation Plan

Secretary of State of Civil Protection (2021). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 2rd tranche from Directorate General for Civil Protection, Secretary of State of Civil Protection for FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

Secretary of State of Civil Protection (2022). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 3rd tranche from Directorate General for Civil Protection, Secretary of State of Civil Protection

Timor-Leste Government Resolution No 8/2022 of March 1, National Climate Change Policy

UNDP Timor-Leste (2019). Funding proposal – FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP. Project site location maps (all projects) – FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2020). Project Inception Workshop Report – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2020). Baseline Assessment Report – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2020). Minutes of the First Project Board Meeting on 06 November 2020 – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2020). Annual Performance Report (APR) – FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2021). Minutes of the Second Project Board Meeting on 26 February 2021 – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2021). Inception Report: Comprehensive climate hazard mapping and risk assessment and development of risk model for Timor-Leste UNDP/TLS/PS/2021/016

UNDP Timor-Leste (2021). Data Report, Updated Methodology & Detailed Work Plan Field Surveys (Rev1): Comprehensive climate hazard mapping and risk assessment and development of risk model for Timor-Leste UNDP/TLS/PS/2021/016

UNDP Timor-Leste (2021). Report on the assessment and establishment of the SDI/ GIS system established in Secretary of State for Civil Protection (SSCP) for the project with incorporation of all available data of interest including the database with hydrometeorological data from national monitoring system

UNDP Timor-Leste (2021). Risk Profiles: Comprehensive climate hazard mapping and risk assessment and development of risk model for Timor-Leste UNDP/TLS/PS/2021/016

UNDP (2021). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 2nd tranche from UNDP for FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2021). Minutes of the Third Project Board Meeting on 02 December 2021 – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2021). Annual Performance Report (APR) – FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Booster training and quarterly meetings with local authorities in Liquiça, Viqueque and Baucau and Pilot LOVRA in Suco Pairara, Lautem Municipality Date: 9-12th May and 9 - 10 June 2022

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: FPIC Consultation & Withdrawal of Consent Form and Gender Assessment Baucau, Viqueque and Lautem, (V-IS-01, V-IS-03, La-RR-04), A2 – Technical Review and Survey at Viqueque and Lautem (V-IS-01, V-IS-03, La-RR-04), and A3 Agriculture Survey (V-IS-01 & V-IS-03), Irrigation Scheme in Viqueque From 15-18 of June, 2022

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Booster Training-MHRA Activity DCITY 25 to 27 May 2022

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). Minutes of the Fourth Project Board Meeting on 12 May 2022 – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Physical Asset Mapping (PAM) in Suco Liurai 2 and Suco Asumau in Remexio Administrative Post, Suco Acubilitoho and Suco Manucasa in Lequidoe Administrative Post, Suco Seloi Craic, Suco Lauisi (Aldeia Erbuti), Suco Lequitura, and Suco Fatubosa in Aileu Vila Administrative Post, Aileu Municipality, Suco Guico, and Suco Lisadilla in Maubara Administrative Post, Suco Leotela and

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Launching of the Updated Digitized Post-Damage and Losses Assessment (PDALA) tools; General orientation of the latest version of the Physical Asset Mapping (PAM) tool; Progress reporting on MHRVA and LoVRA activities; and Climate Change Adaptation Planning Workflow Presentation From 14-15 July 2022

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: FPIC consultation and withdrawal of consent form and Gender Assessment in Malabe Ermera Irrigation rehabilitation (E 1 04) and Lavatery Road Rehabilitation project (BRR 06) from 22 to 25 August 2022 in Ermera and Baucau municipality.

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Environmental Screening Assessment for 11 - resilient rural infrastructure units to be implemented in 2022 and establishment of Grievance Redress Mechanism Committees and completion of full, free prior and informed consent of the affected peoples form at each project site.
UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Field visit for Detail Technical Assessment review of Water Supply at Suco Muapitini (La-WS-07)

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Meeting with SSCP, Participating the Workshop of 2nd in country Multi-hazard Mapping in Timor-Leste; Meeting with SSE and NDMG, Meeting with Ministry of Public Works – Rural Road for Development (R4D) and Team meeting (UNDP, GCF, Antea group and HIVOS)

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: FPIC consultation and withdrawal of consent form and Gender Assessment in Lahae to Eralolo road rehabilitation (A-RR-05) from 06 to 07 July 2022 in Aileu municipality.

NDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Reverification of Malabe Irrigation Scheme (E-IS-04) Beneficiary Map in Suco Malabe, Atsabe Administrative Post, Ermera Municipality from 05 - 06 September 2022

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Physical Asset Mapping (PAM) in Suco Ducurai, Suco Haupu, Suco Catrai Craic, Suco Catrai Leten, and Suco Lauana, Letefoho Administrative Post, Suco Baboi Craic, Suco Baboi Leten, Suco Parami, and Suco Atara, Atsabe Administrative Post, Suco Poetete, and Suco Leguimea, Ermera Administrative Post, Ermera Municipality

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Preparation for Atauro Culture and Music Festival and Participating in the Atauro Culture and Music Festival

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). BTOR: Preparing Hydraulic Analysis, Design and BoQ For 2 Location of Water System (Suku Estadu-Ermera and Suku Moapitine-Lospalos)

UNDP (2022). Signed Co-Financing Letter from UNDP indicating the status and amount of co-financing applied for FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2022). Annual Performance Report (APR) – FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report January 2023

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report February 2023

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report March 2023

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report April 2023

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report May 2023

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report June 2023

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report July 2023

UNDP Timor-Leste. Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste: Progress Report August 2023

UNDP 2023 Beneficiaries per Scheme

UNDP 2023 Beneficiaries GCF per agroforestry site

UNDP Timor-Leste. GCF-SRC Project Result Tracker base on output

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Minutes of the Fifth Project Board Meeting on 19 January 2023 – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP (2023). Signed Co-Financing Letter for 3rd tranche from UNDP FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). ESIA and ESMP for Water Supply Projects – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: A-RR-05 Lahae - Eralolo road rehabilitation

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: B-IS-07 Water source protection and irrigation channel in Fatulia, Bahawatu

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: B-RR-06 Road rehabilitation from Suco Lavateri to Aldeia Onor Tibalari

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: L-RR-01 Road rehabilitation of Lika

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: E-RR-09 Road rehabilitation from Katrai Kraik to Dukurai

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: L-RR-06 Road rehabilitation of Kaigeremeta

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: La-RR-04 Road Rehabilitation from Luarai to Bauro

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Report: La-RR-02 Road Rehabilitation from Waroque to Baniria

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring Checklist E-RR-06, E-RR-091st, E-RR-09 2nd, E-IS-04, A-RR-12

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring infrastructure schemes step

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring progress of infrastructure schemes 2022, 2023, and 2024

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Monitoring suggestion boxes-GRM-2022

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Draft ESIA and ESMP for Rural Roads Rehabilitation Projects – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Multiyear Financial Report 2020-2023 – FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). Logframe – FP 109: Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste

UNDP Timor-Leste (2023). LGCF-SRC Project Result Tracker base on output- August 2023

United Nations(2020). Country Programme Document for Timor-Leste (2021-2025)

Annex VI: Co-financing table:

Name of co-financer	Type of co-financing	Planned co-financing over the entire project life (US$)	Actual co-financing at 31 Dec. 2022 (US$)	Perc
MSA	In-kind	19,687,062	1,311,005.11	6.7
MAF	In-kind	12,000,000	4,761,393.05	39.7
SSCP	In-kind	5,000,000	2,234,328.92	44.7
UNDP	Cash	400,000	237,244.70	59.3
Total		37,087,062		23.0

Annex VII: Evaluation criteria rating scales

Progress towards results rating scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice"
Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Project implementation and adaptive management rating scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Sustainability rating scale

Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Annex VIII: Signed UNEG Code of conduct

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: Matteo Borzoni

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed in Firenze MB on 29 Sept 2023

Name of Consultant: Octavio F.C. Oliveira de Araújo

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed in Firenze on 29 Sept 2023

to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit, RTA and PTA included in the final report)

Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor - Nature, Climate and Energy

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex IX: Signed interim evaluation final report clearance form

Still to be added