



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW

“Consolidation of Cape Verde’s Protected Areas System”

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term review of the full-size project “Consolidation of Cape Verde’s Protected Areas System” implemented through the Directorate General of Environment is to be undertaken in 2013. The project started on the, 2010 and is in its third year of implementation of full implementation. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term review.

The essentials of the project to be reviewed are as follows:

Project Title:	Consolidation of Cape Verde’s Protected Areas System			
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4091	Project financing	<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at MTE (Million US\$)</i>
ATLAS Project ID:	00072399	GEF financing:	\$3,100,000 USD	
Country:	Cape Verde	IA/EA own:	\$200,000 USD	
Region:	West Africa	Government:	\$783,000 USD	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	\$100,000 USD	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Program		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	Directorate General of Environment (DGA)	Total Project Cost in cash:	\$4,183,000 USD	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		4/08/2010
			Planned closing date: 30/05/2014	Revised closing date: 31/12/2014

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND: project objectives and expected outcomes

In partnership with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Government of Cape Verde is currently implementing an integrated programme which aims at conserving globally significant biodiversity in Cape Verde through the

creation and consolidation of the national system of protected areas (PAs). The programme is the second phase the protected areas program. It is also expected to contribute to halting and reversing existing degradation of land and water resources within the protected areas and adjacent landscapes at the same time that it promotes the creation of income-generating alternative livelihood options for local communities that live in the surroundings of the PAs.

The programme is implemented by the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Land Planning through the General Direction of Environment (DGA) on the basis of national execution modalities and the support of UNDP as GEF implementing agency. DGA is the institutional focal point, responsible for project implementation and facilitation of operational procedures with the Office of the United Nations Funds and Programmes (representing UNDP in Cape Verde) and other funding partners.

The project's Phase II is to be implemented over a four-year period, having started in late 2010 and expected to end in late 2014. The current phase focuses on strengthening and consolidating the country's nascent PA System.

This approach rest on three main pillars: First, strengthening of the institutional, policy and legal framework for PA system management, with particular respect to financial sustainability. Second, increasing the level of operationalization of sites so that Cape Verde can gain experience in protected areas management and can avert direct threats to the biodiversity contained in PAs and MPAs; and third, widespread dissemination of stakeholder participation in PA management and different models piloted.

The key outcomes of Phase II are:

1. The strengthening of the governance framework for the expansion, consolidation and sustainability of the National PA system;
2. The enhancement of the management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and coastal/marine PAs; and
3. The strengthening of PA's sustainability through community mobilization, sectoral engagement and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within PAs/MPAs and adjacent areas

The project's development goal is to conserve globally significant terrestrial and marine biodiversity in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde through a protected area system's approach. The project's objective is to consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde's protected areas (PA) System through the

establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation.

The programme is designed to significantly strengthen capacities for PA management in the country in its efforts to conserve the island's ecosystems and undertake long-term adaptive management against potential future degradation of Cape Verde's environment. It is also expected to contribute to sustainable development and poverty alleviation in the project's zone of influence as well as to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

4. OBJECTIVES of Mid-Term Review (MTR)

The objective of the MTR is to provide an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTR will identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objective and outcomes, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF supported projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTR will assess early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made.

The review will include both the evaluation of the progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document (PRODOC) in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The review will also address underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

The Mid-Term Review is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation strategy to come up with recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing the project outputs and outcomes to date. The overall project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework.

Consequently, the review mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of the project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement

with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser based and key stakeholders.

The review mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going projects. The international consultant for this review is expected to identify lessons learnt and best practices from other protected areas and biodiversity conservation projects that could guide technical recommendations and improvements.

In summary, the project Mid-Term Review has as its main objectives:

1. To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project
2. To ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective
3. To enhance organizational and development learning
4. To enable informed decision-making

5. SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The scope of the Mid-Term Review will cover all components and activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The review team will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. The evaluation will diagnose problems and suggest any necessary corrections and adjustments. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

The review team will assess the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the review team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in 8.

The Mid-term Evaluation will cover the following **aspects of project design and implementation**:

5. 1 Progress Towards Development objectives

- *Changes in development conditions*
-

- Review and analysis of the changes occurred on the country development conditions in relation with biodiversity conservation and protected area system management in the country. Assessment against the barriers identified on the barrier analysis (refer to PRODOC pag.16) and review of which changes can be attributed with project intervention
 - Assessment of stakeholder's perception (including local communities) on the progress on the project implementation associated to consolidation of protected areas system.
 - ***Measurement of change***
 - Assess progress towards achievement of project development objectives and outcomes results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention.
 - Conduct a well justified prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met is also expected.
 - Apply the GEF Tracking Tool – by reviewing the draft prepared by the project team – and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool during the inception phase. Propose ways of effectively using the Tracking Tool as useful tool for assessing success in PAs consolidation, management and sustainability.
 - In connection with the evaluation and two weeks prior to the arrival of the mission, the project team will draft the BD1 Tracking Tools that are due by Mid-Term Review. The Review team will assist the project team in reviewing the document within the framework of a work session.
 - Propose ways of effectively using the Tracking Tools as useful tool for assessing success in PAs consolidation, management and sustainability.
 - ***Millennium Development Goals***
 - Assess the extent to which the project activities are contributing – or can potentially contribute – to the achievement of MDGs, with focus in the areas of biodiversity, poverty reduction and gender.
 - ***Gender perspective:***
-

- Appraise at what point gender equity aspects were considered on the analysis of barriers and problems that the project is expected to address and at the design of the strategy design.
- Analyze the extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How are gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions and management tools design?
- Suggest measures to strengthen the project's gender approach.
- Review of the cost-efficiency and effectiveness of the project strategy to reinforce capacities for gender mainstreaming in protected areas managements

5. 2 Progress towards Results

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions (if necessary)
- Assess whether the project design is clear, logical and commensurate with time and resources available;
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities.
- Review the baseline data included in the project results framework and suggest revisions as necessary.
- Review indicators and target reformulation suggested on the PIR (Project Implementation Review) and propose improved formulation if needed.

Progress:

- Assess the scope, quality and significance of the projects outputs produced to date in relation to expected results
 - Assess the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
 - Conduct an evaluation of project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the project document
 - Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional benefits, impacts resulting from project implementation beyond those specified in the project document;
 - A qualified assessment of the extent to which project outputs to date have scientific credibility;
 - An assessment of the extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have influenced the execution of the project activities;
-

- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze, beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
- Review the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
- An Analysis of project's performance in engaging all the partners and stakeholders and applying a participatory approach: extent of cooperation on engendered and synergy created by the project in each of its component activities;
- A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met;

Sustainability

- The MTR should also pay special attention to the potential contribution of the project to creating the basic conditions to ensure sustainability of the Cape Verde' protected areas system. To this purpose, the review should appraise at what point all the management tools proposed by the project (Statute of Autonomous Authority; Business Plan; Zoning and National PA strategy) create appropriate basis to ensure the financial, institutional, environmental, socio-economic sustainability of the PA system and the Autonomous Authority of Protected Areas.
- Assessment of the capacity building strategy: appraisal of project contribution capacity reinforcement (institutional, community and individual capacity) for biodiversity conservation and protected area management
- Appraisal of socio-economic sustainability of supported community initiatives within the PA and buffer zones.
- Appraisal of scale up potential and sustainability of supported (partner and/or project) ecotourism initiatives

5.3 Adaptive management

Work Planning

- a) Analyze adaptive management and result-based focus in project implementation and adherence to the governance structure. Assess to what point work planning processes are result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
 - b) Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on project management.
-

- c) Identify any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first three years of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the Project governing bodies and their appropriateness in terms of overall objectives of the project;
- d) Provide recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall project work plan and timetable for the purposes of enhancing the achievement of project objectives and outcomes
- e) Assessments of the project timeframe initially established for this project, delays and the adequacy proposed revisions in project duration. The mid-term review should provide specific recommendation on project extension and strategy and team engagement needed to complete planned activities and achieve project outputs. If applicable, outline recommendations for revising this timeframe with proposed benchmarks for the reminder implementation time.

Finance and co-finance:

- a) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- b) Assess the quality and adequacy of the financial planning instruments
- c) Complete the co-financing monitoring table
- d) Identify and quantify additional co-financing mobilized and point potential sources of co-financing mobilization (in kind and in cash) for biodiversity conservation and protected areas system consolidation.
- e) Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- f) Assess financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.

Monitoring Systems.

- a) Review the monitoring tools and system currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
 - b) Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, meet GEF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
 - c) Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART indicators, including gender disaggregated indicators as necessary.
 - d) Assess to which point the information collected and produced is being used for decision-making and strategy review
 - e) Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
-

Risk Management and underlying factors

- a) Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Give particular attention to critical risks.
- b) Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
- c) Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.
- d) Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made about factors out of the project's control and, in case applicable, assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made at project design or during project implementation

Reporting

- a) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
- b) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

5. 4 Management arrangements

- a) Assess the adequacy, effectiveness of implementation arrangements of the project
 - b) Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the project document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
 - c) Conduct an evaluation of project coordination, management and administration provided by the project management unit. This evaluation should include specific reference to organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions involved in project arrangements and execution;
 - d) Assess the effectiveness of project management units (national specialists and island coordinators) in guiding project implementation
 - e) Assess any administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project and present recommendations for any necessary operational changes;
 - f) Assess the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the project governing bodies (steering committee and technical committee), the Technical Support and Advisory Team
 - g) Review the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
 - h) Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
-

- i) Review the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
 - Field visits
 - Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
 - /PIR preparation and follow-up
 - GEF guidance
 - Quarterly Progress and Financial Reports.
 - Work plans
 - Combined Delivery Report
- j) Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide, especially the quality assurance elements, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework
- k) Assess the quality of UNDP orientations and guidelines on financial management and reporting procedures
- l) Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.
- m) Provide concrete recommendations on how to improve daily support and supervisory roles

6. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The Mid-Term Review will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions.

The mission will start with a desk review of project documentation and relevant country and GEF Focal area strategic documents and also take the following process:

- a. Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports, such as Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Board meetings and Technical Support and Advisory Team meetings, Project Implementation Review (PIR), Quarterly Progress Reports, M&E framework, mission reports and other internal documents including financial reports and relevant correspondence;
 - b. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications, audiovisual materials, technical packages, consultancies reports and other materials and reports;
 - c. Interviews with the Project Managers, technical specialist and other project staff
 - d. Interview with Program Officers in charge of project oversight at UNDP CO;
 - e. Interview with project institutional partners (list to be detailed):
 - f. Finance and Operation Manager at UNDP CO authorizing direct payments;
 - g. Interview with project executing agency: Directorate General of Environment; finance Officer and Program Officer at executing partner;
 - h. Field visits (considering that the project islands are: S.Antão, S.Vicente, Fogo, Sal e Boavista, and one ample can be considered) to conduct consultations and/or interviews with relevant
-

stakeholders involved, including government's representatives, local communities, NGO's, private sector, donors, other UN agencies and organizations.

- i. Field visit to sample project sites with the purpose of interviewing project local partners and beneficiaries (community associations, local officials, school managers, etc.)

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

7. RATING PROJECT SUCCESS

The evaluators may also consider assessing the success of the project based on outcome targets and indicators and using the performance indicators established by GEF for Climate Change Adaptation projects. The following items should be considered for rating purposes:

- Achievement of objectives and planned results
- Attainment of outputs and activities
- Cost-effectiveness
- Coverage
- Impact
- Sustainability
- Replicability
- Implementation approach
- Stakeholders participation
- Country ownership
- Acceptability
- Financial planning
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Impact on disaster risk management

The evaluation will rate the success of the project on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest (most successful) rating and 5 being the lowest. Each of the items above should be rated separately with comments and then an overall rating given. The following rating system is to be applied:

<u>Rating:</u>	<u>Achievement:</u>
1= excellent	90-100%
2= very good	75-90%
3= good	60-74%
4= Satisfactory	50-59%

5= unsatisfactory 49% and below

8. REVIEW TEAM

Two consultants with the following qualifications shall be engaged to undertake the evaluation working concurrently according to the planned schedule. The international consultant, who will have in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience, will be designated as the team leader and will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the review, and submitting the final report. The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, and conduct of local meetings.

The collection of documents is to be done by National Consultant prior to commencing the work. The International Consultant has the overall responsibility for completing the desk review prior to the country mission to Cape Verde, and for submitting the final report following the country mission. The consultants will sign an agreement with UNDP Cape Verde and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement.

Team Qualities:

1. Recent knowledge of result-based management evaluation methodologies
2. Recent knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches
3. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
4. Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
5. Experience applying UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
6. Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to biodiversity conservation or natural resource management
7. Recognized expertise in the management of island biodiversity and/or arid and semi-arid ecosystems
8. Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Cape Verde
9. Demonstrable analytical skills
10. Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects
11. Both team members with excellent Portuguese communication skills (or Spanish for the international evaluator) and English (oral, written and presentation).

Qualifications of Team Leader (International consultant)

1. International consultant with academic and professional background in fields related to Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Areas Management. A minimum of 5 years of relevant experience is required;
 2. Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors;
 3. Excellent English writing and communication skills. Portuguese, French or Spanish reading and communication skills. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment;
 4. Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distills critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
-

5. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
6. Ability and experience to lead multi disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
7. Familiarity with the challenges developing countries to develop, strengthen and ensure sustainability of protected area system
8. Familiarity with Cape Verde or similar SIDS (Small Islands Developing States) countries; and
9. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
10. Excellent feedback-giving skills and culture sensitiveness

9. DELIVERABLES

The review team will produce the following deliverables to UNDP, DGA, GEF Operational and Political Focal Points, UNDP/GEF-LDCF and the Project Board (Steering and Technical Committee):

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities	Payment Schedule
Contract signing				10%
Inception Report	Review team clarifies timing and method of review	No later than 1 weeks before the review mission	Review team submits to UNDP Country Office	15%
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of review and field mission	To project management and UNDP Country Office; and key stakeholders	
Draft Final Report + Executive summary	Full report covering all items detailed on section 4 "Scope of the MTR" with detailed attention to lessons learnt and recommendations and with annexes minimally including (List of Persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, questionnaire and summary of results, co-financing and leveraged resources, etc.)	Within 2 weeks of the review mission	Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, DGA, GEF Operational and Political Focal Point	40%
Final Report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report).	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP, executing agency (DGA) and GEF OFP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO	35%

The report together with the annexes shall be written in English and Portuguese and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format to facilitate comments and PDF format.

10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Praia, Cape Verde. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of schedule payments. The **Consolidation of the Cape Verde's Protected Area system** project team will be responsible for liaising with the review team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions. The project coordination unit (PCU) will assist the review team with travel arrangements and scheduling. The PCU is responsible as well for providing logistics for debriefing session.

Considering that the project interventions are in five islands: S.Antão, S.Vicente, Fogo, Sal e Boavista, for field visits one sample of protected areas can be defined considering the specific context. Note that the National Project Management Unit and the main institutions (Ministries and UNDP) are based in Praia, which requires for the evaluation mission to start in Praia and plan enough time in the capital for partner's and stakeholder's interviews and debriefing. The financial proposal must take in to account the internal flights¹.

The Head of Environment, Energy and Disaster Prevention at the Joint Office of UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF (Antonio Querido) will be the supervisor of this consultancy.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

All applications including P11 form, CV, and technical and financial proposals should be submitted to the email address, procurement.cv@cv.jo.un.org indicating the following reference "International Consultant for **"MTR – Consolidation of the Cape Verde's Protected Area system"** by 25 April 2013 COB. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Introduction about the consultant/CV;
- Proposed review methodology and work plan;
- Financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flights tickets (international and national), living allowance, etc).
- Sample of executive summary of a mid-term review or any other type of evaluation report leaded by the applicant

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: The selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments. The financial proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring

¹ Information on prices for internal flights is available in <http://flytacv.com/tacv/>

12. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the review will be 30 working days starting on May 2013 according to the following plan:

Activity	Timeframe
Preparation	(5 days)
Field mission and debriefing	(15 days)
Draft review report	(5 days)
Finalisation of final report	(5 days)

Terms of reference approved by:

António Querido

(Head of Environment, Energy and Disaster Prevention at the Joint Office of UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF)

Praia, 05 April 2013