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## Annex 1 - Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

**FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE LDCF NAPA PROJECT**

***Type of consultancy: Individual Contractor (Intellectual Service)***

1. **Project title:** Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan
2. **Project description:**

|  |
| --- |
| In accordance with applicable policies for UNDP/GEF projects, all GEF-funded projects implemented by UNDP are subjective to a mid-term and a final independent evaluation. The purpose for this independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) is to undertake at the end of the last year of implementation an evaluation will determine whether the project has achieved its intended outcomes. The TE will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring actions for implementation of similar programmes; and will present the lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this TE will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation of similar projects. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy” (see  <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf>  The project is being co funded by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) for Adaptation to climate change (USD 3,300,000), and UNDP Sudan Country Office (USD 500,000) and in kind support from the government of Sudan (USD 3,000,000). The project is being implemented through the National Implementation Modality (NIM) by the Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR). In terms of project ‘supervision’ (as opposed to ‘implementation’), UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency and provides strategic, technical and administrative support to the HCENR.  The project is currently implementing NAPA priority interventions to build resilience in the agriculture and water sectors to the adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan which aims to minimize and reverse the food insecurity and enhance adaptive capacity of small-scale farmers and pastoralists resulting from climate change, including variability in (originally 5) vulnerable regions representing the different ecological settings in Sudan now reduced to (4 regions) due to cessation of the South Sudan. The project has been implemented over five -year period, having started in November 2009 and ending in late 2014.  This Terminal Evaluation will take place when key activities are showing results, and the project is gaining visibility all through the states where it operates.  The PRODOC has identified three components (outcomes) outcomes and several results-oriented indicators. The outcomes that will contribute to the achievement of the project  Objectives are:   1. Resilience of food production systems and food insecure communities in the face of climate change 2. Institutional and individual capacities to implement climate risk management responses in the agriculture sector strengthened 3. A better understanding of lessons learned and emerging best practices captured and up-scaled at the national level |
|  |
| **C: Scope of work**  The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective, identify lessons learnt and to produce possible recommendations on how to expand and upscale the best climate change adaptation practices. The Terminal Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting future climate change adaptation programming in the country. Its main objectives are:   * To document the lessons learnt on project management and monitoring functions of the climate change adaptation projects; * To document the best lessons learnt for enhancing accountability for the achievement of the climate change adaptation objectives; * To enhance organizational and development learning; * To enable informed decision-making for future climate change adaptation programming;   Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the extent of achieving all the outcomes in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is implemented. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:  This Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP/LDCF Project is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to determine the achievement of the intended outcomes. It aims to provide the Implementation Agency (HCENR), UNDP-Sudan Country Office and UNDP-GEF at all levels with strategy and policy options and lessons for replicating the results.  The Terminal Evaluation will highlight lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.  The evaluators will assess the project design. They should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, outcomes, outputs, planned activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. in relation to:  a) Development priorities at the national level;  b) Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;  c) Country ownership / drivenness – participation and commitments of government, states, local authorities, and communities;  d) UNDP mission to promote assisting the country to build its capacities in the focal area of adaptation to climate change;  e) Meeting the LDCF adaptation guidelines: Demonstrating increases in adaptive capacity and resilience for climate change and assess whether and how the engagement of communities has had a particular contribution and added value to community adaptation to climate change;   * Develop a lesson-learning and replication strategy, and a strategy to integrate project results and lessons learnt into the wider dissemination and scale up plans.   The evaluation will assess the outcomes, outputs, and indicators achieved by the project as well as the likely inroads to sustainability of project results. This should encompass the following:  Attainment of objectives and planned results:   * Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives are being achieved; taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In addition, the team will assess the indicators matrix as to its utility for determining sustainability and replicability impact. * Assess the level to which the project has followed guidelines of the LDCF Strategic Priority on Adaptation and recommend ways to further strengthen this linkage.   Achievement of outputs and activities:   * Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced so far in relation to its expected results. * Assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the work plan in implementing the components of the project. * Assess the quality, appropriateness and timeliness of the project with regard to:   + Satisfying the following GEF objectives;   + Delivering global environmental benefits; and   + Achieving financial and environmental sustainability for the project intervention.   The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.  The evaluation will take place mainly in the field. The Consultant will also be accompanied a National Consultant forming a team. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, states’ governments, Higher council for Environment and Natural Resources, the Ministry of Environment and Physical Development, Project Board, project team, and key stakeholders.  The evaluation team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual Reports (PIRs), project budget revision, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the team may consider useful for evidence based assessment.  The evaluation team is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. The evaluation team is also expected to visit the project sites.  The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:   * Documentation reviewed; * Interviews; * Field visits; * Questionnaires; * Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.   Although the evaluation team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP, GEF, LDCF or the project management.  The evaluation team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.  **D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**  The output of the mission will be the Evaluation Report in English. The length of the Report should not exceed 30 pages in total (not including the annexes).  Initial draft of the Evaluation Report will be circulated for comments to UNDP (both CO and Bratislava Regional Office), and the Project Manager. After incorporation of comments, the Evaluation Report will be finalized.  The Evaluation Report template following the GEF requirements is attached in [Annex 1](#Annex1) of this TOR.  **Deliverables/ Outputs**  **Deliverable 1: preparation and pre-reading of project document, Project’s Midterm Evaluation report; NAPA document and any other relevant material**   * Duration: 2 Working Days; * Target: 1/November 2014.   Review and Approval:   * Head of  Energy& environment Unit; * Programme Specialist   **Deliverable 2: Conduct the filed mission**   * Duration: 10 Working Days * Target: 30 November 2014   Review and Approval:   * Head of Energy and environment Unit; * Programme Specialist   **Deliverable 3: Report writing and Submission of Draft Report also incorporating requirement mentioned in the Scope of Works (Section C)**   * Duration: 6 Working Days; * Target: 15 February 2015.   Review and Approval:   * Head of Energy and environment Unit; * Programme Specialist; * UNDP/GEF Regional Advisor - Climate Change Adaptation.   **Deliverable 4: Amend and revise the report until Final Report is accepted by UNDP**   * Date:2 Working Days; * Target: 28 February 2015.   Review and Approval:   * Head of Energy and environment Unit; * Programme analyst; * UNDP/GEF Regional Advisor - Climate Change Adaptation.   **E. Institutional Arrangement**  This is mainly a Home based Consultancy but requiring 10 days of field work in Sudan. The International Consultant, assisted by a National Consultant will performs his duties under the overall guidance of the Team Leader of the Energy and Environment Unit of UNDP Sudan Country Office and in coordination as informed by the technical guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor.    The consultant should liaise with the following institutions:   * The Ministry of Environment, Forests and Physical Development; * GEF- Operation Focal Point; * Agriculture Research corporations (ARC); * The State Ministries of Agriculture; * The Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCNER) * International Cooperation Directorate – Ministry of Finance   The role of these institutions is to avail their relevant information, reflect their views and participate in the consultative meetings and review of the evaluation document.  **F**. **Duration of the Work**  The consultancy service needs to be carried out in 4 months duration starting 1st November 2014 to 28th February 2015. However, given the amount of deliverables and it is home-based consultancy, the entire milestones mentioned in the Section D above must be completed in 20 working days.  **G. Duty Station**  It is a home-based consultancy, but the consultant is required to travel to Sudan and stay for 10 working days for conducting the field surveys and counterparts interviews. For such a reason, the Consultant is required to consider cost of ticket, terminal expenses, insurance, and Living allowance to meet the expenditures in Sudan. |
| **H. Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractor** |
|  |
|  |
| a) Postgraduate University degree in economics, social sciences or environment related fields;  b) Extensive expertise in the field of climate change adaptation and natural resource management issues;  c) 15- 25 years of work experience in the evaluating GEF and donors driven development projects. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset  d) Ability to analyze large amounts of data to identify key messages and indicators for easy visualization of complex analyses;  e) Demonstrated experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies.  **I**. **Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments:**  The consultancy will be remunerated through a Lump Sum amount which is “all-inclusive”. The Lump Sum is payable upon delivery and acceptance of all three products indicated in Section D above. The clearance of final products must be obtained by the persons identified in section D above. This contract price is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.  **Schedule of Payment:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Requirements | Payment % | | Deliverable 1: Project Preparation and pre-reading of project document completed | Nil | | Deliverable 2: Upon completion of Field Mission | 40% | | Deliverable 3: Report Writing and Submission of Draft Report to UNDP for review and feedback | Nil | | Deliverable 4: Amendment and Finalization of draft Report and its acceptance by UNDP | 60% | | Total | 100% |   **J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**   1. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references; 2. **Brief description** of why you consider yourself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, on how you will approach and complete the assignment.   **K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**  The offers received from the candidates will be evaluated using combined scoring method. The Combined Scoring method assesses the offers with technical merits of the proposals – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max. of 70%, and later combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%.  **Technical Scoring Grid (700 Points, Pass Marks 490):**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Assessment Criteria: | Maximum Obtainable Points | Weightage (%) | Evaluated Points Obtained by the Offerors | | | | A | B | C | | Postgraduate University degree in economics, social sciences or environment related fields | 150 | 21.5% |  |  |  | | Extensive expertise in the field of climate change adaptation and natural resource management issues | 150 | 21.5% |  |  |  | | Minimum of 7 years of work experience in the evaluating GEF and donors driven development projects. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system or equivalent will be considered an asset | 200 | 29% |  |  |  | | Ability to analyze large amounts of data to identify key messages and indicators for easy visualization of complex analyses | 100 | 14% |  |  |  | | Demonstrated experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies | 100 | 14% |  |  |  | | TOTAL | 700 | 100% |  |  |  |   The price proposals of candidates obtaining 490 points and higher (or 70% or above) will only be technically qualified; they will be reviewed and compared for the assessment of overall ranking of the proposals. Those obtaining lower than 490 points (or lesser than 70%) will be technically non-responsive proposals, price proposals of such candidate will not be compared.  **Assessment of the Price Proposals (300 Points) or 30%**  The lowest priced bid from among the technically qualified Offerors will obtain the full marks of 300 points in the price proposal. Price proposals of remaining qualified bidders will be prorated against the lowest priced bid using the following formula to derive the marks in their price proposal:  Marks obtained by a Bidder = Lowest Priced Bid (amount) / Bid of the Offeror (amount) X 300 (Full Marks)  **Award of the Contract/Award Criteria**:    The contract will be awarded to the candidate (bidder) whose proposal obtains the highest cumulative marks (points) when the marks obtained in technical and price proposals are aggregated together.  The contract award, however, is dependent on the conditions mentioned “Offerors Letter to UNDP – Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment”. Candidates disagreeing to fulfill the applicable conditions will not be eligible for contract award and signing.  The key criteria for rating the qualification and methodology has been stated together with their equivalent percentage weight, so that Offerors can be evaluated objectively. Therefore, candidates are required to pay highest attention to these requirement while preparing the technical and price proposals.  **L. Annexes to the TOR (not included here)**   1. The Evaluation Report template following the minimum GEF requirements (Annex 1); 2. Explanation on terminology provided in the GEF guidelines to terminal Evaluations (Annex 2); 3. Ethical code of conduct for UNDP Evaluations (Annex 3) 4. Sample IC Contract; 5. General Conditions of Contract for IC; 6. Offerors Letter to UNDP – Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment” |

## Annex 2 – Key Evaluation Questions

| **Key Question** | **Source of Information** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Doc. review** | **Meeting with project team** | **Brainstorm within Evaluation team** | **Key stakeholder interviews** | **Site visits** | **Self-Assessment Tool** |
| **Design and document and basics** | | | | | | |
| The project design | XX |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have the indicators/objective/outputs been delivered? | X | X | XX |  | XX |  |
| The overall project financial information – both LDCF and co-financing. We need to get them onto this. |  | XXX |  |  |  |  |
| **Local benefits** | | | | | | |
| How many ordinary people really benefitted, and to what extent? Does this equate to good value for each LDCF US$? – We need a good way to assess this. |  | Xx | XX |  |  | XXXXX |
| Is there *adequate* sustainability at site level? Again we need some way to measure this. (i) the technical inputs, are they sustainable, and was the follow-up reports enough (ii) Presence and viability of RFs and VDCs? Truly. |  | Xx | XX |  | XX | XX |
| **Broader impacts** | | | | | | |
| Is there *adequate* ‘up-linking’ – to Region and National governments/expertise/departments? How are their workprogrammes affected. Is there a policy aspect? How has ARC been affected? What is the point of all these late reports? How viable are the regional technical committees? |  |  |  | XX | XX | XXX |
| Humanitarian vs. development? A list of small help-outs? Or a model or a strategy? |  |  | XX | XX | XX |  |
| **MDG** | | | | | | |
| Any sufficiently meaningful on gender been achieved, even monitoring it? |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| **Knowledge capture and management** | | | | | | |
| Why so many documents that just list, list and list ‘achievements’? |  | XX |  | XX | XX |  |
| Have lessons been learnt, has knowledge been captured, in any way? Which? What are they? The knowledge products – do they exist, are they any good, are they used, are they fit for purpose? |  | XX |  | XX | XX |  |
| Adaptive management – UNDP, PSC, HNCER – have they been learning and adapting the project? And impact of our MTE? |  | XX |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **And specifically from the ToR (to be assess):** |  |
| * Implementation approach * LFM used during implementation * Presence of effective partnerships? * Financial planning * Monitoring and evaluation * UNDP * Identification and management of risks * Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff | Go through with Project team first, and then follow up. |

## Annex 3 – List of Documents Reviewed and Reference Documents

**Background documents**

*Environmental Degradation Triggering Tensions and Conflict in Sudan* (UNEP, 2007)

*National Adaptation Programme of Action* (Government of Sudan, 2007)

*UN Common Country Analysis* (United Nations, Sudan, 2007)

*Sudan Poverty Reduction Strategy, the 5-Year Plan, 2007 – 2011* (Government of Sudan)

*Revised Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)* (GEF Council Paper no: GEF/LDCF.SCCF.8/Inf) (GEF, 2010).

*Accessing Resources under the LDCF Fund* (GEF, 2012).

*Sudan's Second National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* (Government of Sudan, 2007)

*UNDP Country Programme Document, 2013 – 2016* (UNDP, draft, 2013)

*Country Programme Action Plan Between the Government of the Republic of Sudan and the United Nations Development Programme, 2013-2016* (UNDP/GoS, Draft, 2013)

**Project Management and Planning Documents**

*Project CEO Endorsement Request*

*Project Document*, UNDP and GoS, 2009

*Project Inception Report* (October 2010)

*Report on the Mid-Term Evaluation*, Diek and Fenton, 2013

*Project Implementation Review*, Project, 2011

*Project Implementation Review*, Project, 2012

*Project Implementation Review*, Project, 2013

*Project Implementation Review*, Project, 2014

*Project Board Minutes* (2012, December 2013 and November 2014)

Project Final Workshop Report, November 2014

*Technical Support and Follow up of Adaptation Measures for the Climate Change Intervention in Sudan’s Selected Demo Areas – Mission Reports* (4 reports covering South Darfur, River Nile, North Kordafan and Gadaref States), Prof. Mekki Abdellatif Omer, 2013

*Terms of reference for preparation of knowledge products and documentations of the successes achieved under the NAPA implementation supported by the LDCF*

**Project Outputs**

*NAPA Best Practices in Sudan - Documentation Study*, Dr. Faisal M. A. El-Hag, Mohamed Sallaheldin Mohamed Elhassan and Dr. Abdelrahman A. Khatir, 2012

*Gender Analysis at NAPA Implementation Project Villages at River Nile*, Elgedarif, North Kordufan and South Darfur States, Dr. Shadia Naser Eldin Elsayed, December 2013

*Participatory Rural Early Warning System Phase One: Draft Report*, Noureldin Ahmed Abdalla

*Communication Plan for Climate Change Adaptation*, HCENR, December 2013

*Report on: Consultancy on Biogas and alternative energy sources for domestic energy in NAPA implementation project areas*, Dr. Elyaman Fadlalla, November 2013.

*Documentation and Monitoring Study*, Mahmoud Awad Mekki, January 2014

**Project Awareness Material**

“*A fresh crop: exciting environmental initiatives take hold in Northern Suda*n” Article on UNDP Arab States website ([www.arabstates.undp.org](http://www.arabstates.undp.org))

*Project Brief – covering the UNDP and CIDA Climate Change Adaptation Project*

*LDC Experiences on Working towards Greater Food Security in a Changing Climate* (Flyer Announcement, May 2014)

*GEF Assembly Side Event - LDC Experiences Ensuring Food Security in a Changing Climate: Sharing Lessons and Looking* *Forward* (Flyer, May 2014)

*Sudan – Gender and Climate Change* (Draft, September 2014)

**Related Documents**

*Technology Needs Assessment for Climate Change Adaptation,* Ministry of Environment and HCENR, March 2013.

*Evaluation of Goat Improvement Project under the Western Sudan Resource Management Program*[[1]](#footnote-1) (WSRMP), Faisal M. El-Hag et al, September 2013

*Project Document: Implementing Priority Adaptation Measures to Build Resilience of Rainfed Farmer and Pastoral Communities of Sudan, Especially Women Headed Households, to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change*, CIDA, UNDP and GoS; 2014

*Project Document: Climate Risk Finance for Sustainable and Climate Resilient Rain-fed Farming and Pastoral Systems*, GEF/LDCF, UNDP and GoS; 2014

*National Preliminary Evaluation of the Sudan Project: Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan*, HCENR, 2014[[2]](#footnote-2)

*Sudan Overview*, World Bank, October 2014 (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/sudan/overview>)

## Annex 4 – List of People Met and Interviewees

**National Government**

Hayder Elsafi, Secretary General, Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources

Dalal Elhaj, HCENR Project Focal Point

Abdel Rahman Khidir Osman, Technical Committee (HCENR)[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Project Team and Project Consultants**

Dr. Mutasim B. Nimir, Project Manager

Adil M. Ali, Deputy Project Manger

Suleiman Mohammed Ibrahim, Communication Specialist

Mahmoud Awad Mekki, Reporting/monitoring

Dr. Shadia Nareldeen, Gender Consultant

Prof. Mekki Abdellatif Omer, Technical Follow Up Expert (and Director, Water Harvesting Research Institute, ARC)

Dr. Noureldin Ahmed Abdualla Saeed, Rural Early Warning System Consultant

Dr. Elyaman Fadlalla, renewable/alternative energy specialist

**Staff from Other Projects**

Adil M. Ali, Project Manager, CIDA Adaptation Project[[4]](#footnote-4)

Mahmoud Awad Mekki, Communications Officer, LDCF Climate Risk Finance Project Team[[5]](#footnote-5)

Dalal El-Tayeb Bashir, M+E officer, LDCF Climate Risk Finance Project Team

Tariq Elgamri, National Project Coordinator, CIDA Adaptation Project

**International Organizations**

Bradley Smith, Programme Coordinator, UNEP

Mey Ahmed, Climate Change and Peace Building Focal Point, UNEP

Samah El-Bakri, UNEP

**UNDP**

Tom Twining-Ward, Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP/GEF

Min Htut Yin, UNDP Sudan Environment and Energy Team Leader

Hanan Mutwakil, Programme Officer

Jennifer Baumwoll, Project Coordinator, Canada-UNDP Climate Change Adaptation Facility, UNDP - Global Environment Facility

**Other**

Faisal El-Hag, Director, Drylands Research Centre, Agricultural Research Corporation and Director, International Cooperation Department, ARC

Dr. Noureldin Ahmed Abdualla Saeed, Coordinator of the Sudan Climate Change Network.

**Self-Assessment Focus Group**

Amin H. Habani, North Kordofan State, Member of Technical committee, livestock specialist

Khalid H. Ibrahim, Gedaref State Coordinator, Member of Technical Committee

Dr. Hashim Regab, University of Gedaref, Member of Technical Committee

Rashid M. Maghrabi, Nile State Coordinator

Abdelatif H. Mohamad, Nile State, Member of Technical Committee

Ali F. Ali, Member of Nile State Assembly, Member of Nile State Technical Committee and community representative

Abdel Rahman M. Tahir, South Darfur State Coordinator

Abdulla M. Hassan, Ministry of Agriculture, South Darfur, Member of Technical Committee

**North Kordofan State**

Project Regional Coordinator, and Director General, North Kordofan Ministry of Agriculture

Members of Project NK Technical Committee representing: Dept. of Animal Resources, NK Ministry of Agriculture; Pastoralist Union (Bara locality); Federal Forestry Department; Agricultural Department, Bara Locality; Animal Production Department, NK Ministry of Agriculture; Vegetable Producers Union (Bara locality); Horticulture Department, NK Ministry of Agriculture; Bara Agriculture Extension Department; NK Research Station, Agricultural Research Corporation.

El Heimrat village, 30 – 50 village representatives

Forja village, 30 – 50 village representatives

Shahgenom village, – 30 – 50 village representatives

Ms. Hint, Officer, World Food Programme, NK Programme

## Annex 5 – The Evaluation Mission Itinerary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Destination** |
| 14th February (02:20) | Arrival in Khartoum (Mr. Fenton) |
| 15th - 19th February | Planning and preparing meetings  Meetings with Key Stakeholders in Khartoum  Documentation Review  Preparation of tools for field visit and for self-assessment workshop |
| 20th – 22nd February | Field Visit to North Kordofan State, including meeting with Technical Committee, and travel to El Heimrat, Forja and Shahgenom communities. |
| 23rd February | Self-Assessment workshop with representatives of all four states |
| 24th and 25th February | Preparation of initial findings (evaluators working together)  Final meetings with Project Stakeholders |
| 26th | Presentation to UNDP and members of Project team  Final meetings with Project Stakeholders |
| 27th February (03:30) | Depart Khartoum |

## Annex 6 – Self Assessment Tool

During the facilitated self-assessment workshop, representatives from the four States, as a group, discussed and completed the following questionnaire.

1. Did the Project effectively reach and help enough beneficiaries with support to their livelihood systems? And will it be sustained?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of input or support** | **Number of beneficiaries whose life - over the short term - *has been significantly improved* through the intervention** | | **Likelihood improvements will be maintained for 3 years or more** | | | | |
| **Male** | **Female** | **Very low**  **1** | **Low 2** | **Med. 3** | **High 4** | **Very high 5** |
| Diesel Pumps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shelter-belts: seedlings and drip irrigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agricultural extension |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veterinary services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gas stoves and cylinders |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solar energy for pumping drinking water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water harvesting, ploughing and terracing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seedlings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Financial training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other – specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other - specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Egs, evidence:   * . | | | | |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | | | | |

2. Quantity and quality of Technical support

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Support Sector** | **No. of visits (to each village)** | **How effective (quality) was the technical support to grassroots** | | | | | **Did Technical support meet needs of villages?** | | | | |
| **Very**  **Poor**  **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **Very**  **Good**  **5** | **Not at all**  **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **Completely**  **5** |
| Agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Livestock |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forestry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Energy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Evidence:   * . | | | | | Evidence:   * . | | | | |
|  |  |

3. Has the project sustainably built *institutional* capacity at grassroots level?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization or structure** | **Number significantly strengthened (already existing)** | **Number created** | **Total population covered** | **Likelihood changes will be maintained for 3 years or more** | | | | |
| **Very low**  **1** | **Low 2** | **Med. 3** | **High 4** | **Very high 5** |
| Village Development Committee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revolving Fund |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooperative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Examples, evidence:   * . | | | | | | | |

4. How innovative was the Project (note: there is no correct answer!!!!)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technology or Approach** | **How innovative?** | | | | | **Evidence, examples:** |
| **Not at all**  **(1)** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **Very (5)** |
| Natural Resource Management technology or practice |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organizational development |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach to gender/women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Financial skills/technologies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use of ICT (information and communication technology) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

5. Has the Project built capacity for support and replication at State level?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technology or Approach** | **extent** | | | | | **Evidence, examples:** |
| **Not at all**  **(1)** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **greatly (5)** |
| Did the Project strengthen existing state level (extension) structures? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did the Project construct new (extension) structures? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Will the Technical Committee continue after the Project? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have the Technical Committee members changed their practices as a result of the Project? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are the State Government departments changing allocating of budget and changing practices? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are there new policies, programmes or plans at State level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are other villages adopting the practices? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Has the private sector changed as a result of this Project? |  |  |  |  |  |  |

6. Co-Financing (State and Village level). What is the value of the contributions to the Project objective of the State partners and the communities?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Yearly value (estimated, SDP)** | **Total Value (estimated)** |
| State Office space |  |  |
| State Technical Committee time |  |  |
| State logistical support (vehicle, communications) |  |  |
| State budgetary support (programmes, equipment, agricultural inputs..) |  |  |
| State (other) |  |  |
| Community time |  |  |
| Community facilities (room, fuel, etc) |  |  |
| Community investments (equipment, materials, etc. |  |  |
| Other… |  |  |

7. Provide thoughts and suggestions on the Project’s Implementation approach

* Financial planning and processes
* Role of HCENR, UNDP, Project Coordination Unit
* M+E
* Risk management approach
* Communications

## Annex 7 - Details of the Mobilized Co-financing

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Contributor/Contribution** | **Sudanese Pounds** | **USD** |
| **National Government and agencies** | | |
| HCENR   * Office rent(3000X12x5)=180,000 * Management contribution (staff etc)(1500x3x12x5)=270,000 * Vehicles(1500xx3x4x5)=90,000   Total | 540,000 |  |
| Ministry of Environment   * contribution in meetings (3x5x5000)= | 75,000 |  |
| IRC El Obied:   * Hall rental(3000x3)=9,000 * Guest house(15x3x100)=4500 | 13,500 |  |
| Total HCENR | 628,500 | 101,370 |
| **Local Contributions** | |  |
| Nile State (all local contributions: TC time, office space, transport, local community commitments) | 929,600 |  |
| North Kordofan State (all local contributions: TC time, office space, transport, local community commitments) | 552,000 |  |
| Gedarif State (all local contributions: TC time, office space, transport, local community commitments) | 505,000 |  |
| South Darfur State (all local contributions: TC time, office space, transport, local community commitments) | 3,660,000 |  |
| Total States **Contributions** | 5,646,600 | 910,743 |
|  |  |  |
| **Total Government Contributions** | 6,275,100\* | **1,012,113** |
|  |  |  |
| **International Partners** | | |
| **UNDP** |  | **515,200** |
|  |  |  |
| **Grand Total** | | **1,527,313** |

\*Exchange rate: one USD = 6.20 SDG

## Annex 8 – Tables Summarizing the Projects Impacts

### 8a: Progress to Outputs, Outcomes and Objective

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Result** | **Evaluation Finding** |
| **Outputs** | |
| 1.1 Measures introduced to enhance communal water storage systems, water supply and reduce vulnerability to water scarcity (and flash-flood frequency) in the River Nile State, Northern Kordofan State, Gedarif State, Southern Darfur State, and Central Equatoria State | * Achieved; * There is substantial evidence of this happening (mostly self-reported); * Sustainability is not assured because of financial costs; * In some cases the water harvesting technology could be improved (based on existing ARC knowledge) |
| 1. 2 A set of measures to improve animal production and to increase adaptive capacity to climatic change implemented in the Nile State and Southern Darfur State | * Achieved; * There is substantial evidence of this happening (mostly self-reported) in all four states; * These villages were not covered by previous initiatives; * Investment costs are low and benefits are high and therefore sustainability is much more likely – and there are signs of other villages adopting the technology; |
| 1.3 A set of measures to improve crop production and to increase adaptive capacity to climatic change implemented in the Nile State and Southern Darfur State | * Achieved; * There is substantial evidence of this happening (mostly self-reported); * Improved existing crop production in two states (SD and G); * Horticulture production in all four states (new in those villages); * There has been no financial data collection or analysis to determine IRR or cost of production for the various crops; |
| 1.4 A set of measures to enhance rangelands productivity in the Northern Kordofan State; Gedarif State | * Achieved; * There is substantial evidence of this happening (mostly self-reported) in all four states; |
| 1.5 A set of measures for sand stabilization to combat sand dune encroachment on arable lands in the Northern Kordofan State and Southern Darfur State | * Achieved; * There is substantial evidence of this happening including some good data (mostly self-reported); * This includes: shelterbelts in River Nile State; tree planting in Gedaref State, and sand stabilization in NK and SD States; * However, to be successful, ultimately, sand stabilization requires a huge government run programme; |
| 1.6 A micro-credit, revolving loan and livestock fund established in target communities to build adaptive capacity and livelihood resilience in Northern Kordofan State | * Achieved; * Revolving funds have been supported in all four states – there is evidence and there is some data; * Not really any micro-credit structures; * Important involvement of women in this. |
| Other outputs under Outcome 1 | * Achieved; * The package varied from village to village, state to state. The Project provided many things not specifically included in 1.1 – 1.6, i.e.: fish ponds, gas stoves/cylinders, improved stoves, etc……) |
| 2.1 Integrate climate change awareness and risk management into extension programs to strengthen local capacity to address climate risks into livelihood activities. | * Achieved, with considerations. This is dependent on the interpretation of the Output – and the expected level of achievement; * The State Technical Committee members benefitted from training and involvement in this programme; * State extension staff in all four states benefitted; * There is some evidence and data on this – mostly self-reported; |
| 2.2 Awareness raising workshops for local people in order to ensure their participation in the adaptation projects under Outcome 1 e.g. rangeland rehabilitation process in the Northern Kordofan State, Gedarif State | Achieved. |
| 2.3 Establish local leadership councils and/or Resource Users Association to facilitate stakeholder engagement and ownership of pilot adaptation projects to be implemented under Outcome 1 | * Achieved, with considerations. This is dependent on the interpretation of the Output – and the expected level of achievement; * Village Development Committee and sub-committees created and/or strengthened; * There is some evidence and data on this – mostly self-reported. We have data and evidence; |
| 3.1 National menu of best practices available widely and mainstreamed into national development planning | * Not completely achieved; * ARC had identified best practices through previous research. The Project has helped make these available to the States and villages; * No evidence of mainstreaming these into national development planning. This is not the project’s fault (the traditional rain-fed sector is not a priority for development planners); |
| 3.2 Preparation a national food security policy in the face of climate change | * Not achieved; * No evidence the project was involved in this; * This would be very oo ambitious; * It is not clear who is responsible for this; |
| 3.3 Lessons codified and disseminated through the ALM | * Not achieved; * There are no lessons. There are many documents providing ‘publicity’ for the Project; * As there was no baseline or measuring of impact, there can be no real documentation of lessons. |
| 3.4 Lessons codified and disseminated through throughout Sudanese institutions | * Not completely achieved; * Two workshops were held and proceedings were disseminated (2012, and 2013); * There is to be a final activity with ARC. |
| **Outcomes and Indicators** | |
| Outcome 1: Resilience of food-production systems and food-insecure communities enhanced in the face of climate change in five (5) specific rural areas, identified as being the hardest hit by recurring food insecurity issues.  Indicator: Innovative coping mechanisms and practices with respect to adaptation to climate change risks to food security, e.g. rainwater harvesting, improved irrigation techniques, climate-resilient cropping and grazing systems, livelihood diversification, will be field- tested in 5 high-risks areas | * Obtained; * There is substantial evidence of this happening (mostly self-reported) in all four states; * No independently verified figures; * There was no baseline survey so it is impossible to measure or define the actual achievements; * It is important not to withdraw abruptly from villages – mostly, due to follow-up projects, this is so far respected; |
| Outcome 2: Institutional and individual capacities to implement climate risk management responses in the agriculture sector strengthened.  Indicator: Institutional and individual capacities to respond to climate change risks and plan for adaptation are in place through trainings and workshops;  50% of organizations and / or population with access to climate change impact information and adaptation options at the national level and in five pilot areas. | * Mostly obtained; * There is evidence that, at the village level, there is increased capacity: natural resources management, organizational capacity, women (in all four states); * There is evidence that, at the State level there is increased capacity: technical committee and project implementation staff; * There was no baseline survey so it is impossible to measure or define the actual achievements; * It is important not to withdraw abruptly from villages or States – mostly, due to follow-up projects, this is so far respected; |
| Outcome 3: A better understanding of lessons learned and emerging best practices, captured and up-scaled at the national level.  Indicator: A better understanding of lessons learned and emerging best practices, captured and up-scaled at the national level. | * Incomplete; * The Project used and disseminated some of the ARC developed technologies in water harvesting, improved varieties, livestock;…. * The Project did not develop new knowledge or technologies; * The Project did not attempt to establish or demonstrate a ‘model’ of either technologies or approaches, that could be up-scaled as such; * The Evaluation does not feel that this is a mandate of the project, or even appropriate for a project; |
| Objective | |
| Objective**:** To implement an urgent set of priority adaptation measures for improving food security in the face of climate change in five vulnerable zones in Sudan are implemented covering about 1 million ha.  Indicator: Food security policy has been modified to fully integrate climate change adaptation measures (e.g. climate-resilient crop and livestock production, and climate risk-sensitive rangeland and water resource management strategies). | Objective achieved (although cannot say for the 1 million hectares.  The indicator is not entirely relevant or appropriate.  Note:   * A significant number of village populations have been supported and are engaged. The numerous local community organizations are strengthened and established; * State level capacity has also been established; * At the national level, there is no observed change in terms of integrating climate change; * However, some policy or practice changes observed in two States (SD and G). |

### 8b: Progress Against Indicators from Inception Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme Thematic Areas of Focus** | **Proposed Success Indicators from Inception Report** | **Evaluation Finding** |
| Water Resource Development and Management | * The established water harvesting and spreading system targeting, at least, 10,000 poor farmers of whom 5,000 individuals were originally landless. | * Achieved (based on self-reporting, and noting the lack of baseline and true measurements). |
| * Water resources rehabilitated in all target villages and started to provide good quality water all the year round and that, at least, three hours which were spent earlier in fetching water, were now pared for women to do other economic activities. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| * Water harvesting infrastructures should result in 50% increase in cultivable land, 40% of arable land covered with good vegetation and that due range carrying capacity improved by 30%. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| * A permanent source of water for agriculture, animal production and drinking purposes met, at least, 60% of the potential demand for two former areas of use and 100% of the latter. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| Food Security, Poverty Alleviation and Income Generation | * Total returns from agriculture and livestock estimated at 30% during the first year; 50% during the second year; and more than 60 during the end of the programme cycle. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| * The vulnerability index and absolute poverty reduced by an index of 25% for, at least, half of the target groups with a cash flow of more that 10% of the saleable surplus over the bill of expenditures which could be generated from a given cropping area under irrigation. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| * Restocking of sheep through a revolving fund for at least 200 households annually to be supported by an situ unit of veterinary services and feeding programmes | * It is not clear to the Evaluation whether the revolving funds were linked to sheep restocking. But evidence of related progress – however no baseline or proper measuring. |
| * At least, one Sanduq system for provision of microcredit established in each target village to be used for agriculture, animal production and human health and that a well trained Community Development Committee established in all villages having sanduqs. | * It is not clear to the Evaluation whether the Sanduq system was supported. But evidence of related progress (revolving funds) – however no baseline or proper measuring |
| * Adaptive livelihoods, coping mechanisms and rural credit collectively improved total income of target individuals by 60%. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| Awareness Raising and Capacity Building | * At least, 10,000 villagers became aware of the issues pertaining to climate change and were able to apply improved adaptation approaches, methodologies and techniques. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| * An output center fro knowledge management and dissemination of best practices established in each state and remained operational by the end of the second year of the programme cycle. | * This not established explicitly. |
| Natural Resource Management and Development | * Plant succession showed species which disappeared for many years in most of the natural grazing allotments and that the carrying capacity of the biodiversity improved quantitatively ad qualitatively in, at least, 45% of the grazing lands benefiting more than 50% of the herders. | * No clear evidence for this.   Reports, but not properly substantiated, nor measured, of improvements in rangelands. |
| * At least, 5 Km of shelterbelts and 400 Km of windbreaks established around each of the target villages, including a life-fence around each irrigated farm, grazing allotment and sand dune fixation. | * Evidence of good progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| * All farmers remained well informed about agro-meteorological variables pertaining to climate change and, at least, five individuals in each of the target villages acquired the skills to measure total precipitation, average temperature and relative humidity. | * It is not clear to the Evaluation whether this was a major focus of the Project. |
| * More than 30% of the range and forest resources showed visible signs of restoration by the end of the second year of the implementation of the programme | * Some evidence of some progress towards this. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| Energy and Environment | * A known number of renewable energy source (Gaz) being introduced in target villages which ultimately reduced total biomass used by households for energy by, at least, 30% each year, staring from the second year of implementation. | * Some evidence of some progress towards this. The sources are introduced and holding, even spreading, but no evidence for impact on biomass use. * Baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected. |
| Institutional Building and capacity Support | * A Resource User Association (RUA) to carry out activities and ensure sustainability established in target villages, as appropriate. | * Evidence of good progress towards this, with the Village Development Committees and sub-Committees at many villages. * However, baseline not available, and data not sufficiently collected |

### 8c: State Coordinators Self-Assessment of Achievements and Impacts

**PART 1: State and Village Level**

NK

Gadarif

River Nile

South Darfur

1. Did the Project effectively reach and help enough beneficiaries with support to their livelihood systems? And will it be sustained?

هل استطاع المشروع ان يصل بكفاءة الي عدد مناسب من المنتفعين وان يساعدهم في اسلوب معيشتهم؟ وهل سيستديم هذا الانتفاع؟

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of input or support**  **نوع المدخل أو الدعم** | **Number of beneficiaries whose life - over the short term - *has been significantly improved* through the intervention**  **عدد المنتفعين الذين تحسنت حياتهم بصورة واضحة على المدى القصير بسبب هذا التدخل** | | **Likelihood improvements will be maintained for 3 years or more**  **احتمالية أن التحسينات ستستمر لمدة 3 سنوات أو أكثر** | | | | |
| **Male**  **ذكر** | **Female**  **أنثى** | **Very low**1  **منخفض جدا** | **Low 2**  **منخفض** | **Med. 3**  **متوسط** | **High 4**  **مرتفع** | **Very high 5**  **مرتفع جدا** |
| Diesel Pumps  مضخات الديزل | 1395  1358  2400 | 1567  2012  1000 |  |  |  | X, X | X |
| Shelter-belts: seedlings and drip irrigation  الأحزمة الشجرية:  الشجيرات (الشتول) و ري بالتنقيط | -  1,100 | -  2,000 |  |  | X |  |  |
| Forest | 1358 | 2012 |  |  |  |  | X |
| enclosures | 1358 | 2012 |  |  |  | X |  |
| Agricultural extension (includes horticultural support)  الارشاد الزراعي | 78[[6]](#footnote-6)  143  2,220  1,200 | 698  76  550  1,800 |  |  | X | X | X, X |
| Agriculture - Training and piloting (FMNR)/ | 200 | 0 |  |  |  | X |  |
| Agriculture - Fodder production | 500 | 100 |  |  |  | X |  |
| Agriculture – home garden | 200 | 50 |  |  |  |  | X |
| Irrigated horticulture | 500 | 75 |  |  |  | X |  |
| Veterinary services  خدمات بيطرية | 533  78  3,100  600 | 423  35  2,141  400 |  |  | X | X | X, X |
| Improved Stoves |  | 2500 |  |  |  |  | X |
| Gas stoves and cylinders  مواقد و أنابيب الغاز | 0 | 254  216  1,683 |  |  |  | X, X | X |
| Solar energy for pumping drinking water  الطاقة الشمسية لضخ مياه الشرب | 1091  1,000 | 1292  1,050 |  |  |  | X, X |  |
| Water harvesting, ploughing and terracingحصاد المياه, الحرث و التسوية(تروس) | -  459  1500[[7]](#footnote-7) | -  152  1000 |  |  | X[[8]](#footnote-8) | X |  |
| Seedlings  الشتول | 78  200[[9]](#footnote-9)  4,000  2,000 | 698  200  11,000  1,000 |  |  |  | X, X, X | X |
| Technical training  تدريب فني | 276  109  160  88 | 276  174  160  37 |  |  | X | X | X, X |
| Financial training  تدريب مالي | -  33  150 | -  8  120 |  |  |  | X, X |  |
| Management training  تدريب إداري | 75  33  150  50 | 30  8  120  0 |  |  | X, X | X, X |  |
| Training and introduction of supplementary irrigation | 8 | 24 |  |  | X |  |  |
| Rehabilitating existing water infrastructure | 3121/2 | 3121/2 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |  | Egs, evidence: الدليل   * Project highly connected with population so activities to continue (livestock). * Increasing no. of adaptation by non-supported households/farmers * New technologies were introduced and improved food security * Villagers adopted the new packages for food security | | | | |
| TOTAL NOS????? |  |  |

Quantity and quality of Technical support

2. مقدار و نوعية الدعم التقني

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Support Sector**  قطاع الدعم | **No. of visits (to each village)**  **عدد الزيارات لكل قرية** | **How effective (quality) was the technical support to grassroots**  **مدي فعالية و جودة الدعم التقني المقدم بالنسبة للمجتمعات القاعدية** | | | | | **Did Technical support meet needs of villages?**  **هل اوفى الدعم التقني احتياجات القرى** | | | | |
| **Very**  **Poor**  **1**  **ضعيف جدا** | **2**  ضعيف | **3**  **متوسط** | **4**  **جيد** | **Very**  **Good**  **5**  **جيد جدا** | **Not at all**  **1**  **إطلاقا** | **2**  **إلى حد ما** | **3**  **متوسط** | **4**  **إلى حد كبير** | **Completely**  **5**  **بالكامل** |
| Agriculture  الزراعة | 48, 44, 40 |  |  | X | X | X, |  |  | X | X, X |  |
| Agriculture, water, forestry and livestock | 192 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Water  Management  إدارة المياه | 32, 5, |  |  |  | X X |  |  |  |  | X X, |  |
| Livestock  الماشية | 96, 24, 8 |  |  | X |  | X, X |  |  | X | X, X |  |
| Forestry  الغابات | 48, 28, 16 |  |  |  | X, X | X, |  |  |  | X, X, X |  |
| Energy  الطاقة | 24, 2, 10, 12 |  |  |  | X | XX, X |  |  | X | X | X, X |
| Finance  التمويل | - 1 - |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Management  الإدارة | - - - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forage and rangeland improvement  Other  أخرى | 16 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  |  | Evidence: الدليل   * Harsh area, low literacy, difficult logistics, so it takes time to build capacity. * Remote area, limited budget, lack of mobility * Project has stopped, but village level activities continue * Communities adopted the new varieties and new stoves and planting of seedlings. | | | | | Evidence: الدليل   * High level of adoption (gas). * Shelterbelts established and reduction of sand encroachment | | | | |
|  |  |

3. Has the project sustainably built *institutional* capacity at grassroots level?

هل تمكن المشروع من بناء القدرات الموسسية علي مستوي القواعد؟

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization or structure**  **التنظيم و الهيكل** | **Number significantly strengthened (already existing)**  **العدد الذي تم تعزيزه (موجود أصلا)** | **Number created**  **العدد الذي تم انشاءه** | **Total population covered**  **العدد الذي تمت تغطيتيه** | **Likelihood changes will be maintained for 3 years or more**  **احتمالية أن التحسينات ستستمر لمدة 3 سنوات أو أكثر** | | | | |
| **Very low**  **1**  **منخفض جدا** | **Low 2**  **منخفض** | **Med. 3**  **متوسط** | **High 4**  **مرتفع** | **Very high 5**  **مرتفع** |
| Village Development Committee  لجنة تطوير القرية | 7, 0, 0 | 1, 10, 20 | 48 members/3121 people, 15,740, 3,000 |  |  |  | X, X | X |
| Village sub Committee[[10]](#footnote-10) (e.g. water) |  | 28, 5, 20 | 1778; 15,740 |  |  |  | X, X, X |  |
| Revolving Fund  المال الدوار |  | 3, 1, 20, 4[[11]](#footnote-11) | 448, 1,863  2,000 |  |  | X | X, X | X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Examples, evidence: الدليل والامثلة   * The committees coordinate and carry out the activities. * Some parts of villages have satisfied needs in gas cylinders * Existence of 3 service centres covering all 10 villages (to distribute gas, support RF) * Village committee play role in organizing beneficiaries in packages and activities. | | | | | | | |

4. How innovative was the Project (note: there is no correct answer!!!!)?

ما مدى إبداع المشروع ( ملاحظة: ليست هنالك إجابة بعينها صحيحة)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technology or Approach**  **التقنية أو الطريقة** | **How innovative?**  **مدى الإبداع؟** | | | | | **Evidence, examples:**  **الدليل, أمثلة:** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Natural Resource Management technology or practice  تقنية أو ممارسة إدارة الموارد الطبيعية |  |  |  | X | X, X, X | Sand dune fixation (NK), fish farm (NK), water harvesting techniques and supplementary irrigation (G)  Shelter belts, drip irrigation, solar energy (RN)  Many new agronomic practices/technologies (varieties, ploughing, FMNR, …). |
| Organizational development  التطوير المؤسسي |  |  |  | X, X, X | X | Group horticultural work (NK, RN), establish community organizations (G, SD), |
| Approach to gender/women  طريقة الوصول للجنسين –الرجال و النساء |  |  | X | X | X X | Vigorous women participation (NK); introduce women participation (G) Village committee convinced women to attend training etc.. |
| New Income generation practices |  |  |  | X, X |  | Cheese-making and food processing (RN, G) |
| Financial skills/technologies  القدرات? التقانات التمويلية |  |  | X, X | X |  | Revolving Fund (NK, G, RN) |
| Use of ICT (information and communication technology)  استخدام تقنية المعلومات و الاتصالات |  | X |  | X, X, X |  | Common use of mobile phones (NK, G, RN, SD) Mobile phone link to rainfall data, distributed TV to support cultural clubs (RN) |
| Livestock – management (strategic and supplementary feeding) |  |  |  |  | X | Copied by neighboring villages (NK) |

5. Has the Project built capacity for support and replication at State level?

هل قام المشروع ببناء القدرات للدعم حتى يتم تكراره علي مستوي الولاية؟

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technology or Approach**  **التقنيه او الطريقه** | **extent** | | | | | **Evidence, examples:**  **دلائل وامثلة** |
| **Not at all**  **(1)**  **ابدا علي الاطلاق** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **greatly (5)**  **بصورة كبيرة** |
| Did the Project strengthen existing state level (extension) structures? هل استطاع المشروع ان يقوي البنى الموجودة علي مستوي الولاية؟ | X, |  |  | X, X | X | Established a small factory for producing animal feed (NK).  Established 8 Technology Transfer centers by M. Ag (G).  Training of trainers (RN)  Training of extension of workers (SD) |
| Did the Project construct new (extension) structures?  هل انشا المشروع بنيات جديدة؟ |  | X |  | X, X |  | Use of local community in data collection (NK)  Local (village) extension officers (RN)  Project constructed a simple seed store (SD) |
| Will the Technical Committee continue after the Project?  هل ستستمر اللجنة الفنية بعد المشروع؟ |  |  |  |  | X, X, X, X | Will continue for CIDA project at least (NK, G,) Will continue for Climate Risk Finance (RN) Both CIDA and CRF (SD) |
| Have the Technical Committee members changed their practices as a result of the Project?  هل غيٌر اعضاء اللجنة الفنية ممارساتهم نتيجة لهذا المشروع؟ |  |  |  | X | X, X, X | Created a channel of communication from locality to Ministry (NK) Thinking and awareness of TC members regarding CC (G) TC member joining in strategic discussions (RN)  Give priority to NAPA activities when preparing state level plan (SD). |
| Are the State Government departments changing allocating of budget and changing practices?  هل غيٌرت اقسام الحكومه الولائية توزيع الميزانيات وغيٌرت ممارساتها؟ | X |  |  | X, X | X | To the new TT centers (G).  State HCENR now getting budget 950,000/yr SDG (RN).  Significant equipment and facilities (SD). |
| Are there new policies, programmes or plans at State level  هل هنالك برامج او خطط اوسياسات جديدة علي مستوى الولايات؟ |  |  |  | X, X, X | X | Policy to rehabilitate the gum Arabic belt for next season (NK) Now CC-A mainstreamed in all plans (G)  Min Ag mainstreamed water harvesting techniques (SD). |
| Are other villages adopting the practices?  هل تبٌنت القرى هذه الممارسات؟ |  |  | X, X  X | X |  | Livestock innovations are being adopted (NK) all the surrounding villages have adopted some activities (G)  Some asking for shelterbelts (RN)  Some, with support from Min Ag after seeing demonstration plots (SD). |
| Has the private sector changed as a result of this Project? هل تغير القطاع الخاص نتيجة هذا المشروع؟ |  |  |  | X, X | X, X | Replicating livestock innovations (NK). All private companies start commercializing tractors, irrigation equipment and gas cylinders (G) Private gas cylinder distribution centres (RN)  Large scale farmers adopting some of the practices. Seed dealers distributing new seeds. |

6. Co-Financing (State and Village level) (**Homework**!!). What is the value of the contributions to the Project objective of the State partners and the communities?

المشاركه في التمويل .ماهي قيمة المساهمات لتحقيق اهداف المشروع من الشركاء والمجتمعات

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item**  **البند** | **Yearly value (estimated, SDP) القيمة السنوية (مقدرة بالجنيه)** | **Total Value (estimated) القيمه الكلية (مقدرة)** |
| State Office space  مساحة المكتب الولائي | 12,000 | X4 |
| State Technical Committee time  زمن اللجنه الفنية الولائية | 20,000 | X4 |
| State logistical support (vehicle, communications)  الدعم اللوجيستي الولائي (السيارات,وسائل الاتصال) | 6,000 |  |
| State budgetary support (programmes, equipment, agricultural inputs..)  الدعم المقدم من الميزانية الولائية | 25,000 |  |
| State (other)  الولايه (اخرى) | 0 |  |
| Community timeزمن المجتمع | 20,000 |  |
| Community facilities (room, fuel, etc)  خدمات المجتمع(غرف,وقود...) | 20,000 |  |
| Community investments (equipment, materials, etc.  استثمارات مجتمعيه (معدات,مواد, الخ...) | 35,000 |  |

**PART 2: Overall and Federal Levels**

8. Thoughts and suggestions on the Project’s Implementation approach

الافكار والمقترحات في طريقه تنفيذ المشروع

Financial planning and processes

تخطيط التمويل والاجراءات

* Process: each year all communities plan and propose to TC (this is done quarterly in Gadaref); endorsed by TC; and submitted to Project Coordinator; approved funds (with changes) returned to State Coordinator on a quarterly basis.
* Significant delays in receiving the first quarter funds is a problem.
* Straightforward;
* Led by States and communities, not Khartoum;
* State level Purchasing Committee approves service provider, State Coordinator signs contract, State Coordinator/State Project Accountant signs payment; (copies of all documents sent to Khartoum for auditing);
* (‘Topping’ is very low. cf other projects and load). This includes for State Coordinator).

Role of HCENR, UNDP, Project Coordination Unit

دور المجلس الاعلي للبيئه ,برنامج الامم المتحدة الانمائي ووحدة تنسيق المشروع

Federal HCENR:

* Provided training for the State Coordinators and TC and closely followed-up the activities (visited many times);
* Vehicle and maintenance should be local component. This was not forthcoming. HCENR helped by getting a vehicle. But maintenance was not covered and had to be covered by project budget for activities;
* Low financial contribution from government (both national and state). Good in-kind contribution;
* (low budget for capacity building).

UNDP

* Have no connection with them;
* Aware of their role as financing;
* Often joined HCENR on visits and exchanged information and ideas;

Project Board

* They all attended
* Useful
* Discussed progress etc…discussed issues
* Took some decisions;
* Met once a year – it was not enough

Project Coordination Unit

* Very good job
* Very cooperative
* Good and continuous contact and regular visits (even S. Darfur)
* Transparent
* Flexible
* Provided many national experts who visited and this was very useful (based on requests from States) – enough of these visits.
* Should have had a role in project sustainability.

M+E

المتابعه والتقييم

* Project has no monitoring and evaluation officer at state level – this would be needed;
* Were supported by State Min Ag unit;
* Were 3-4 federal visits over project lifetime for M+E;
* Indicators and targets: (indicators related to satisfaction; targets – so many –
* Min Ag staff supported – did questionnaire at village level (through interview and group discussion) – to assess technical package – and completed a report to send to Mutasim – yearly (different questionnaire in each state);
* This also submitted a ‘final report’ for all four years, includes a full evaluation of all activities – e.g. of milk production increases;
* Sometimes Project Coordinator with comment on reports and ask for additional statistics;
* They are not sure what was done with the reports;
* This was a lot of work – very tedious;
* Also quarterly reports
* They see their information in publications from HC and Project;
* MTR – they were invited to comment;
* They wanted training on how to collect the information required for the reports (Gadaref got this!)

Risk management approach

طريقة ادارة المخاطر

Communications

الاتصال

* They communicated through telephone and email;
* It is OK;
* Some minor delays, but always a response;
* Overall smooth;

Overall

RN: Beneficiaries: overall evaluation – more positives, but some negatives;

The most successful implemented in their area (River Nile);

Training, livestock, awareness, participation of women, improving income, shelterbelts were good and effective; connecting communities; etc.

So insist it should continue, either by itself or with help. This was message, and response was CIDA project, but different villages (his village was excluded).

Some negative things: not enough money to meet requirements/demands; so limited no. of villages; smooth withdrawal and so push for sustainability; affected by international politics.

G: gave him an opportunity to apply his knowledge on the ground; clearest indicator of success – village insist to be involved in follow-on CIDA project!; state minister of agric. gives special attention; State governor receives regular reports and is satisfied.

On behalf of all: thank NAPA and UNDP and all others who have helped communities.

SD: a leading project because gives lessons to community and villages. Increasing adaptation capacity and improving livelihoods; people involved are now awaiting CRF project to push implementation ahead; Min. Ag adopting water harvesting technology.

NK: fully supports all the above comments. Been success in transferring technologies to communities. Main factor in success: simple administrative processes and structure.

### 8d: Total Beneficiaries

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State** | **Number of beneficiaries** |
| Nile | 5,835 |
| North Kordofan | 4,984 |
| South Dafur | 4,500 |
| Gedarif | 2,500 |
| **Total** | **17,819** |

In total, an estimated 17,819 persons have benefitted from the Project. There is no breakdown available for the numbers of men and women.

1. Program of the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and IFAD. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This evaluation report was prepared by a technical committee under the HCENR and so cannot be considered a project output. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Mr. Osman was also the National Consultant for this Terminal Evaluation [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Also Deputy National Project Manager of the project being evaluated [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Also Reporting/Monitoring Expert for the project being evaluated [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Number trained in NK [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Packages included early maturing varieties of sorghum and onion [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. G: require equipment and training [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 400 households receiving seedling [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. NK: for women, pastoralist, water and agriculture in each village [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Only 1 year ago [↑](#footnote-ref-11)