

Project Evaluation Serie  
[48/2024](#)

**Terminal evaluation of the project  
“Integrating climate resilience into  
agricultural and agropastoral production  
systems through soil fertility management  
in key productive and vulnerable areas using  
the Farmer Field School approach”**

Project code: GCP/ANG/050/LDF  
GEF ID: 5432

**Annex 1. Terms of reference**

# Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>1. Background and context of the project</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Description of project context, project objectives and components.....	1
1.2 Project stakeholders and their role .....	4
1.3 Theory of change .....	5
<b>2. Terminal evaluation purpose and scope</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 Purpose.....	6
2.2 Scope .....	6
<b>3. Evaluation objectives and questions</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Methodology</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>5. Roles and responsibilities</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>6. Evaluation team composition and profile</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>7. Evaluation products (deliverables)</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>8. Evaluation timeframe</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 1. Overview of the available documents</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix 2. Project results framework</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix 3. Glossary</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix 4. GEF ratings</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix 5. Financial data</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## Box and tables

Box 1. Basic project information.....	1
Table 1. Main project partners and their role in the project.....	4
Table 2. Main purposes and intended users of the evaluation.....	6
Table 3. Evaluation questions.....	9

## Abbreviations

BH	Budget Holder
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FLO	Funding Liaison Officer
LOA	letter of agreement
LTO	Lead Technical Officer
MTR	mid-term review
MTE	mid-term evaluation
OPIM	Operational Partner Implementation Modality
PTF	Project Task Force
RES	Regional Evaluation Specialist
TOC	theory of change
TOR	terms of reference

# 1. Background and context of the project

1. This document describes the terms of reference (TORs) of the final evaluation of the regional full-size project "Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and agropastoral production systems through soil fertility management in key productive and vulnerable areas using the Farmer Field School approach" (in hereinafter "the IRCEA project"), GCP/ANG/050/LDF.
2. The project, implemented in Angola, has a duration of six years. It was declared operational on November 2016 and will officially close in November 2022.<sup>1</sup> The total committed budget is USD 30 287 412, of which USD 6 668 182 were financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The remaining budget represents the co-financing (whether in cash or in kind) committed by the Government of Angola and FAO.<sup>2</sup>

## Box 1. Basic project information

- GEF project ID Number: 5432
- Recipient country: Angola
- Implementing agency: FAO
- Executing agency: FAO
- Date of project start and expected end: 3 November 2016 - 21 November 2022
- Date of mid-term evaluation: October 2019

3. A decentralized mid-term review (MTR) has been finalized in October of 2019 under the responsibility of the project Budget Holder (BH) in the FAO Office in Angola. In summary, the MTR has concluded that the project's effectiveness in delivering outputs was very low, with significant delays in all components. As a result, progress in achieving results (outcomes) and their contribution to the envisaged objectives were minimal. The delays in results were due to some external factors (e.g., elections in Angola in 2017, end of the mandate of FAO's Representative in Angola and long period until the new one takes office), but mainly to internal factors that are affecting project performance (e.g., CTA exit and long delay in replacement, delays in hiring consultants, FAO Angola's lack of support and guidance to project team, limited supervision and backstopping from FAO Angola, Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and Funding Liaison Officer (FLO), no results-based management, among others). The MTR has therefore recommended a project extension and a number of corrective measures related with adjustments to the project result matrix, capacity building strategy, the implementation of an FFS-Model" plan and Farmer Field School (FFS)-based pilot internship programme, governance and partnership of the project, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) procedures and reinforcement of the supervisory role from the LTO, BH and FLO (conclusions and recommendations of the MTR are available in Appendix 7).

## 1.1 Description of project context, project objectives and components

### 1.1.1 Context

4. Angola is among the poorest and most vulnerable country in the world, as it is ranked 148 out of 187 countries in terms of human development index (2019). The civil war and the dependence on

<sup>1</sup> The original project NTE was September 2021. The project got a no-cost extension until November 2022.

<sup>2</sup> USD 23 619 230: Ministry of Environment (USD 3 325 000; Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry USD 13 500 000, Ministry of Trade USD 2 494 230, FAO USD 4 300 000.

the oil and extractive industries have rendered the country dependent on food imports rather than producing their own crops.

5. The War has affected the meteorological infrastructure in the country; as a result, the analysis of climate change in Angola is difficult due to a lack of data from recent years. There are many uncertainties, but climate projections agree that surface temperatures in Angola could rise and an increase in the occurrence of extreme climate events, an expansion of arid and semi-arid regions, a shift in seasonal rainfall, a rise in sea level, an increase of wildfires and changes in river flows could happen. Available projections agree that there will be a decline in the length of the agricultural growing period in southern Angola and along the coast, while areas in the north that currently benefit from two growing seasons may in the future only experience one. If such predictions were to become true, given the rainfall dependency of most staple crops, combined with unsustainable agricultural practices and prevalent soil erosion, it would have severe impacts on smallholder farmers.

### **1.1.2 Project description**

6. In response to the above challenges, the objective of the project is to "*integrate climate resilience into agricultural and agropastoral production systems through soil fertility management in key productive and vulnerable areas using the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach*". Thus strengthening the climate resilience of the agropastoral production systems in key vulnerable areas in the Provinces of Bié, Huambo, Malanje and Huila.
7. This was planned to be achieved through: i) mainstreaming climate change adaptation (CCA) into agricultural and environmental sector policies, programmes and practices; and ii) capacity building and promotion of CCA through soil fertility and sustainable land management (SLM) practices using the FFS approach. The project strategy is built on four main components. The first is to strengthen knowledge and understanding of climate change vulnerability and adaptation. The second is scaling up of improved CCA/SLM practices through FFS. The third is mainstreaming CCA into agricultural and environmental sector policies and programmes. The last component focuses on monitoring and evaluation.
8. The project includes four outcomes.
  - i. The first expected outcome is: the strengthening of the adaptive capacity of the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the Ministry of Trade, provincial governments, civil society, the National Institute of Meteorology and Geophysics (INAMET) and Food Security Office (GSA) staff to minimize climate risks in both agropastoral and agricultural production systems.
  - ii. The second expected outcome is: 115 000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices.
  - iii. The third expected outcome is: environmental and agriculture policies and programmes at national and decentralized levels integrate CCA aspects.
  - iv. And the fourth expected outcome is: project implementation based on results based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated.
9. Directly, the project was meant to support at least 150 000 farmers through an existing network of 5 150 FFS to develop and implement new approaches and practices to increase climate resilience. The project planned to train FFS master trainers and facilitators to disseminate climate

resilient strategies and practices. The project also planned to closely liaise and collaborate with the FAO Subregional Office for Southern Africa FFS Network, to optimize support to FFS development. The project worked on building institutional capacity and strengthening cross-sector coordination for implementing approaches to mainstream CCA in rural development and the agricultural sector.

10. Project sites have been identified in the project document as 30 municipalities from the provinces of Bié, Huambo, Malanje and Huila (26 municipalities targeted by MOSAP II in Bié, Huambo and Malanje and four additional municipalities in Huila).

### **1.1.3 Contribution to the FAO and GEF strategies**

11. The project is meant to contribute to FAO Strategic Objective/Organizational Result: SO-2.01.03 comparable to the current FAO betters:
  - i. better production, BP1: innovation for sustainable agriculture production and BP4: Small-scale producers' equitable access to resources;
  - ii. better environment, BP3: BE1: climate change mitigating and adapted agri-food systems; and
  - iii. better life, BP4: BL5: BL5: resilient agri-food systems.
12. The project is in line with the Angola Country Programming Framework and in particular:
  - i. Outcome 3: By 2022, vulnerable population is resilient to climate change and the risk of disasters, having an inclusive and sustainable production; with planning and management of the territory, cities, natural resources and the environment.
    - Output 3: Transform the Angolan agrifood system into a resilient, competitive, diversified and inclusive system, strengthening the capacities of family farming and fishing, encouraging best sustainable practices with innovative technologies to better respond to climate change and supporting their livelihoods to face emergency situations.
      - Indicator 3.1: At least 67 650 farmers are organized in FFS and training in resilient and innovative practices.
13. As the GEF is concerned, the project contributed to the GEF Focal Area/LDCF: climate change (adaptation), in particular:
  - i. CC-A – 1: Reduce the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change.
  - ii. CC-A – 2: Strengthen institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation.
  - iii. CC-A - 3: Integrate climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes.

## 1.2 Project stakeholders and their role

14. The evaluation team during its assessment will confirm the actual role and activities implemented by each of these partners compared to what was scheduled in the project document (Table 1).

**Table 1. Main project partners and their role in the project**

Stakeholder	Role
Ministry of the Environment	It is the central government body responsible for the coordination, development, implementation and enforcement of environmental policies, particularly in the areas of biodiversity, environmental technologies and the prevention and assessment of impacts as well as the environmental education. Ministry of Environment is the lead government counterpart and coordinating agency of the project. In particular, Ministry of Environment is closely involved in the government capacity building trainings on CCA and SLM (Output 1.1), in the inter-sectoral task force on CCA (Output 3.1), and in the capitalization of project’s best practices and lessons learned (Output 4.3).
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	It is responsible for agricultural, rural development and the forestry sector, its mission is to undertake the design and implement agricultural and food security policy, ensure sustainable rural development, oversee the welfare of rural communities, as well as ensure sustainable fisheries and aquatic biological resources and forestry. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry has a co-leading role in the project and is closely involved in the capacity building trainings on CCA and SLM (Output 1.1), in the inter-sectoral task force on CCA (Output 3.1), and in the capitalization of project’s best practices and lessons learned (Output 4.3). The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry institutes relevant to the project are IDA and GSA (see below).
Agrarian Development Institute (IDA) - Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	It is responsible for defining and implementing extension services to support small farmers through the Provincial Agriculture Offices and the Agrarian Development Stations (EDA). IDA is involved in the provincial training sessions on CCA (Activity 1.1.3), in the elaboration of Climate Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) (Activity 1.2.3), and in setting-up FFS under Component 2.
Food Security Office (GSA) – Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	It is a technical support entity within the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in charge of defining and following-up on the implementation of policies and strategies that allow the improvement of food security. GSA is involved in the training and development of CVA (Output 1.2).
The Ministry of Trade	It is responsible for the preparation, implementation, monitoring and control of trade policy, aimed at regulating and disciplining the exercise of trade activity. the Ministry of Trade is implementing the co-financing project PMIDRCP. The ministry plays a co-leading role in the project and is closely involved in the capacity building trainings on CCA and SLM (Output 1.1), in the inter-sectoral task force on CCA (Output 3.1), and in the capitalization of project’s best practices and lessons learned (Output 4.3).
National Institute of Meteorology and Geophysics (INAMET)	It is the national institution with mandate for monitoring the weather and climate. It is also a research organization and provides scientific services in the fields of meteorology and geophysics under the Ministry of Telecommunications and Information Technologies. INAMET is represented across the country through its provincial departments. Under the project, INAMET is closely involved in training and development of CVA (Output 1.2).
Decentralized government services at provincial and municipal level	The Provincial Governments of Bié, Huambo, Malanje and Huila. They take part in the training on CCA and SLM provided at the provincial level (Activity 1.1.3), and in the development of land and resources managements systems including CCA (Output 3.2); Agrarian Development Stations (EDA) which links the IDA with small-scale farmers. EDA is closely involved in setting-up FFS under Component 2, and in the development of land and resources managements systems including CCA (Output 3.2); The Veterinary Services Institute (ISV) provides support in FFS implementation; and Municipal Administrations are involved in FFS implementation (Component 2), as well as in the development of land and resources managements systems including CCA (Output 3.2).

Stakeholder	Role
Civil society organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	<p>Civil society organizations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Farmers, agropastoralists, herders, and women's groups;</li> <li>The Angolan national farmers' union (UNACA);</li> <li>Federação Dos Sindicatos dos Trabalhadores da Agro-Pecuária, Pescas e Derivados de Angola (FSTAPPD);</li> <li>Association for field support and development (ADAC)</li> </ol> <p>NGOs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ADRA – Acção para o Desenvolvimento Rural e Ambiente (Angola NGO, currently working both in Huila, Cunene, Benguela, and other provinces). ADRA has potential and capacities for FFS implementation in Huila, Huambo and Malange provinces and has collaborated in setting-up FFS in Huila;</li> <li>World Vision has potential and capacities for FFS implementation in Bié, Huambo and Huila and has collaborated in to setting-up FFS in Huila;</li> <li>Centro de investigaciones aplicadas al desarrollo ambiental (IDAF);</li> <li>Cruz Vermelha de Angola (in Bié and Huambo); and</li> <li>CODESPA (currently working with FAO/MOSAP). This is a FFS implementing structure in Bié and Huambo.</li> </ol> <p>They take part in the training sessions on CCA and SLM provided at the national level (Activity 1.1.2), are closely involved in the FFS trainings to be provided under Component 2, and in the development of land and resources managements systems including CCA (Output 3.2).</p>
Academic and research institutions	<p>They take part in the trainings on CCA and SLM to be provided by the project (Output 1.1), and include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Universidad Jose Eduardo dos Santos (Faculdade de Ciencias Agrarias, Faculdade de Veterinaria);</li> <li>Universidad Agostinho Neto;</li> <li>Agriculture Research Institute (Instituto de Investigação Agronómica) in Huambo; and</li> <li>Instituto Marques de Val Flor (working in Huambo).</li> </ol>
Project beneficiaries	<p>These are smallholder farmers from a total of 30 municipalities from the provinces of Bié, Huambo, Malanje and Huila (26 municipalities targeted by MOSAP II in Bié, Huambo and Malanje and 4 additional municipalities in Huila). The project is based on a wide involvement of farming communities in order to decrease the overall vulnerability of smallholder farmers and pastoralists. Smallholder farmers are closely involved in the FFS trainings provided under Component 2. Through 5 150 FFS, LDCF funding therefore directly reach around 154 500 beneficiaries, including 30 percent women.</p>
Private sector and cooperatives	<p>They are meant to provide adequate equipment and input for FFS implementation and to strengthen access to markets to farmers. They include the 5 PAPAGRO supported cooperatives in Huila province, namely: Cooperativa Empresarial do Lubango, Cooperativa Empresarial de Caluquembe and Cooperativa Empresarial de Cacula which form part of the AIA; Fazenda do Malipi and Fazenda do Guingui which form part of the ASCOFA; and the private operator also involved with PAPAGRO project</p>

Source: Elaborated by the Evaluation Team.

### 1.3 Theory of change

- No theory of change (TOC) was developed during the project design nor by the MTE. This terminal evaluation will elaborate a TOC in consultation with the project team (including national coordinator, Project Task Force members, LTO) and include it in the inception report. As further elaborated in the methodology section, the agreed TOC will be the basis to develop in detail the evaluation approach.



## 2. Terminal evaluation purpose and scope

### 2.1 Purpose

16. The terminal evaluation, which was contemplated in the project document and in accordance with GEF requirements, will be conducted with the dual purpose of accountability and learning. On the one hand, the evaluation will serve to inform the donor (GEF), regional bodies and national governments actors and counterparts in the project execution. At the same time, this exercise will have a learning purpose, since, in the process of assessing the achievement of results, their impact and the contribution to the objectives set by the project, measures will be identified to consolidate the sustainability of the results of the project itself and in turn highlight main lessons learned that could serve future similar activities.

### 2.2 Scope

17. As mentioned in the introduction, FAO has carried out the MTR of the project finalized in October 2019. Therefore, the final evaluation will evaluate the period of project execution that goes from August 2019 (considering September was dedicated to the evaluation report drafting) to the date of the investigation phase (September 2022), covering the activities in all project components. It will also take into consideration the first part of the project implementation, its design, and the conclusions of the MTE (2019). The evaluation will assess i) the performance of the project considering both its regional and national dimensions, ii) its results, their sustainability and transformational changes occurred in the enabling environment for sustainable agropastoral production systems, iii) shortcomings as well as good practices of project implementation.
18. Regarding geographic coverage, should possible COVID-19 in-country restrictions allow, the evaluation team will engage in project site visits. Project sites to be visited will be identified in consultation with the project national teams and the evaluation team, based on the criteria presented in the methodology section of this document.

**Table 2. Main purposes and intended users of the evaluation**

<b>Purpose</b>		<b>Intended user</b>
Accountability: to respond to the information needs and interests of policy makers and other actors with a decision-making role.	Inform decision-making Provide accountability	Donors (incl. GEF) FAO Management Government
Improvement: Project improvement and organization development provides valuable information for managers or others responsible for project operations	Improve project	GEF coordination unit Operational Partners Project Task Force, Project Management Unit, FAO Country Office(s) GEF project formulators
Enlightenment: In-depth understanding of the project and its practices normally cater to the information needs and interests of project staff and sometimes participants	Contribute to knowledge	FAO personnel and future formulators and implementers

Source: Elaborated by the Evaluation Team.

### 3. Evaluation objectives and questions

19. The evaluation objectives and main questions have been identified in consultation with the project coordinator and main Project Task Force members. Evaluation objectives and main questions are also aligned to the GEF terminal evaluation guidelines<sup>3</sup> which indicate that the terminal evaluations should assess at a minimum, and provide a rating, for the following areas.<sup>4</sup>

#### **1) Strategic relevance (requires a rating)**

20. Relevance is understood as the extent to which the intervention design and intended results were consistent with local and national environmental priorities and policies and to the GEF and FAO's strategic priorities and objectives, and remained suited to the conditions of the context, over time. It also includes complementarity with existing interventions.

#### **2) Effectiveness (requires a rating)**

21. The extent to which the intervention achieved, or expects to achieve, results (outputs, outcomes and impacts, including global environment benefits) taking into account the key factors influencing the results.

#### **3) Efficiency (requires a rating)**

22. Efficiency refers to the extent to which the intervention achieved value for resources, by converting inputs (funds, personnel, expertise, equipment, etc.) to results in the timeliest and least costly way possible, compared to alternatives.

#### **4) Sustainability (requires a rating)**

23. Sustainability is understood as the continuation/likely continuation of positive effects from the intervention after it has come to an end, and its potential for scale-up and/or replication; interventions need to be environmentally as well as institutionally, financially, politically, culturally and socially sustainable. Under sustainability the evaluator should also assess catalytic effect of the project/programme and likelihood of replication.

#### **5) Factors affecting performance (all the aspects mentioned below require a rating)**

##### *Project design and readiness*

24. This refers to the quality of project design and to factors affecting the project's ability to start as expected, such as the presence of sufficient capacity among executing partners at project launch.

##### *Quality of project implementation*

25. This includes: quality of project implementation by FAO (BH, LTO, Project Task Force [PTF], etc.) and Project oversight (PSC, project working group, etc.)

##### *Quality of project execution*

26. It is important to consider that for DEX projects<sup>5</sup>, the responsibility for project execution lies with the Project Management Unit/BH whereas for Operational Partner Implementation Modality

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-guidelines-te-fsp-2017.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Definitions are taken from the GEF Evaluation Policy (2019).

<sup>5</sup> Projects/programmes Directly Executed by FAO.

(OPIM)<sup>6</sup> projects it is executing agency/ies in case the operational partner agreement (OPA) covers the entire project, and both the FAO Project Management Unit and the Executing Agency/ies if the OPA covers only some components.

#### *Financial management and co-financing*

27. The evaluators will provide information on the extent to which expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing is cash or in-kind, whether it is in form of a grant or loan or equity, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization, how short fall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results, etc. The GEF co-financing policy (2018) should be consulted for this section.

#### *Project partnerships and stakeholder engagement*

28. The terminal evaluation report should detail the level and quality of stakeholder engagement and the project’s partnership arrangements both at the design stage and during implementation. As far as stakeholder engagement is concerned, the terminal evaluation should examine three related (often overlapping) processes: i) active engagement of stakeholders in project design, implementation of project activities and decision-making; ii) consultations with and between stakeholders; and iii) dissemination of project-related information to and between stakeholders. The GEF stakeholder engagement policy (2017), GEF principles and practices for engagement with indigenous people, and the GEF guidelines “Partnership in practice – indigenous people” should be consulted for this section. The project’s partnership section should describe the arrangements in place and how this have been reflected in project governance structure and influenced project results achievement.

#### *Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products*

29. The terminal evaluation should assess the effectiveness of the communication of project aims, progress, results and key messages to date along with any structured lesson-learning and experience-sharing between project partners and interested groups that has arisen from the project. Some analysis should be provided on whether communication products and activities are likely to support the sustainability of project results.

### **6) Overall quality of M&E (requires a rating)**

30. The terminal evaluation should assess M&E according to two main elements: M&E design and budgeting; and M&E implementation, including project reporting. The GEF Monitoring Policy (2019) should be consulted for this section.

### **7) Cross-cutting concerns (all the aspects mentioned below require a rating)**

#### *Gender, human rights issues, Indigenous Peoples*

31. The evaluators will determine the extent to which the gender considerations were taken into account in designing and implementing the project. The evaluator should report whether a gender analysis was conducted, the extent to which the project was implemented in a manner that ensures gender equitable participation and benefits, and whether gender disaggregated data was gathered and reported on beneficiaries. The analysis should also cover project/program efforts toward gender empowerment. The evaluator will describe the gender analysis conducted and report on how the women benefitted from the project. In case the given GEF project

---

<sup>6</sup> For more information on OPIM, refer to the OED OPIM toolkit available in the OED SharePoint website, [here](#).

disadvantages or may disadvantage women, then this should be documented and reported. The evaluators should also determine the extent to which relevant gender related concerns were tracked through project M&E. The GEF gender guidelines, gender equality policy and gender implementation strategy should be consulted for this section.

### 8) Environmental and social safeguards

32. The evaluators will assess whether appropriate environmental and social safeguards, including those on mainstreaming of gender concerns, were addresses in the project’s design and implementation. It is expected that a GEF project will not cause any harm to environment or to any stakeholder and, where applicable, it will take measures to prevent and/or mitigate adverse effects. The GEF policy on environmental and social safeguards (2019) should be consulted for this section. In addition, the following aspects must have a dedicated section in the report, but do not require any rating.

### 9) Progress to Impact

33. Some evidence of progress towards long-term impacts, and the extent to which the key assumptions of the project’s theory of change hold, may be available and it may be feasible to assess and report on the progress. The evaluators should also assess the extent to which the progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project.

### 10) Lessons learnt

34. From June 2021, the GEF Secretariat requires GEF Agencies to provide more detailed information on lessons learned from MTRs and terminal evaluations in the portal through specific categories (see Annex 3B for more details). Lessons and good practices can be identified for substantive, methodological or procedural issues, which may be relevant to the design, implementation (management, partnerships, M&E, etc.) of similar projects and programmes.
35. The terminal evaluation report will be structured around main evaluation questions corresponding to the above areas of analysis (see the FAO GEF projects terminal evaluations report outline – Annex 3B). Main evaluation questions presented in Table 3 will be broken down into sub questions by the evaluation team who will include them in an “evaluation matrix” presenting for each sub question indicators and means of analysis.

**Table 3. Evaluation questions<sup>1</sup>**

<p><b>1) Relevance</b> (rating required)</p>	<p>Were the project outcomes congruent with the GEF focal areas/operational programme strategies, country priorities and FAO Country Programming Framework? Was the project design appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes? Has there been any change in the relevance of the project since its design, such as new national policies, plans or programmes that affect the relevance of the project objectives and goals? To what extent has the project responded to identified capacity needs across the three capacity development dimensions, and how have they capitalized on existing capacities?</p>
<p><b>2) Effectiveness</b> (rating required) Includes capacity development questions from the OED Framework</p>	<p>To what extent have project objectives been achieved, and were there any unintended results (<i>include sub-questions for each project outcome</i>)? To what extent the country's adaptive capacity to minimize climate risks in agropastoral and agricultural production systems, has been strengthened?<sup>2</sup> To what extent the target of 115 000 farmers adopted climate change adaptation (CCA) and sustainable land management (SLM)? To what extent are CCA aspects integrated into Environmental and agriculture policies and programmes at national and decentralized level ? To what extent can the attainment of results be attributed to the GEF-funded component? <i>Capacity development</i> To what extent did the intervention enhance target beneficiaries’ functional and technical skills and their knowledge?</p>

	<p>To what extent has the capacity development intervention contributed to changed behaviour/attitudes? Are target beneficiaries implementing/using them and demonstrate changes in attitudes and practices? To what extent did the intervention contribute to improve the performance of the organization, promote institutional changes and informed decision making in the concerned development sector? What are the outcomes at enabling environment level, within the intervention/Country Programming Framework?</p>
<b>3) Efficiency</b> (rating required)	<p>To what extent has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and management been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation? Was the project cost-effective? How does the project cost/time versus output/outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects?</p>
<b>4) Sustainability</b> (rating required)	<p>What is the likelihood that the project results will continue to be useful or will remain even after the end of the project? What are the key risks which may affect the sustainability of the project benefits? <i>Capacity development</i> How sustainable are the achieved results on capacity development? What mechanisms are in place to ensure sustainability? To what extent the achievement of capacity development outputs and outcomes contributed to achieve development outcomes? What are the cumulative and/or long-term effects expected/resulted from the capacity development intervention, including contribution towards the intended impact, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes? What transformational change the intervention has contributed to generate (or has the potential to) from its work on capacity development dimensions and the creation of virtuous interconnections?</p>
<b>5) Factors affecting performance</b> (rating required)	<p>Implementation: To what extent did FAO deliver on project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation, approval and start-up, oversight and supervision? How well risks were identified and managed? Execution: To what extent did the execution agency effectively discharge its role and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project? <i>Monitoring and evaluation</i> (M&amp;E design) Was the M&amp;E plan practical and sufficient? (M&amp;E implementation) Did the M&amp;E system operate as per the M&amp;E plan? Was information gathered in a systematic manner, using appropriate methodologies? Was the information from the M&amp;E system appropriately used to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation? Financial management and co-financing: To what extent did the expected co-financing materialize, and how short fall in co-financing, or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results? Project Partnership and Stakeholder engagement: Were other actors, such as civil society, indigenous population or private sector involved in project design or implementation, and what was the effect on the project results? Communication, knowledge management<sup>3</sup> and knowledge products: How is the project assessing, documenting and sharing its results, lessons learned and experiences? To what extent are communication products and activities likely to support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results?</p>
<b>Environmental and social safeguards</b>	<p>To what extent where environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the design and implementation of the project?</p>
<b>Gender, human rights issues, Indigenous Peoples</b>	<p>To what extent were gender and human rights considerations taken into account in designing and implementing the project? Was the project implemented in a manner that ensures gender and vulnerable groups’ equitable participation benefits and empowerment?</p>
<b>Progress to impact</b>	<p>To what extent may the progress towards long-term impact be attributed to the project? Was there any evidence of environmental stress reduction and environmental status change, or any change in policy/legal/regulatory framework? Are there any barriers or other risks that may prevent future progress towards long-term impact?</p>
<b>Lessons learnt</b>	<p>What knowledge generated has been generated from project results and experiences, which have a wider value and potential for broader application, replication and use?</p>

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Includes questions from the OED Framework on how to evaluate capacity development

<sup>2</sup> Ministries and institutions at central level, provincial governments, civil society organizations, universities and research bodies.

<sup>3</sup> See for reference: Stocking, M. et al. 2018. *Managing knowledge for a sustainable global future. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility*. Washington, DC.

## 4. Methodology

36. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards<sup>7</sup> and be in line with the FAO Office of Evaluation Manual and methodological guidelines and practices. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.
37. The evaluation integrates the GEF criteria and requirements into the methodology, to facilitate comparison with the reports produced by the GEF and to contribute to the GEF programme selection process. In this respect, the evaluation will present an assessment of GEF criteria as mentioned in section 3, also through the qualification scheme presented in section 7. The evaluation will present the financial and co-financing data (see Appendix 5) according to the new guide of the GEF published in May 2019, adapted to this final evaluation.
38. The evaluation will follow a theory of change (TOC) approach with an emphasis on the results chain. The TOC will be developed by Evaluation Team and based on document review, discussions with PTF and if possible a face-to-face meeting with LTO to get a good understanding of the project. The TOC will seek to capture the causal relationship between inputs, expected products detailed in the project's results framework, results to which they should contribute, and conditions under which they should occur. The evaluation team will elaborate a TOC based on document review, and in consultation with the project team, PTF and LTO (if possible through face-to-face or virtual meeting). This TOC will also include assumptions, a mapping of externalities and possible unwanted outcomes. The TOC, thus developed, will help to get a good understanding of the project and will serve for the analysis of the project strategy and design. It will be included in the inception report.
39. Likewise, at the beginning of the evaluation process, a stakeholders mapping will be prepared with the objective of identifying additional users of the evaluation and planning the information collection phase, ensuring that all counterparts are identified.
40. To answer the key questions, an evaluation matrix will be developed in which the indicators, the evaluative criteria, the sources of information to monitor said indicators, as well as the methods and instruments that will be used to respond to evaluation criteria will be detailed. The evaluation team will further develop the main evaluation questions presented in this TORs and break them down into sub-questions able to capture specific features of project implementation at country level, taking into consideration specific features of the agricultural production systems, CCA and FFS sectors and project workplan.
41. In general, the following methods and sources will be used to collect primary and secondary data to answer the evaluation questions:
  - i. Desk review of the MTE report, project documents (including the GEF tracking tools), the project/programme information platform if available, semi-annual and country progress reports, project implementation reports, national strategic documents, regional/local governments and the organizations and institutions involved related to the issue of

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

[specific sector]; technical reports and reports from FAO support missions, and any other that is identified in the course of the evaluation.

- ii. Semi-structured interviews (in person or remotely) with key informants, stakeholders and participants at the regional, national and local level, public and private, based on interview protocols developed by the evaluation team.
  - iii. Focus group discussions (in presence or remotely) with project participants and stakeholders, including local communities involved or engaged in integrating climate resilience into agricultural and agropastoral production systems using farmers field school approach, also supported by interview protocols.
  - iv. Direct observation during field visits if the COVID-19 pandemic allows it.
  - v. Online surveys of key stakeholders not interviewed.
36. The selection of pilot sites for the field visits, should the national norms during the COVID-19 pandemic allow them, will be made by the evaluation team, based on consultations with the project team, the evaluation manager and according to the criteria below. The evaluation team may add criteria or reorganize the priority among them.
- i. Level of budget execution: sites with a medium / high level of budget execution / support (range to be defined at a later stage).
  - ii. Number of activities implemented under the main products: sites with a medium/high number of activities of key activities implemented (range to be defined at a later stage).
  - iii. Level of results: sites with successful and not so successful results to identify useful lessons for future interventions.
  - iv. Sites visited during the MTE: some of the sites visited by the MTE to corroborate the evaluation of the identified results and sites not visited by the MTE to increase geographic coverage and representativeness.
42. The evaluation mission to Angola is scheduled to take place after mid-September to avoid the election period between mid-August to mid-September. A mission to Angola will seek to interview public institutions representatives and decision takers both from previous and new government involved in the project, as well as other key project stakeholders. Field missions will be carried out to interview key project stakeholders and beneficiaries at decentralized levels (province; municipality, local community, demonstration site), and to visit project achievements. Understanding challenges faced/managed during project implementation, and future priorities and orientation of the new government is an important step for a forward looking exercise as this will definitely inform the evaluation recommendations.
43. At the beginning of the investigation phase, a protocol for the interviews will be developed according to the type of actor to be interviewed and the topic to be addressed. Special attention will be paid to ensure that women, indigenous groups and other disadvantaged groups are properly consulted. In terms of gender analysis, the evaluation team will assess the project's

contribution to the objectives presented in the FAO Gender Equity Policy<sup>8</sup> as well as in the GEF Gender Policy.<sup>9</sup>

44. As a reference to evaluate the work carried out with local communities, the Evaluation Team will use the FAO Free, Prior and Informed Consent Manual (FPIC).<sup>10</sup> Together with the FAO Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, this document will serve as a reference regarding FAO's approach and processes for reaching consensus with local communities benefiting from a project. Together with the FAO Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples and the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement, this document will serve as a reference regarding FAO's approach and processes for reaching consensus with local communities benefiting from a project.
45. The specific objectives of the project include capacity building at enabling environment, organizational and individual level. The FAO Office of Evaluation Framework for Evaluating Capacity Development is the basis for evaluating the measures, approach, performance, and results of the activities that were implemented throughout the project to develop capacities. The interview protocols will seek to measure the level of knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP model) of the beneficiaries.<sup>11</sup>
46. To answer the question on sustainability, four main criteria will be assessed: i) beneficiaries' ownership of project results, ii) availability of resources, iii) sufficient capacities of the actors involved, and iv) conducive institutional and social environment (with respect to the FAO's capacity development framework).
47. Beyond the methodological elements outlined above, final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations among the project team, the evaluators, and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3205e.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.C.53.04\\_Gender\\_Policy.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.53.04_Gender_Policy.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> FPIC available here <https://www.fao.org/indigenous-peoples/our-pillars/fpic/en/>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.fao.org/3/ca5668en/ca5668en.pdf>



## 5. Roles and responsibilities

48. The Regional Evaluation Specialist (RES), based in the FAO Regional Office for Africa will act as Evaluation Manager. He or she is responsible to develop the first draft TORs with inputs from the PTF (including the BH and LTO), the FLO and the GCU<sup>12</sup> and using the guidance of this document. Besides the TOR drafting and finalization, the RES is responsible for the selection of the evaluation team. The RES shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for quality assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the TORs and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations in the evaluation report. The RES also has a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management response and the follow-up to the Management response.
49. The Budget Holder (BH) is responsible for initiating the evaluation process. Together with the project Lead Technical Officer (LTO), they assist the Evaluation Manager in drafting the TORs, in the identification of potential consultants and in the organization of the missions. The BH will provide the evaluation team with all project documents (see Appendix 2) needed for the terminal evaluation. The BH is also responsible for sharing the terminal evaluation report with the GEF operational focal point (OPF), the execution partner, the project team and national partners and for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management response and the follow-up report, fully supported in this task by the LTO and others members of the PTF. The FAO Office of Evaluation guidelines for the Management response and the follow-up report provide necessary details on this process. Involvement of different members of the PTF will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.
50. The GEF Coordination Unit (in particular the FLO) is responsible for providing inputs to the first version of the Terms of Reference. They are required to meet with the evaluation team, make available information and documentation as necessary (see Appendix 2), and comment on the draft evaluation report.
51. The country level GEF OPF. According to the GEF Evaluation Policy (2019), Minimum Requirement 4 (Engagement of Operational Focal Points), "the OPF will be informed of midterm reviews and terminal evaluations and will, where applicable and feasible, be briefed and debriefed at the start and at the end of evaluation missions. They will receive a draft report for comment, will be invited to contribute to the management response (where applicable), and will receive the final evaluation report within 12 months of project or programme completion". "The GEF OPFs play a key role in facilitating access to staff members of government institutions involved in GEF projects during evaluations. They may promote the use of, follow-up to, and action on evaluation recommendations related to GEF matters and directed at the regional, national, and project levels. They also play an important role in keeping national stakeholders (including the civil society organizations involved in GEF activities) fully consulted with, informed on, and involved in the plans, conduct, and results of country-related GEF evaluation activities".
52. The Evaluation Team) is responsible for further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation, and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Evaluation Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the

---

<sup>12</sup> And the OPIM team in HQ if the project is executed under the OPIM modality (OPIM-MS701@fao.org)

evaluation process, based on the reporting outline provided in *Annex 3A* of the FAO Office of Evaluation Project Evaluation Manual. The Evaluation Team will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the EM, and consultations with the BH and PTF where necessary. The Evaluation Team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although the RES is responsible for quality assurance of all evaluation reports.

53. The Evaluation Team Leader guides and coordinates the Evaluation Team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.
54. For further details related to the tasks of the Evaluation Team Leader and Evaluation Team members, please refer to their specific job descriptions prepared at the time of their recruitment.
55. The FAO Office of Evaluation Decentralisation Support Team (DST) and in particular the appointed FAO Office of Evaluation Supporting Officer will provide comments on the various deliverables and technical support throughout the evaluation process.
56. The RES supervisor in the concerned Regional Office is responsible for the final clearance of evaluation products, in particular the TORs and the evaluation report.

## **6. Evaluation team composition and profile**

57. The Evaluation Team will consist of an Evaluation Team Leader (international consultant, evaluator) and a team member (national consultant, technical expert). The Evaluation Team Leader, under the guidance of the Evaluation Manager, is responsible for all the deliverables outlined in Section 7 of these TORs.
58. The Evaluation Team member's role is to assist the Evaluation Team Leader in evaluation preparations, project data collection, analysis, and report writing, capitalizing on their knowledge and experience in Angola as well as subject matter expertise (agricultural livelihoods and FFS approach).
59. Combined, the members of the evaluation team should have:
  - i. Advanced university degrees in agriculture, environmental studies, sociology, agricultural advisory and extension systems, adult training.
  - ii. Relevant professional experience in evaluation; rural and agricultural development; and strengthening of institutional capacities. Experience leading UN, FAO or GEF evaluation and/or related fields constitute an advantage.
  - iii. In-depth knowledge and experience in agricultural extension systems and farmer field school approach in Angola; climate change adaptation and climate resilient agricultural practices; farming systems including agricultural and agro-pastoral production systems.
  - iv. Demonstrated experience in gender analysis; stakeholders analysis; quantitative-qualitative data collection and analysis methods; and the use of participatory approaches.
  - v. Proven professional experience in Portuguese-speaking African countries and in particular, Angola.
  - vi. Institutional knowledge of the political structure and processes in Angola that impact on agricultural governance and management.
60. Fluent in English and Portuguese, because while the main evaluation products will initially be written in English, some documents useful for the evaluation are in Portuguese and interactions with stakeholders will also be in Portuguese.
61. Both evaluators should be independent and not been involved in the design, execution or advice (to a significant extent) to any aspect of the project that is the subject of the evaluation.

## 7. Evaluation products (deliverables)

62. At the minimum, these products should include:

- i. Inception report: it should include a stakeholders mapping, a revised TOC, an evaluation matrix showing how each evaluation question will be answered through indicators, methods, sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should also include a flexible plan, with different scenarios, for the investigation phase when it is not possible to entirely plan ahead for field/country visits. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, a stakeholder analysis and the final evaluation matrix.
- ii. Zero draft evaluation report: a clear, concise (30-50 pages excluding appendices and annexes and depending on evaluation complexity), professionally-written and high-quality draft evaluation report is expected. It should be written in English or another official UN language, and composed in accordance with the FAO Style of Writing. For reference, samples of FAO evaluation reports can also be accessed at <http://www.fao.org/evaluation/library/>. The zero draft will be sent by the Evaluation Team to the RES for comments followed by peer review and clearance by the FAO Office of Evaluation, and then after approval by the FAO Regional Office for Africa Regional Program Leader it will be circulated by the RES for comments to internal and external stakeholders (OED, BH, FLO, LTO, GCU, project team, executing partner, PSC members, key project partners).
- iii. Final evaluation report: this is the result of the incorporation of comments received on the zero draft. The final report will be submitted by the FAO Office of Evaluation or the RES to all the stakeholders, and will be revised by an editor and graphic designer, before publication on the FAO Office of Evaluation or Regional Office website.
  - The evaluation report should be prepared in MS Word Format and submitted electronically by the Evaluation Team Leader to the FAO Office of Evaluation or the RES. As the main author of the report, the FAO Office of Evaluation or the RES will have the final decision as to how the report should be composed.
  - Supporting evidence: Electronic or hard copies of the survey data and report, minutes or notes of interviews and discussions, and other sources of the primary data/information collected by the evaluation team and used in the report should be sent to the FAO Office of Evaluation or the RES. Sources of secondary data/information used in the report should be cited in the footnotes and included in the list of documents reviewed which is appended in the evaluation report.
  - The evaluation report should include an Abstract of 200 to maximum 400 words and an executive summary and illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the TORs. The executive summary should be drafted as presented in Annex 3B of the FAO Office of Evaluation project Evaluation Manual, in order to update the GEF Portal.
  - All GEF evaluation reports should have a full translation in English when they were prepared in another UN language. This is under FAO responsibility.
  - Evaluation reports should have numbered paragraphs, following the FAO Office of Evaluation GEF reporting outline (see *Annex 3B*). Supporting data and analysis

should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

- Evaluation briefs and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.
- The evaluation report should include the GEF Rating table:<sup>13</sup>

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating <sup>1</sup>	Summary comments <sup>2</sup>
<b>A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE</b>		
A1. Overall strategic relevance	HS• HU	
A1.1. Alignment with GEF and FAO strategic priorities	HS• HU	
A1.2. Relevance to national, regional and global priorities and beneficiary needs	HS• HU	
A1.3. Complementarity with existing interventions	HS• HU	
<b>B. EFFECTIVENESS</b>		
B1. Overall assessment of project results	HS• HU	
B1.1 Delivery of project outputs	HS• HU	
B1.2 Progress towards outcomes <sup>3</sup> and project objectives	HS• HU	
- Outcome 1	HS• HU	
- Outcome 2	HS• HU	
- Etc.	HS• HU	
- Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes	HS• HU	
B1.3 Likelihood of impact	HS• HU	
<b>C. EFFICIENCY</b>		
C1. Efficiency <sup>4</sup>	HS• HU	
<b>D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES</b>		
D1. Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	L• HU	
D1.1. Financial risks	L• HU	
D1.2. Socio-political risks	L• HU	
D1.3. Institutional and governance risks	L• HU	
D1.4. Environmental risks	L• HU	
D2. Catalysis and replication	HS• HU	
<b>E. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE</b>		
E1. Project design and readiness <sup>5</sup>	HS• HU	
E2. Quality of project implementation	HS• HU	
E2.1 Quality of project implementation by FAO (BH, LTO, PTF, etc.)	HS• HU	
E2.1 Project oversight (PSC, project working group, etc.)	HS• HU	
E3. Quality of project execution For DEX projects: Project Management Unit/BH; For OPIM projects: Executing Agency	HS• HU	
E4. Financial management and co-financing	HS• HU	
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder engagement	HS• HU	

<sup>13</sup> See Appendix 4 for more information on GEF ratings.

Evaluation products (deliverables)

<b>GEF criteria/sub-criteria</b>	<b>Rating<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Summary comments<sup>2</sup></b>
E6. Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products	HS·HU	
E7. Overall quality of M&E	HS·HU	
E7.1 M&E design	HS·HU	
E7.2 M&E plan implementation (including financial and human resources)	HS·HU	
E8. Overall assessment of factors affecting performance	HS·HU	
<b>F. CROSS-CUTTING CONCERNS</b>		
F1. Gender and other equity dimensions	HS·HU	
F2. Human rights issues/Indigenous Peoples	HS·HU	
F2. Environmental and social safeguards	HS·HU	
<b>Overall project rating</b>	<b>HS·HU</b>	

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> See rating scheme at the end of the document.

<sup>2</sup> Include reference to the relevant sections in the report.

<sup>3</sup> Assessment and ratings by individual outcomes may be undertaken if there is added value.

<sup>4</sup> Includes cost efficiency and timeliness.

<sup>5</sup> This refers to factors affecting the project's ability to start as expected, such as the presence of sufficient capacity among executing partners at project launch.

## 8. Evaluation timeframe

<b>Task</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Responsibility (OED or RES)</b>
Team identification and recruitment	July/August	Evaluation Manager
TOR preparation	July	Evaluation Manager, LTO, FLO and GCU
TOR finalization	Mid-September	Evaluation Manager
Travel arrangements and organization of the agenda/travel itinerary in the country for the field mission	October	Evaluation Manager, project team/Country Office and Evaluation Team
Reading background documentation	Mid-October	Evaluation Team
Briefing of Evaluation Team	Mid-October	Evaluation Manager, GCU, LTO, FLO, FAO Office of Evaluation OPIM focal point when necessary
Inception report	October 25	Evaluation Team
Data collection	November 01 to November 15	Evaluation Team with support of Evaluation Manager and PMU/Country Office
Production of first draft for Evaluation Manager review	December 05,	Evaluation Team
Circulation of first draft for comments (BH, LTO, FLO, project team, GCU, key national partners, PSC members, EP)	December 20, 2022 to January 10, 2023	Evaluation Manager
Integration of comments and production of the final report	January 11 to February 05, 2023	Evaluation Team
Circulation of final report and publication	February 2023	Evaluation Manager
Management response	1 month after the final report is issued	BH
Follow-up report to the terminal evaluation	6 months after the Management response is issued	BH

## Appendix 1. Overview of the available documents

1. Project Identification Form (PIF)
2. Comments received from GEF Secretariat, the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and the GEF Council members on the project's design and FAO's responses
3. FAO Concept Note, and FAO Project Review Committee report
4. Request for GEF CEO endorsement
5. FAO-GEF Project Preparation Grant (PPG) document<sup>1</sup>
6. Project document
7. Project inception report
8. Six-monthly FAO project progress reports (PPR)
9. Annual work plans and budgets (including budget revisions)
10. All annual GEF project implementation reports<sup>2</sup>
11. Any documentation detailing any changes to the project framework and project components, e.g. changes to outcomes and outputs as originally designed
12. List of stakeholders
13. List of project sites and site location maps (for planning the mission itineraries and fieldwork)
14. Execution agreements in case under Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) and letters of agreement (LOAs)
15. Relevant technical, backstopping, and project supervision mission reports, including back-to-office reports (BTORs) of relevant project and FAO personnel, including any reports on technical support provided by FAO headquarters or Regional Office staff
16. Minutes of the meetings of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), FAO Project Task Force (PTF) and other relevant meetings
17. Any environmental and social safeguards analysis and mitigation plan produced during project design period and online records on the Field Project Management Information System (FPMIS)
18. Any awareness raising and communications materials produced by the project, such as brochures, leaflets, presentations given at meeting, address of project website, etc.
19. FAO policy documents e.g. related to FAO Strategic Objectives and gender
20. All other monitoring reports prepared by the project
21. Finalized GEF focal area tracking tools at CEO endorsement and updated tracking tools at mid-term for GEF-5 projects or review of contribution to GEF-7 core indicators (retrofitted) for GEF-6 projects, and GEF-7 core indicators for GEF-7 approved projects
22. Financial management information including: an up-to-date co-financing table; summary report on the project's financial management and expenditures to date; a summary of any financial revisions made to the project and their purpose; and copies of any completed audits for comment (as appropriate).
23. GEF Gender Policy, GEF Gender Implementation Strategy, GEF Guidelines on Gender Equality and GEF Guide to Advance Gender Equality in GEF projects and programmes
24. Mid-term review/evaluation report and Management response
25. FAO Country/Countries Programme Framework document; FAO Guide to the Project Cycle; FAO Environment and Social Management Guidelines and Policy; FAO Policy on Gender Equity; Guide to mainstreaming gender in FAO's Project Cycle; and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) Manual

### *In the case of Programmes*

26. CEO endorsement/approval of child projects under the programme
27. Programme framework document (PFD) and child projects titles or concepts

### *Notes:*

<sup>1</sup> Applicable to full-sized projects, medium-sized projects, and projects under programmes for which project preparation grant (PPG) was approved by the GEF.

<sup>2</sup> A project progress report (PPR) is an FAO requirement, due every six month, with deadlines on 31 July for a reporting period from 1 January to 30 June, and on 31 January for a reporting period from 1 July to 31 December every year. The project implementation report is a GEF requirement, due every year (usually from July) until project closure for projects that have been under implementation for one year or longer.



## Appendix 2. Project results framework

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	Milestones					Means of verification and responsible entity	Assumptions
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	End of project target – year 5		
<p><b>Project objective/impact</b> To strengthen the climate resilience of the agropastoral production systems in key vulnerable areas through: i) mainstreaming of climate change adaptation (CCA) into agricultural and environmental sector policies, programmes and practices; and ii) capacity building and promotion of CCA through soil fertility and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices using the Farmers Field School (FFS) approach</p>	<p>Objective indicator: (AMAT indicator 2) Type and extent of assets strengthened and/or better managed to withstand the effects of climate change</p>	<p>Farmers in target areas currently have a low capacity and limited knowledge on CCA and SLM practices</p>					<p>Institutional capacities of the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the Ministry of Trade civil society, provincial government, INAMET and GSA staff strengthened. 115 000 farmers (75% of the beneficiaries, of which at least 30% are women) adopt resilient technologies/ practices 5-year strategy to mainstream CCA into sectoral planning and budgeting in place and under implementation</p>	<p><u>Means:</u> Interview with training beneficiaries Progress reports Training attendance sheets 5 year strategy document <u>Resp:</u> Project team</p>	<p>Close involvement of national institutions after the end of the project Climate change impacts remain in the scale of what was projected Buy-in by local communities of adoption technologies Political stability</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1</b> The adaptive capacity of the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the Ministry of Trade, INAMET, GSA, provincial governments, civil society organizations, academia and research organizations, to minimize climate risks in both agropastoral and agricultural production systems, is strengthened.</p>	<p>Outcome Indicator 1.1: (AMAT indicator 10) Capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures</p>	<p>Institutions currently have a low capacity and limited knowledge on CCA and SLM practices in crop-livestock production systems No climate vulnerability assessments have been conducted in any of the 4 provinces of intervention</p>		<p>Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Ministry of Trade, Provincial government, Academia and research institution, and civil society staff trained,</p>			<p>15 Ministry of Environment, 15 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 15 Ministry of Trade, 10 civil society organizations, 40 provincial government 10 academia and research institutions staff have increased capacity and knowledge on CCA and SLM practices including on climate vulnerability assessment</p>	<p><u>Means:</u> Training attendance sheets and reports Interviews with training beneficiaries <u>Resp:</u> Project team Service providers</p>	<p>Relevant institutions participate actively in project's trainings and workshops Meteorological data is sufficient to inform the climate vulnerability assessment</p>

Appendix 2. Project results framework

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	Milestones					Means of verification and responsible entity	Assumptions
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	End of project target – year 5		
				aware of CCA and SLM practices, and aware of the results of the CVA					
<b>Outcome 2</b> 115 000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices	Outcome Indicator 2.1: (AMAT indicator 4) Extent of adoption of climate resilient technologies/practices	Farmers already involved in FFS but not specifically adopting CCA and SLM practices to increase their resilience		3 000 farmers adopt resilient technologies/practices	30 000 farmers adopt resilient technologies/practices	65 000 farmers adopt resilient technologies/practices	115 000 farmers (75% of the beneficiaries, of which at least 30% are women) adopt resilient technologies/practices	<u>Means:</u> Trainings attendance sheets field visits Interviews with FFS beneficiaries Progress reports Household survey (SHARP representative sample) <u>Resp:</u> Project Team Service providers	Interest in FFS remain constant Activities respond to the real needs of farmers (including women) Farmers and relevant institutions participate actively in the trainings provided

Terminal evaluation of the project “Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and agropastoral production systems through soil fertility management in key productive and vulnerable areas using the Farmer Field School approach” – Annex 1. Terms of reference

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	Milestones					Means of verification and responsible entity	Assumptions
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	End of project target – year 5		
<p><b>Outcome 3</b> Environmental and agriculture policies and programmes at national and decentralized level integrate CCA aspects</p>	<p>Outcome indicator 3.1: (AMAT indicator 13): sub-national plans and processes developed and strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures</p>	<p>At national level: no strategy to integrate CCA into sectoral annual budgeting and planning is in place Municipalities in Huila do not have a land and natural resources management system including CCA considerations in place</p>				5-year strategy to mainstream CCA into sectoral planning and budgeting in place	CCA aspects are being mainstreaming in annual Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Trade and Forestry sectoral planning and budgeting 3 municipalities in Huila Province have an inclusive land and natural resources management system	<p><u>Means:</u> Task force’s TOR and MOU Technical proposal Quarterly meeting agendas Land and natural resources management document Progress reports 5-year CCA mainstreaming strategy <u>Resp:</u> Project team Service providers</p>	<p>Relevant institutions are willing to cooperate Relevant institutions participate actively in the activities organized by the project The two commissions remain relevant and in place for the duration of the project</p>
<p><b>Outcome 4</b> Project implementation based on result-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated.</p>	<p>Fulfilment of planned M&amp;E activities including establishing baseline values for all project indicators, yearly updating of indicators, a mid-term evaluation/review and a final project evaluation</p>	n/a		30% progress in achieving project outcomes.	60% progress in achieving project outcomes	80% progress in achieving project outcomes	Project outcomes fully achieved and showing sustainability	<p><u>Means:</u> Project implementation reports Mid-term and final evaluations <u>Resp:</u> Project team</p>	<p>The M&amp;E team provides quality reports in a timely manner Accurate data is available to perform project M&amp;E tasks</p>

Notes: Refer to the project document to see more details at the output level.

<sup>1</sup> Value in the case of quantitative indicators and description of situation in the case of qualitative indicators. Please insert the year of the baseline

## Appendix 3. Glossary

(Source: GEF Evaluation Policy, 2019)

**Agency fee:** the financing provided to a GEF partner Agency in connection with a GEF project or programme.

**CEO Approval:** the approval of a fully developed medium-sized project or enabling activity by the GEF CEO.

**CEO Endorsement:** the endorsement of a fully developed full-sized project by the GEF CEO.

**Child project:** a project that forms part of a programme, as set out in a programme framework document.

**Co-financing:** financing additional to GEF project financing, and that supports implementation of a GEF-financed project or programme and the achievement of its objectives.

**Evaluation:** Evaluation is the systematic and impartial assessment of planned, ongoing, or completed activities, projects, programmes in specific focal areas or sectors, policies, strategies and their implementation, or other topics relevant to the GEF partnership and organization.

**Full-sized project:** a project with GEF project financing exceeding US\$2 million.

**GEF additionality:** the additional effects (both environmental and otherwise) that can be directly associated with a GEF-supported project or programme

**GEF agency:** an agency eligible to request and receive GEF resources directly for the design, implementation, and supervision of GEF projects and programmes

**GEF-financed activity (or intervention):** any programmatic approach, full-sized project, medium-sized project, or enabling activity financed from any GEF-managed trust fund, as well as regional and national outreach activities

**GEF operational focal point:**<sup>14</sup> nominated by the recipient country, the GEF operational focal point ensures that GEF proposals and activities in the country are consistent with country priorities and the country commitments under global environmental conventions; identifies project ideas to meet country priorities; endorses project proposals; facilitates broad based in-country consultations on GEF operational matters; and provides feedback on GEF activities, including implementation of projects.

**Global environmental benefits:** these relate to international conventions and commitments the GEF is mandated to serve. GEF projects must demonstrate that the project activities are delivering global environmental benefits.

**Goal:** a higher-order objective to which a GEF-financed project or programme is intended to contribute.

**Knowledge management:** the process by which organizations within the GEF partnership generate value and improve performance from their intellectual and knowledge-based assets.

**Impact:** the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a project or programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

---

<sup>14</sup> See <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.8.Inf..5.5.pdf>

**Indicator:** a quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to a project or programme, or to help assess the performance of an organization.

**Lead agency:** The agency that coordinates all activities under a programme.

**Medium-sized project:** a project with GEF project financing of up to USD 2 million.

**Mid-term review:** an assessment of a project or programme’s performance and results carried out for adaptive management purposes at the midpoint of a project or programme’s intended duration.

**Monitoring:** a continuous or periodic function, carried out by project or programme management, that uses a standardized and systematic process of collecting and analyzing data on specific indicators to provide decision-makers and management of a GEF-financed activity with information on progress in the achievement of objectives and in the use of allocated funds.

**Outcome:** an intended or achieved short- or medium-term effect of a project or programme’s outputs.

**Output:** a product or service that results from the completion of activities implemented within a project or programme.

**Portfolio:** a subset of projects focusing on a specific theme, GEF focal area, geographic region, country or GEF agency.

**Programme:** a coherent set of interventions designed to attain specific global, regional, country, or sector objectives, consisting of a variable number of child projects.

**Programme’s added value:** the additional results brought in by the GEF funding delivered as a programme compared with either a pre-existing or a hypothetical set of stand-alone full- and/or medium-sized projects or other comparable alternatives.

**Programme framework document:** the document that sets forth the concept of a programme that is proposed for GEF financing.

**Result:** Includes intervention outputs, outcomes, progress toward longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, and should be discernible/measurable.

**Stakeholder:** an individual or group that has an interest in the outcome of a GEF project or programme or is likely to be affected by it, such as local communities, indigenous peoples, civil society organizations, and private sector entities; stakeholders may include national project or programme executing agencies, or groups contracted to conduct activities at various stages of the project or programme.

**Stakeholder engagement:** a process that begins with stakeholder identification and analysis, and includes planning; disclosure of information; consultation and participation; monitoring, evaluation, and learning throughout the project cycle; addressing grievances; and ongoing reporting to stakeholders.

**Terminal evaluation:** evaluation of a project or programme’s design, performance, and results carried out at the end of implementation.

## Appendix 4. GEF ratings

### PROJECT RESULTS AND OUTCOMES

*Project outcomes are rated based on the extent to which project objectives were achieved. A six-point rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes:*

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings."</i>
Satisfactory (S)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings."</i>
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings."</i>
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings."</i>
Unsatisfactory (U)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major short comings."</i>
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	<i>"Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe short comings."</i>
Unable to Assess (UA)	<i>The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements.</i>

*During project implementation, the results framework of some projects may have been modified. In cases where modifications in the project impact, outcomes and outputs have not scaled down their overall scope, the evaluator should assess outcome achievements based on the revised results framework. In instances where the scope of the project objectives and outcomes has been scaled down, the magnitude of and necessity for downscaling is taken into account and despite achievement of results as per the revised results framework, where appropriate, a lower outcome effectiveness rating may be given.*

### PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION

*Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. Quality of implementation pertains to the role and responsibilities discharged by the GEF Agencies that have direct access to GEF resources. Quality of Execution pertains to the roles and responsibilities discharged by the country or regional counterparts that received GEF funds from the GEF Agencies and executed the funded activities on ground. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale:*

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<i>There were no shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution exceeded expectations.</i>
Satisfactory (S)	<i>There were no or minor shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.</i>
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	<i>There were some shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution more or less meets expectations.</i>
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	<i>There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution somewhat lower than expected.</i>
Unsatisfactory (U)	<i>There were major shortcomings and quality of implementation substantially lower than expected.</i>
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	<i>There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation or execution.</i>
Unable to Assess (UA)	<i>The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation or execution.</i>

## MONITORING AND EVALUATION

63. Quality of project M&E will be assessed in terms of:

- Design
- Implementation

## SUSTAINABILITY

*The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale:*

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Likely (L)	<i>There is little or no risk to sustainability.</i>
Moderately Likely (ML)	<i>There are moderate risks to sustainability.</i>
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	<i>There are significant risks to sustainability.</i>
Unlikely (U)	<i>There are severe risks to sustainability.</i>
Unable to Assess (UA)	<i>Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.</i>

## Appendix 5. Financial data

### GEF financing table

CO-funder name	Co-funder type <sup>1</sup>	Co-finding type <sup>2</sup>	Co-finding agreed upon at CEO endorsement (in USD)			Materialized co-financing at project end (in USD)		
			In kind	Cash	Total	In kind	Cash	Total
<b>Total</b>								

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Some examples of categories include: local, provincial or national government; autonomous semi-governmental institutions; private sector, multilateral or bilateral organizations; educational and research institutions; non-governmental organizations; Civil society organizations; foundations; beneficiaries; GEF agencies; and others (please explain).

<sup>2</sup> Scholarships; loans; beneficiary (individual) cash shares; guarantee; material contributions in kind; and others (please explain).

### GEF grant by project component and result

	Total at CEO endorsement		Total at the end of the project	
	%	(USD '000)	%	(USD '000)
<b>Component 1:</b>				
<b>Outcome 1.1</b>				
<b>Outcome 1.2</b>				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>Component 2:</b>				
<b>Outcome 2.1</b>				
<b>Outcome 2.1</b>				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>Component 3:</b>				
<b>Outcome 3.1</b>				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>Component 4:</b>				
<b>Outcome 4.1:</b>				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COST</b>				



Office of Evaluation  
evaluation@fao.org  
www.fao.org/evaluation

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**  
Rome, Italy