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# Background of the AAP Programme Evaluation

## Purpose

The Programme Evaluation is aimed at critically assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme, measuring to what extent the goal/outcome/results have been achieved against the logical framework (results framework), and identifying factors that have hindered or facilitated the success of the programme.

The Evaluation also aims at organising and synthesising experiences and lessons and providing conclusions and recommendations that may help sustain the results of AAP and improve future relevant interventions of UNDP, identifying what worked and what did not work and why.

## Outputs

The programme evaluation is expected to produce the following outputs:

1. An inception Plan
2. A synthesised evaluation report of the entire AAP covering all 4 components:
	1. National Component – 20 National Projects
	2. Inter-Regional Technical Support Component (IRTSC)
	3. Improving public awareness of climate change issues in Africa: Capacity Support for Local Media through South-South Cooperation (MCBP)
	4. Programme and Project Assurance Support Component (PPAS)
3. A Power Point Presentation covering the key points of the evaluation report
4. A Presentation to the AAP Programme Board

## Scope

The Terms of Reference (ToR) define the scope of the assignment as follows:

Each of AAP’s components will be evaluated using the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, timeliness, and sustainability. These criteria generally correspond with the five OECD/DAC criteria for good evaluation practice (see box below); UNDP’s “Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results” specifies that UNDP evaluations generally should apply the OECD/DAC criteria. It is noted that the “impact” criteria is not included, although the evaluation will cover the related aspects of outcomes and results. In this context it should be kept in mind that the primary direct impact of AAP would be associated with the national projects, for which the Evaluation Team will only carry out a meta-evaluation/synthesis. Hence, the focus on tangible outcomes and results rather than impact is practical and realistic. The added criterion of timeliness, which is linked to efficiency, is an important aspect to assess considering the delays in formulating the national programmes, which necessitated an extension of the programme.

|  |
| --- |
| **OECD/DAC and UNDP criteria definition:** |
| Relevance: | OECD/DAC: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.UNDP: Relevance concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues. Relevance concerns the congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries. It also incorporates the concept of responsiveness—that is, the extent to which UNDP was able to respond to changing and emerging development priorities and needs in a responsive manner. |
| Effectiveness:  | OECD/DAC: The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.UNDP: Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the initiative’s intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved. |
| Efficiency: | OECD/DAC: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.UNDP: Efficiency measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Efficiency is important in ensuring that resources have been used appropriately and in highlighting more effective uses of resources. |
| Impact: | OECD/DAC: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintendedUNDP: Impact measures changes in human development and people’s well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Many development organizations evaluate impact because it generates useful information for decision making and supports accountability for delivering results. At times, evaluating impact faces challenges: Confirming whether benefits to beneficiaries can be directly attributed to UNDP support can be difficult, especially when UNDP is one of many contributors. However, the impact of UNDP initiatives should be assessed whenever their direct benefits on people are discernible. |
| Sustainability: | OECD/DAC: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.UNDP: Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future. |
| Sources: 1) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationofdevelopmentprogrammes/2754804.pdf>)2) UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results |

The table below depicts the overall evaluation aspects and several related factors presented in the ToR. While all these are relevant for the evaluation, the Team will prioritise the most pertinent factors and maintain focus on the overall programme and the regional components, in order to ensure a focused evaluation with a clear analysis of the key issues and lessons. In relation to the national projects, care will be taken not to duplicate the efforts of the national evaluations. With this in view, some issues to consider are presented in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Aspect/factor** | **Consideration** |
| 1. **Programme outcomes/results**
 |  |
| Effectiveness and efficiency of all programme activities under the major components | * The evaluation will assess all activity categories/types (rather than individual activities) with a focus on the regional components.
* National project activities will be assessed at a synthesised level, based on the national evaluation reports
 |
| Progress in the achievement of outcomes/outputs, measured against the Programme baselines set in the log frame. For the IRTSC and MCBP, progress should be measured against their logical frameworks  |  |
| Progress in the achievement of results/objectives  |  |
| Assess the sustainability of the Programme outcomes (likelihood of the achieved outcomes continuing after the end of the Programme) and identify key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of programme results achieved |  |
| 1. **Processes**
 |  |
| 1. *Institutional arrangement*
* Formulation and implementation stages
* Consultative processes
 |  |
| 1. *Quality and effectiveness of advice and support by global and regional teams (IRTSC, BDP, RBx) to national project design and implementation*
* Capacity building initiatives
* Programme outputs
* Assumptions and risks
* Programme related complementary activities
 | * The assessment of complementary activities may be limited by the extent to which they are reflected in progress reports and monitoring data
 |
| 1. *Partnerships*
* Assessment of national level involvement and perception of partners
* Assessment of local partnerships and their involvement
* Assessment of collaboration between government, non-governmental organisations, the private sector, and regional/international organisations
 | * Assessment of national level and local partnerships and collaboration is expected to be captured in detail in the national evaluation reports.
* The Team will focus on a) regional level partnerships, b) interagency UN cooperation with UNIDO, WFP, UNICEF, c) Japan – UNDP partnership, and d) a synthesis of general partnership trends at the national level
 |
| 1. *Processes and administration*
* Programme related administration procedures
* Milestones (log-frame matrix)
* Key decisions and outputs
 |  |
| 1. *Programme oversight and active engagement*
* UNDP and the Programme Board for the overall program
* UNOPS as the implementing partner for the IRTSC and MCBP
* Regional Bureaux for Arab States and Africa and Bureau for Development Policy
* UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) and project steering committee for national component
* National government entity as the implementing partner for the national component in each country
* UNDP BDP and Regional Service Center practice teams for the PPAS
* Responsible party for some activities of national projects: WFP (Malawi/Kenya/Ethiopia), UNICEF (Ethiopia/Nigeria), UNIDO (Kenya, Nigeria)
 | * The national evaluation reports are expected to capture the engagement and oversight of national government entities in each country. The Team will focus on a synthesis of general trends in this regards
* The assessment of the engagement and oversight of WFP, UNICEF and UNIDO will focus at the general level. National evaluation reports are expected to capture the specific national context
 |
| 1. *Disbursements*
* Overview of actual spending against budget expectations
* Analyse disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently
 | * Overall programme disbursements and disbursements in the regional components will be assessed.
* The application of funds at national level is expected to be captured in the national evaluation reports
 |
| 1. *Budget procedures*
* Effectiveness of programme document/national project documents to provide adequate guidance on how to allocate the budget
* Review audits and any issues raised in audits and subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations
* Review budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevancy of such revisions
 | * The guidance by national project documents to budget allocations is expected to be captured in national reports. The Team will focus on synthesising this and on the regional support to this
* The Team will review programme/regional level audits. Audits of national programmes is expected to be covered by the national evaluations
 |
| 1. *Coordination mechanisms*
* Appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms and approaches between implementing partners and oversight bodies
* Propose improved coordination mechanisms and approaches
 | * After assessing AAP coordination, the Team will present key findings and recommendations for improved coordination for future UNDP programmes
* The Team will focus on coordination at the global and regional levels.
* National level coordination is anticipated to be captured by the national evaluations; based on these the Team will focus on a synthesis of general trends
 |
| 1. **Monitoring and Evaluation**
 |  |
| Identify problems/constraints, which impacted on successful delivery of the programme identified at the programme design stage and subsequently as part of the Mid-Term Review (MTR)  |  |
| Identify threats/risks to programme success that emerged during implementation and strategies implemented to overcome these threats/risks |  |
| Analyse impact of MTR recommendations  |  |
| Assess the Monitoring & Evaluation plans, whether they were well designed, implemented and budgeted at country, regional and global levels |  |
| Assess the extent, appropriateness and effectiveness of adaptive management at all levels of the programme implementation  | Adaptive management at the national level is expected covered by national evaluations. The Team will synthesise the findings of these |
| Assess national projects and regional/global components monitoring and evaluation systems, if any, and their contribution to the compulsory quarterly and annual reporting processes at the national and regional levels  | * The Team will assess the overall programme and regional component M&E system (incl. UNDP HQ and IRTSC M&E).
* In relation to national M&E, the Team will focus on the integration with the overall programme M&E system.
* In-country M&E systems are expected to be covered by the national evaluations
 |
| Analyse effectiveness of IRTSC’s national-level quarterly progress assessments, aimed to measure overall progress toward achievement of AAP outcomes and expected results at programme level and replicability of this framework |  |

# Evaluation Strategy

The programme evaluation will comprise three interlinked main elements:

* A direct evaluation of the overall AAP programme management
* A direct evaluation of the three interregional components of AAP
* A meta-evaluation/synthesis of the findings from the individual evaluations of the 20 national projects of AAP

The programme evaluation will be a final/post-implementation evaluation. AAP implementation was completed by 31 December 2012, and at the time of the evaluation most programme staff have left the programme. Hence, the evaluation is planned to be carried out as a distance evaluation from the home office of the Evaluation Team and will rely on tools such as phone/Skype, emails and questionnaires for stakeholder interviews and consultations. Furthermore, the consultant team will review available AAP programme documentation and data. One implication of the distance evaluation strategy is that the Evaluation Team will depend fully on AAP programme staff and stakeholders for the provision of information and access to documentation, data and relevant stakeholders.

In the ToR, a visit by the Evaluation Team to Dakar during a programme workshop to interact with interregional and national programme staff and stakeholders was envisaged. However, given this was not possible, the current strategy is to carry out the evaluation fully as a distance evaluation. In the current situation, this appears the most cost-effective approach. However, in case the distance evaluation strategy turns out to impose limitations, which significantly affects the evaluation’s accuracy, a brief visit by the Evaluation Team Leader to Dakar to have in-person discussions with remaining programme staff, stakeholders and partners (including national stakeholders in Senegal, UNDP CO, UNOPS, Embassy of Japan) and to see the AAP management and monitoring systems could be considered. The foreseen limitations related to the distance evaluation strategy versus evaluation on location are presented in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Limitation** | **Mitigation measure** |
| Full dependence on data and documentation made available | Full access granted to AAP internet sites to search for any missing information |
| Difficult to fill data gaps and to compile data from multiple sources | Tables to capture results and progress to be filled by AAP Teams |
| Difficult to triangulate and confirm information and data available in reports | Consulting stakeholders, national evaluators, international consultants via Skype/phone or email |
| More difficult to test and validate results/findings | Skype/phone and email consultations, draft report submitted for stakeholder comments |
| Inability to directly view programme systems and resources | Access to AAP intranet and introduction to systems over Skype by AAP Teams  |
| Less tacit knowledge of those involved in AAP | Skype/phone consultations |
| Dependence on timely receipt of final programme data and reporting, and national evaluations | Allowing a 21 day grace period for submission, using draft reports, receiving M&E data sheets as soon as they are ready |
| National evaluations cannot be expected to make a strong linkage to the overall/inter-regional programme level | Targeted questionnaire for national stakeholders |
| Reliance on receiving responses from stakeholders on emails/questionnaire – can be a challenge, especially where national stakeholders and programme staff have left | Submitting questionnaires to multiple national stakeholders (government and UNDP CO). Additional contact information such as staff’s personal email addresses and cell phone numbers (if available) will be provided by AAP Teams |

# Methodology

As mentioned above, the strategy of the evaluation is to use a distance evaluation approach where the primary information sources will be: available programme related documentation; consultation with stakeholders and informants via phone/Skype, email and questionnaires. To synthesise the information, especially from the country programmes, tables and matrices will be used, some of these will need to be filled by AAP stakeholders to ensure accuracy and comprehensiveness, as well as stakeholder participation in the evaluation process. The following sections introduce the tools and methods to be used by the team as well as considerations regarding scope and limitations affecting the evaluation. The key sources of data for interpretation and analysis, which are outlined below, are:

* Document review
* Stakeholders consultation
* Questionnaire
* Summarising and cross referencing through tables and matrices

## Document review

The ToR and the Resource Guide for Evaluators provided by AAP give an overview of the key documentation available. Annex F provides an overview of the key documentation and reports related to overall AAP programme and the four components. AAP has made the key documents available to the Evaluation Team and provided the Team with access to the programme intranet and relevant UNDP Teamworks sites.

In relation to programme management (incl. financial management) and coordination, and the three interregional components (IRTSC, MCBP, and PPAS/cross practice), the Evaluation Team will consult the documents made available to draw out key information on programme performance and lessons. Key documents in this regard include the Programme Document, logical frameworks/results frameworks for the overall programme and IRTSC and MCBP components, the Mid-term Review Report, progress reports, monitoring data (including achievement tracking tables), management meeting minutes, AAP products/publications, and financial reports. Considering the large amount of documentation related to the programme, the Team will focus on specific key documents identified. The quality of documentation and M&E information available will be assessed and taken into consideration when interpreting data.

In relation to the meta-evaluation of the twenty national projects, the Team will focus on the upcoming national evaluation reports and Results and Learning Report. These reports are expected to fully capture the key results, issues and lessons learned at the national level, and detailed evaluation of the national projects is outside the scope of the global Programme Evaluation. It is outside the scope of the evaluation to systematically review available documentation related to the 20 country programmes, and such effort would also duplicate the effort of the national evaluations; however, such documents may be consulted if the Team needs to clarify specific points in the national evaluation reports. The Team will organise and synthesise the results from the national evaluation reports in interventions types, key issues and lessons in order to identify general trends. While all the national evaluation reports are scheduled to be available by 18 January 2013, it is expected that a number of the national evaluation reports (e.g. Tanzania) will be delayed. Given the timeframe available for the Programme Evaluation, the Evaluation Team can only include in the meta-evaluation those reports, which are provided (at least in final draft form) in time to be included in the analysis of the national projects as per the evaluation timeline (ver. 4), i.e. 8 February 2013.

## Stakeholder consultation

The other main methods for gathering information in relation to the overall programme and the three interregional components is stakeholder consultation, e.g. through interviews to be complemented by emails, questionnaires and tables. Given the interregional scope and complexity of the AAP programme and its large numbers of stakeholders and the timeframe available for the evaluation, the stakeholders need to be prioritised to ensure that all the key individuals are consulted. The Evaluation Team has prepared a stakeholder consultation tracking form (annex E), in which the AAP team will fill out information on e.g. stakeholders, their contact information, role in AAP/component, and consultation priority. The form will then be used by the Evaluation Team to ensure that at least a representative sample of all the key stakeholders are interviewed (or otherwise consulted). The AAP team has provided the Evaluation Team with AAP organigrams (annex A), to give an overview of the relationships between the key stakeholders and their role in AAP, and the management and reporting flows.

The stakeholders to be interviewed include:

* The AAP Team in New York within BDP/EEG
* ITRSC staff
* MCBP Team
* AAP Programme Board Members and OSC Members
* UNDP BDP Cross practice Teams
* UNDP RBx (RBA and RBAS) HQ and Regional Service Centres (UNDP RBA Regional Service Centres in Dakar and Johannesburg)
* UNOPS
* WFP, UNICEF, UNIDO

### Questionnaire

Considering that detailed evaluations are carried out of each of the 20 national projects, and that the Programme Evaluation will carry out a meta-evaluation of the findings from these, it is deemed unnecessary to engage interviewing national stakeholders, i.e. to avoid duplication with the national evaluations. Indeed, the ToR for the Programme Evaluation does not call for such interviews. Nonetheless, the effectiveness and timeliness of support provided by the ITRSC and UNDP Cross practice Teams can only be assessed by looking at the national level – was the support appreciated, was it provided when needed, was it relevant, and did it improve national project implementation? Would it have been done better if done differently? The national evaluation reports are not expected to fully answer such questions, due to their national scope and focus. To capture such aspects, a questionnaire for national projects will be used (annex B). This method will also enable the team to quantify the findings. It is not expected that all national stakeholders will fill the questionnaire, so the chances of getting inputs from all countries will be enhanced by submitting the questionnaire to national teams, UNDP CO staff and also the evaluators of the national projects.

### Tables and tools

The data gathering, compiling and analysis will be assisted by the use of tables and tools. The AAP Team and stakeholders will be requested to assist with filling info into these; the advantages of such involvement are that it a) ensures that entries are correct and comprehensive, and b) that stakeholders participate actively in the evaluation/analysis process, which will enhance ownership of the evaluation findings. The tools include the following:

* A table presenting the cumulated results and outputs of the programme against the logical framework/results framework (goal, objectives, outcomes, outputs, targets), including physical achievements (e.g. number and types of trainings, number of people trained). If possible, the table should also present the results obtained (e.g. actual use of new skills, changed practices/approaches resulting from activities). This table will be extracted from the programme monitoring system by the ICTSC
* An overview matrix of the delivery of each country vis-à-vis programme objective and outcomes (annex C). To be filled by the Evaluation Team in collaboration with IRTSC
* A global Mid-term Review recommendation implementation status form (annex D). This table tracks the actions implemented in response to the MTR recommendations and the results/improvements achieved. To be filled by AAP Team in New York and IRTSC
* The above-mentioned stakeholder consultation tracking form (annex E). To be filled by AAP Team in New York and IRTSC
* A table for rating AAP and each component in relation to specific criteria related to the programme’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency/timeliness, sustainability (annex I)
* The above-mentioned organigram (annex A). Has already been prepared by the AAP Team in New York
* The above-mentioned questionnaires (annexes B and H). To be filled by national project stakeholders and journalists

## Analysis and reporting

Analysis of findings will be an iterative process throughout the evaluation. This will enable the team to discuss and test the initial findings with stakeholders as the evaluation progresses; which will ensure a) that the analysis is participatory and stakeholders can assume ownership of the findings, and b) that the Evaluation Team can adjust its emphasis to stay on track and ensure that the evaluation focuses on the key issues. An important element of this process is that stakeholder participation and inputs described in relation to the methods and tools applied in the evaluation. An advantage of the use of the questionnaire and tables is that they will facilitate a quantitative analysis and identification of trends and lessons of wider applicability. The raw data collected will also be provided to the AAP team to enhance the resources available for further learning.

The detailed outline for the evaluation report is presented in annex J.

## Early observations

At this preliminary stage of the evaluation, a number of potential key issues for the evaluation to look into more closely have emerged. These include:

* Country project design – this process took much longer than originally anticipated, and seems to be the major reason for the delays experienced in programme implementation. Nonetheless, the end designs appear generally to be appropriate and relevant for each country. An important lesson seems to be to allow sufficient time for the design processes and building of national capacity in this regards.
* Programme management, coordination and oversight – a number of the main issues affecting the programme seems to relate to this:
	+ AAP seems to have struggled with a fragmented management setup for the various components (called “the firewall” in MTR Report). Among other things, this seems to have impacted on ability to monitor overall programme progress and capture lessons, especially for replication, and to document changes achieved vis-à-vis the objective and goal (sub-goals) at the overall Programme level. The mandate of the IRTSC in relation to monitoring may have been insufficient.
	+ Prior to the introduction of the OSC, the Board appears to have been unable to provide sufficient guidance and oversight to IRTSC and AAP implementation. The introduction of the OSC seems to have rectified this shortcoming.
	+ Coordination between Bureaux within UNDP – during formulation and early implementation the coordination and involvement of RBx was limited. This appears initially to have affected the ownership of UNDP COs and RBx. It is the impression of the Team that the RBx and COs now play a much more significant role in the implementation of, and support for, country programmes. It appears that closer collaboration between Bureaux from the programme formulation stage would have benefited the programme.
	+ Cross practice support – the functionality of cross practice support to AAP appears to have varied significantly, in some areas the added value of this has been substantial, in others it has been marginal.
* Administrative and financial systems and procedures have resulted in delays in programme implementation:
	+ Staff recruitment for the IRTSC was delayed.
	+ Disbursements were in some instances delayed.
	+ There have been difficulties in locating vendors.
* Impact and outcome monitoring:
	+ The M&E system appears not to have been able to fully capture changes at the goal and objective levels and the actual contribution of AAP to these – at least at the overall programme level. For example, the system seems not to fully have captured the results in terms of e.g., changed government practices and budgets, or the functionality of climate change committees/coordinating bodies created and their ability to influence government and sector ministries. Nonetheless, some elements are captured in the IRTSC monitoring, such as direct influences by some national projects on the formulation of policies and plans. Furthermore, the ongoing national project evaluations and the lessons learned study are anticipated to help capturing these aspects. It is also acknowledged by the Team that it can be extremely difficult to monitor impact of policy programmes.
	+ The PPAS /cross practice component does not have specific targets and indicators one can monitor against. It is however understood, that it is very difficult to identify in advance relevant targets and indicators for a component, which focuses entirely on responding to emerging needs for support.
* Sustainability – across the entire programme, most progress was made during late 2011 and 2012, and spending increased exponentially. Stakeholders generally agree that AAP has generated some very valuable innovations and lessons for future interventions and upscaling. While this progress is significant, the question is whether there has been sufficient time to consolidate the results achieved:
	+ Initially, stakeholder ownership at the national level appears to have been limited. This has seemingly improved significantly, but the question is whether national stakeholders have fully internalised the tools and skills obtained and are able and willing to continue the process. This also included more mundane questions such as future maintenance and updating of data systems and hardware installed.
	+ The programme has achieved significant results in promoting knowledge management and creating a culture of lessons sharing among country programmes. However, the tools and approaches developed by AAP appear not currently to be made readily available for a broader audience outside the programme. This, in connection with the scattering of former AAP staff may limit the potential for replication and upscaling of the approach developed by AAP. It is also uncertain whether the lessons, tools and approaches from AAP will be internalised and mainstreamed in UNDP.
	+ The Media Capacity Building Component appears to have been effective in building the capacity of journalists and increasing the visibility of climate change issues in the media in the countries and regions. It seems likely that this result will continue after programme completion, with the new skills and knowledge given to journalists.

## Allocation of tasks and roles

### Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will in close consultation with the AAP Team lead the evaluation process. The main evaluation areas will be preliminarily divided between the two team members as per the table below. As the evaluation progresses, the Team may choose to adjust the division of labour.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Team Leader**  | **Supporting Consultant**  |
| Overall evaluation management | Lead | Support |
| National component | Anglophone countries | Francophone countries |
| IRTSC component | Lead | Support |
| MCBP component | Lead | Support |
| PPAS/cross practice component | Support | Lead |
| AAP HQ Team  | Support | Lead |
| Institutional and coordination arrangements | Lead | Support |
| Programme formulation process | Support | Lead |
| Programme monitoring framework | Lead | Support |
| Financial management and spending | Support | Lead |
| Administrative procedures | Support | Lead |
| Partnerships | Support | Lead  |

### AAP Team

The AAP HQ team composed of AAP focal points at BDP/EEG, RBA and RBAS will be responsible for the overall direction of the evaluation process. The AAP HQ Team and IRTSC Team will also support the team in ensuring the availability of data and documentation, and facilitation contact to stakeholders. Furthermore, they will advise the Evaluation Team on the prioritisation of stakeholders for interviews and interview timing. They will also participate in entering data into the above described tables/tools. AAP national teams will fill the questionnaire. Other key AAP actors, including from BDP/EEG and RBx will be consulted by the Evaluation Team, e.g. through interviews.

# Schedule

The Evaluation Team will to the extent possible carry out the evaluation as per the revised timeline (annex H) provided by the AAP Team. There may be some adjustments to the detailed sequencing and time allocation of the processes internal to the Evaluation Team (document review, analysis, outlining and drafting of report sections), but the Team will endeavour to keep the timing outlined, whenever it involves or affects programme stakeholders, such as interviewing and delivery of evaluation outputs. Although the Evaluation Team finds the timeline generally feasible, it is also considered tight and depending on a number of factors, which lie outside the direct control of the Evaluation Team, the AAP HQ Team and IRTSC, especially:

* National evaluation reports – there is a probability that not all reports will be available in final or final draft form on 18 January. While the Team can accommodate for some delay of some reports, some reports may not be available in due time to feed into the Programme Evaluation (e.g. Tanzania). Furthermore, if a large proportion of the national evaluation reports is delayed, it would become difficult for the Evaluation Team to complete the Programme Evaluation as per the timeline. Only reports available in final or final draft form on 8 February can be included in the analysis, if the Programme Evaluation Report and Presentation is to be available at the Programme Board Meeting in mid March.
* Given the programme has ended and most staff have left the programme or will do so in the near future, it is important that the interviews with former and current interregional staff (e.g. IRTSC staff) and stakeholders take place as soon as possible. In the timeline, these interviews are scheduled to commence in the week 14-18 January. While this is indeed feasible, the Evaluation Team needs to consult further documentation and to receive the filled stakeholder consultation tracking form in order to plan the interviews and contact stakeholders to schedule them. Thus, the interview process can at the earliest begin on Wednesday 16 January.
* Given the large number of stakeholders, which are spread over different countries and time zones, it may be difficult to reach all key interviewees within the time frame allocated. Some interviews may thus have to take place later in the evaluation process.
* The questionnaire responses from some of the national stakeholders may be delayed.

# Annex A AAP Organisational Charts



AAP Programme Board Co-chairs:

* The Bureau for Development Policy/Environmental and Energy Group (BDP/EEG)
* The Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA)
* The Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS)

AAP Programme Board Members:

* 1 representative of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
* 1 representative of the Bureau for External Relations and Policy (formerly Partnership Bureau)
* 2 representatives from participating RBA countries
* 1 representative from participating RBAS countries
* Members of BDP practice groups (Poverty, Gender, KICG/CDG)
* UNV

Operations Subcommittee (OSC) (established in December 2011), Members: representatives from RBA, RBAS, BDP/EEG, BERA, and IRTSC.

****

# Annex B National Project Questionnaire on Regional Support

Please see the attached Excel spreadsheet.

This questionnaire is to be filled by national project stakeholders (government project managers and UNDP CO).

# Annex C Country Results Vis-à-Vis Overall Programme Goal, Objective and Outcomes

One table to be prepared for each of the below sub-goals, objective and outcomes. The phrasing has been adapted to reflect that programme implementation has concluded.

**Goal**:

* *Sub-goal 1: Adaptive capacity of vulnerable countries to climate change & disaster risks enhanced*
* *Sub-goal 2: Early adaptation through evidence-based solutions & [initiative] for action promoted*
* *Sub-goal 3: Foundation laid for long-term investment to increase resilience to climate change across the African continent*

**Objective**: National development processes adjusted to incorporate climate change risks/opportunities

**Outcomes**:

* *Outcome 1. Countries have introduced dynamic, long-term planning mechanisms to manage the inherent uncertainties of climate change*
* *Outcome 2. Countries have built leadership capacities and developed institutional frameworks to manage climate change risks and opportunities in an integrated manner at the local and national levels*
* *Outcome 3. Countries are implementing climate resilient policies and measures in priority sectors*
* *Outcome 4. Financing options to meet national adaptation costs have been expanded at the local, national, sub-regional and regional levels*
* *Outcome 5. Knowledge on adjusting national development processes to fully incorporate climate change risks and opportunities is being generated and shared across all levels*
* *Outcome 6. AAP projects are being effectively managed in accordance with UNDP standards*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Relevant country objective** | **Achievement of Objective/ Outcome (pls tick off)** | **Evidence** | **Main enabling factors** | **Main limiting factors/ constraints/ challenges** | **AAP contribution** | **Other contributing initiatives** |
| **Fully** | **Partially** | **Not** |
| **AAP Goal/Objective/Outcome: XXXXXX**  |  |  |
| Burkina Faso |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cameroon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Congo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethiopia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gabon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ghana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kenya |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lesotho |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Malawi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mauritius |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morocco |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mozambique |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Namibia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Niger |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nigeria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rwanda |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sao Tome and Principe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senegal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tanzania |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tunisia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Annex D Global Mid-term Review Recommendation Status Form

This table is to be filled by AAP Team in New York and IRTSC.

|  |
| --- |
| **TO ADVANCE REGIONAL PUBLIC GOODS & REGIONAL COOPERATION**  |
| **Recommendation** | **Implementer** | **Time-frame** | **Action Taken** | **Time**  | **Result achieved** |
| 1) Regional or subregional substantive workshops to consolidate lessons learnt on models for transformation (Outcomes, 1,2, & 3); | IRTSC | March pipeline presented to Board  |  |  |  |
| 2). Regional or subregional gatherings to advance regional standards on relevant topics (Outcome 1 & 5)  | IRTSC | Any earlier implementation encouraged. Quarterly report |  |  |  |
| 3). Knowledge Fairs convened at national or subregional levels for sharing experiences, lessons learnt. | IRTSC, KM | Q2, on-going |  |  |  |
| 4). Knowledge management systems established with common regimes, standards  |  |  |  |
| 5). Increased synergies between components including Media Capacity Building project. | IRTSC/MCDP |   |  |  |  |
| 6). **Strengthened partnerships with global or regional entities** and co-sponsored gatherings to advocate AAP lessons for regional policy influence;  | IRTSC to lead; EEG Secretariat to support | On-going |  |  |  |
| 7). Establishing Advisory Committee from among top international academics in the field of climate change adaptation | EEG Secretariat | On-going  |  |  |  |
| 8). Resource mobilization strategy by mid-point of 2012 including proposal for interest income | EEG Secretariat, RBA, RBAS, BERA | January, 2012 |  |  |  |
| 9). TICAD V inputs—working closely with RBA, the EEG Secretariat should draw lessons from AAP after the mid-point of 2012 | EEG Secretariat, RBA | Q2, 2012 |  |  |  |
| *Inter-regional workshops with AAP countries on EEG Hqs handbook on Establishing National Funds and other modalities of financing - possibly offered to other African and Arab states on a cost basis. Regional co-sponsorhip with the Government of Ghana is suggested. (Outcome 4)* | *EEG*  | *During 2012* |  |  |  |
| **TO SUPPORT CONTINUING PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES**  |
| **Recommendation** | **Implementer** | **Time-frame** | **Action Taken** | **Time**  | **Result achieved** |
| 10) Consolidating regional and national documentation, strengthening Knowledge management and products (Outcomes 1 & 5);  | IRTSC (DIMC, KM, Media) | Q3, Q4, 2012 |  |  |  |
| 11) Continued support for gender mainstreaming (Outcome 2) *(Resources undetermined)* | Cross practice Gender Team + IRTSC | On-going |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 12) Negotiations are underway with Poverty and Capacity Development Groups regarding return of resources | EEG Secretariat | December, 2011 |  |  |  |
| 13) Preparation of comprehensive press packets for partners, UNDP COs & Hqs. and others re: journalists under Media Capacity Building Project  | Nairobi Office (MCB) | Quarterly  |  |  |  |
| 14) Continued capacity building in DICM  | IRTSC (DICM) | On-going |  |  |  |
| 15) Continued support for on-going requests for targeted institutional strengthening;  | IRTSC | On-going |  |  |  |
| 16) Application of enhanced cost-sharing basis for 3 subcomponents under Outcome 2;  | IRTSC, CO's to cost share | Immediately |  |  |  |
| 17) Innovative Financing—significantly increase the outputs for this area of work or defer | IRTSC with EEG Cross practice policy support, Ghana AAP | Jan 2012: work plan agreed upon  |  |  |  |
| 18) Increased communications documentation to be shared frequently with public, donor, stakeholders | EEG Secretariat + Communications Team | On-going |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |  |  |  |
| **TO STRENGTHEN PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT**  |
| **Recommendation** | **Implementer** | **Time-frame** | **Action Taken** | **Time**  | **Result achieved** |
| 19) Designation of executive/equivalent for Country Projects to Regional Bureau for Africa and Regional Bureau for Arab States;  | RBA, RBAS | Immediately |  |  |  |
| 20) Establishment of EEG operations subcommittee of Board;  | EEG Operations Subcommittee (EEG Secretariat) | Immediately |  |  |  |
| 21) Simplification of reporting requirements, integration of results frameworks between regional and country activities, integration of 3 objectives | IRTSC (M&E Team) | January, 2012 |  |  |  |
| 22) Letter to UNDP COs regarding nurturing relations with local Embassy of Japan and other donors for AAP and sending copies or related reports to IRTSC. Jointly signed by RBx, EEG and BERA; standard format for national briefs prepared. | EEG Secretariat to draft letter & brief format, RBA, RBAS to send letter (with all signatories); CO's to follow up | January 2012, Reminders as needed.  |  |  |  |
| 23) Frequency of Board meetings—hold quarterly Board meetings | EEG Operations Subcommittee (EEG Secretariat) | Quarterly |  |  |  |
| 24) Instruction sheet drafted by IRTSC on cost-sharing system for 3 subcomponents and all other cost-sharing services | IRTSC | January, 2012 |  |  |  |
| 25) Under PDP, UNDP staff to be paid from CO Learning budget, not AAP resources | RBx to communicate to COs | January, 2012 |  |  |  |
| 26) Final evaluation: consultation with Office of Evaluation | EEG Secretariat to facilitate; IRTSC budget to fund evaluation; Office of Evaluation to provide guidance & clearance. | Q3 2012 |  |  |  |

# Annex E Stakeholder Consultation Tracking Form

Please see the attached Excel spreadsheet.

This form is to be filled by the AAP Team in New York and IRTSC.

# Annex F Key Programme Documentation

A list of key documents extracted from ToR and Resource Guide for Evaluators provided by AAP Team. The list may be subject to revision by the Evaluation Team.

* **Overall AAP**
* Programme Document
* Mid-term Review Report
* Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks
* Monitoring data
* Annual progress reports
* Quarterly progress reports
* Strategy documents
* Minutes of Programme Board meetings
* Guidelines and discussion papers
* Outreach materials, including Baobab Coalition Journal and fliers
* Work plans of implementation task teams
* Financial reports (based on Atlas)
* Financial audit reports
* **National component**
* National project evaluation reports

The meta-evaluation of the national component will be based on the national project evaluation reports, and the tables filled by stakeholders. However, there may in certain cases be a need to consult the following:

* National Project Documents
* National mid-term review reports
* Strategy documents
* Outreach materials including Baobab coalition and fliers
* Annual progress reports
* Quarterly progress reports
* AAP national projects cumulative reports (Japan Reports)
* Mission reports
* Newsletters
* Monthly financial reports based on ATLAS information
* **ITRSC**
* IRTSC Internal Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (2011 and 2012)
* Data component (HPC delivery status excel)
* Publications and flyers
* Knowledge management (KM) best practices
* Discussion papers
* Mission reports of IRTSC task managers and experts
* **MCBP**
* Project Document of MCBP
* Monthly reports of staff
* Mission reports
* Articles written by trained MCBP journalists
* **PPAS – Cross Practice**
* Cross practice Analysis document (forthcoming)
* PPAS Strategy for AAP (September 2010)
* Summaries of programme Board meetings
* Summaries of Operations Sub-committee (OSC) meetings
* Summaries of Cross Practice meetings
* Presentations on Cross Practice (i.e. Lesotho presentation)
* Cross Practice cumulative final report (December 2012) and other previous quarterly and annual reports
* AAP Cross Practice Framework (June 2010)
* Draft Cross practice Results and Resources Framework (December 2010)
* AAP Cross practice plan and concrete steps for implementation (February 2011)
* Integrated Policy Framework (September 2011)
* Monthly reports of staff
* Mission reports
* Policy briefs
* Knowledge products from the Practice Groups (Poverty Group Toolkit, Methodology for capacity needs assessment, etc.)
* Article for Baobab Coalition Journal on Cross practice
* Lesotho integrated support initiative (last updated September 2012)
* Discussion papers – 1) Gender 2) Climate Data and Information
* Briefing notes for senior management
* Other presentations (i.e. Board Meetings, AfricaAdapt Symposium)
* Side event concept notes, presentations, news articles on them
* Brownbag lunch concept notes, presentations, news articles on them

# Annex G Minutes of Skype Meetings

**Evaluation of the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP)**

**Subject:** Notes on the Skype Meeting 8 January 2013 16:30 CET

**Participants:** UNDP: Jennifer Stephens, Candida Salgado Silva, Yuqiong Zhou, Ryan Laddey. Evaluation Team/Consultants: Kris B. Prasada Rao and Niels Ipsen.

**Purpose:** First orientations regarding the evaluation assignment (start: 7 January 2013)

**Points from the discussions:**

* The evaluation shall a.o. provide lessons learned for future programming
* UNDP confirmed that almost all documentation is available on the Internet. The consultants confirmed that they have access to the internet sites given by UNDP. Candida Silva will assist further on documentation
* The Preliminary Inception Note/Plan is intended to be provided by the Evaluation Team/Consultants in the week 14-18 January
* It was agreed that the Consultants will develop and use questionnaires for inquiring key programme stakeholders – especially to get information on national teams’ comprehension of the regional support efficiency and effectiveness. The Consultants will be aware of the fact that the national teams are very busy in finalising their reports. Hence, communication with the national teams will be coordinated by Candida Silva
* Jennifer Stephens will send the proposed ToR format for the national reports to the Consultants
* The Consultants were made aware that there is an evaluation folder under each country folder
* Since the documentation of the programme is huge, UNDP will provide guidance to the Consultants on the key documentation (key docs)
* Candida Silva will send link to the Midterm Review Report
* UNDP will provide a list of key people to consult
* UNDP will provide a programme organisation diagram
* The Programme Manager (Ian Rector) will be available from 14 January 2013
* Terminal Report to be finished by end February 2013. However, draft compiled info will be made available for the Consultants by first week of January (matrices)
* Candida Silva will make available quarterly reports

The Evaluation Team, 10 January 2013

**Evaluation of the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP)**

**Subject:** Notes on the Skype Meeting 17 January 2013 14:30 CET

**Participants:** IRTSC: Ian Rector, Candida Salgado Silva

Evaluation Team: Kris B. Prasada Rao, Niels Ipsen

**Purpose:** Discussion on IRTSC, overall programme, and methodology for interacting with country stakeholders

**Agreed next steps:**

* Most of the national evaluations are expected to be submitted late, around end January of end February. The evaluators will thus focus on programme management and regional components first. It is agreed that a cut-off date for receiving national evaluation reports (final or draft) will be set. Reports submitted after this date will not be considered
* Kris will share the updated Inception Plan (2nd draft), which addresses Candida’s comments and has a revised version of annex C. It is suggested by the evaluators to have Friday 8 February as the final cut-off date
* Ian and Candida will reflect on the table in annex C, to suggest possible revisions and people to engage in filling the table. The purpose of annex C is to assess the changes (impact/results) achieved at the sub-goal, objective, and outcome levels of the overall AAP results framework. Outputs and achievements are already captured by the IRTSC monitoring system
* The Country questionnaire (annex B):
	+ Ian and Candida will on Friday 17 January provide a list of the support provided to each country. The evaluators will insert these in the questionnaires, so it is easier/quicker for the country stakeholders to fill out
	+ It will be considered whether to send questionnaire to all countries or a representative selection
	+ The questionnaire will be translated into French
	+ The questionnaire will be sent out to the countries directly by the evaluators on Tuesday 22 January, blind copy IRTSC and AAP NY team. It will be sent to national project managers and responsible UNDP CO officers
	+ The deadline for responding to the questionnaire will be Friday 25 January
	+ IRTSC will follow up with countries to ensure they fill and submit the questionnaire
* The questionnaire for journalists (annex H) will be translated into French and send out to 24 journalists on Friday 17 January or in the morning, Monday 21 January. The evaluators will send it out directly, blind copy IRTRC, AAP NY team, and Jackie
* Anonymised raw data from the questionnaire surveys will be shared with IRTSC
* Ian, Candida, Niels and Kris will talk again on Monday 21 January – 16.00 CET

The Evaluation Team, 17 January 2013

**Evaluation of the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP)**

**Subject:** Notes on the Skype Meeting 21 January 2013 17:00 CET

**Participants:** IRTSC: Ian Rector, Candida Salgado Silva

Evaluation Team: Kris B. Prasada Rao, Niels Ipsen

**Purpose:** Discussion on methodology for interacting with country stakeholders (annex B table) and for assessing results at the goals and objectives level (annex C table)

**Agreed next steps:**

* The Team will finalise the country questionnaires and insert the specific support activities provided by the IRTSC as per the info provided by Candida
* The Team will send the questionnaires to IRTSC who will distribute them to country stakeholders who will be requested to send their response to the Team
* IRTSC will follow-up with country stakeholders re. the filling of the quesitonnaire
* Candida will provide the Team with and overview and brief explanation of the different activity types included in the questionnaires
* The Team will on the basis of information from the national evaluation reports fill the results table (annex C). IRTSC will assist the Team in case the evaluation reports not provide easy access to the needed information.
* Ian will provide a brief write-up on the background and key points from AAP to serve as background information for the Team

The Evaluation Team, 21 January 2013

# Annex H AAP Programme Evaluation Timeline (Version 4)

Revised timeline to accommodate for late national evaluation reports.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Team Leader** | **Supporting Consultant** | **Deadline** |
| Translate MCBP/journalist questionnaire to French |  | X | Sun 20 Jan |
| Submit MCBP/journalist questionnaire | English | French | Mon 21 Jan |
| Finalise country project questionnaire | X |  | Mon 21 Jan |
| Translate country project questionnaire to French |  | X | Mon 21 Jan |
| Submit country project questionnaire | English | French | Tue 22 Jan |
| Develop detailed outline for Programme Evaluation Report | X |  | Tue 22 Jan |
| Finalise and submit Inception Plan | X | X | Wed 23 Jan |
| *Deadline for questionnaire responses* | *Fri 25 Jan* |
| Interviews with all global and regional stakeholders, including UNDP NY, IRTSC, Cross Practice/PPAS, RBx, partner institutions | X | X | Fri 25 Jan |
| Document review (overall programme, 3 regional components) | X | X | Fri 25 Jan |
| Draft Programme Evaluation section on MCBP | X |  | Fri 1 Feb |
| Draft Programme Evaluation section on HQ team, including Cross Practice (PPAS) |  | X | Fri 1 Feb |
| Draft programme evaluation sections on programme background, management, coordination, administration, financial management, M&E etc. | X | X | Fri 8 Feb |
| *Cutoff point for national evaluation reports* | *Fri 8 Feb* |
| Review of national evaluations and reports/documents from 20 AAP countries | English | French | Fri 15 Feb |
| Draft sections of Programme Evaluation Report for National Projects | X | X | Fri 22 Feb |
| Finalise draft synthesized evaluation report | X | X | Fri 22 Feb |
| Incorporate comments/finalise Programme Evaluation Report | X | X | Fri 8 Mar |
| Development of presentation on final evaluation for AAP Board Meeting | X |  | Tue 12 Mar |
| Presentation of findings at AAP Programme Board meeting (tentative) | X |  | Tue 12 Mar |

# Annex H Questionnaire on MCBP

Please see the attached Excel spreadsheet.

This questionnaire is to be filled by the 24 journalists engaged in MCBP.

# Annex I Programme and Component Performance Rating Form

The table will be used to provide an assessment rating against the main criteria evaluated; the scores given reflect the following (1 – very low/unsatisfactory, 2 – low/below expectations, 3 – medium/meets expectations, 4 – high/above expectations, 5 – very high/excellent performance).

A table will be prepared for the overall Programme and each component.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Sub-criteria** | **Findings and conclusion/explanation** | **Score (1-5)** |
| **Relevance** | Relevance for national and regional needs and priorities |  |  |
| Relevance for UNDP mandate and priorities |  |  |
| Addressing critical constraints |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** | Achievement of intended change described in each programme and component objective and outcomes (each objective/outcome to be listed separately) |  |  |
| Delivery of planned outputs |  |  |
| Targets reached |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Efficiency** **(incl. timeliness)** | Completion of planned activities |  |  |
| Timeliness of technical support/capacity building |  |  |
| Cost-effectiveness |  |  |
| Conduciveness and timeliness of administrative/approval procedures  |  |  |
| Timeliness of disbursement and procurement |  |  |
| Responsiveness of management/oversight structure to address critical/emerging issues |  |  |
| Ability of M&E system to guide implementation and capture results/change |  |  |
| Responsiveness and timeliness of coordination mechanisms |  |  |
| Ability to engage and collaborate with partners |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** | Ownership and commitment of stakeholders |  |  |
| Sufficiency of stakeholder capacity |  |  |
| Integration of AAP processes in systems/planned continuation of processes (e.g. at country level) |  |  |
| Absorption/mainstreaming of approaches (e.g. in UNDP) |  |  |
| Replicability/upscaling potential |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Overall** |  |  |  |

# Annex J Evaluation Report Outline

1 Executive summary

1.1 Brief description of programme

1.2 Context and purpose of the evaluation

1.3 Main conclusions

1.4 Overview of recommendations

1.5 Overview of lessons learned

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

2.2 Key issues addressed

2.3 Methodology of the evaluation

2.4 The MTR team and programme

2.5 Structure of the evaluation

3 The Programme and its Development Context

3.1 Programme start and its duration

3.2 Challenges that programme seek to address

3.3 Objective and goal of the programme

3.4 Main stakeholders

3.5 Results expected

4 Findings and Conclusions

4.1 Programme Formulation Process

4.1.1 Overall programme

4.1.2 National projects

4.1.3 Regional components

4.2 Programme Implementation

4.2.1 Programme management and coordination

4.2.2 Implementation modalities

4.2.2.1 Overall Programme

4.2.2.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.2.2.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.2.2.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.2.2.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.2.3 Administrative procedures

4.2.4 Financial management

4.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation

4.2.5.1 Overall Programme

4.2.5.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.2.5.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.2.5.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.2.5.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.2.6 Indicators and baselines

4.2.6.1 Overall Programme

4.2.6.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.2.6.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.2.6.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.2.6.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.2.7 Coordination with partners

4.2.7.1 Overall Programme

4.2.7.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.2.7.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.2.7.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.2.7.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.2.8 Stakeholder participation

4.2.8.1 Overall Programme

4.2.8.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.2.8.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.2.8.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.2.8.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.2.9 Cost effectiveness

4.2.10 Replication approach

4.2.11 Linkage of the programme and other interventions within the sector (UNDP-UNEP CC DARE, UNDP-UNEP PEI)

4.3 Results

4.3.1 Attainment of Goal/Objective

4.3.1.1 Overall Programme

4.3.1.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.3.1.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.3.1.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.3.1.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.3.2 Attainment of Outcomes/Outputs

4.3.2.1 Overall Programme

4.3.2.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.3.2.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.3.2.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.3.2.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.3.3 Sustainability

4.3.3.1 Overall Programme

4.3.3.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.3.3.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.3.3.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.3.3.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

4.3.4 Replicability

4.3.4.1 Overall Programme

4.3.4.2 Component 1 – national projects

4.3.4.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

4.3.4.4 Component 3 – MCBP

4.3.4.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

5 Lessons Learned

5.1 Overall Programme

5.2 Component 1 – national projects

5.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

5.4 Component 3 – MCBP

5.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Evaluation criteria and AAP performance (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, timeliness, sustainability)

6.1.1 Overall Programme

6.1.2 Component 1 – national projects

6.1.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

6.1.4 Component 3 – MCBP

6.1.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice

6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 Overall Programme

6.2.2 Component 1 – national projects

6.2.3 Component 2 – IRTSC

6.2.4 Component 3 – MCBP

6.2.5 Component 4 – PPAS/Cross practice
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Annex 2 Achievement of sub-goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

Annex 3 National project survey results

Annex 4 Journalist survey results

Annex 5 Questionnaire on Support for National Projects

Annex 6 Questionnaire for trained journalists

Annex 7 Terms of Reference

Annex 8 Evaluation Timeline
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Annex 11 Inception Plan 1