



Mid-Term Evaluation of the project
“Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change by Mainstreaming Adaption Concerns
into Agricultural Sector Development in Liberia”

FINAL Report

October 15, 2015

Prepared by

Joana Talafre

Susanna Pykala

Emmanuel Johnson Nimbuen

Clara Champalle

Submitted to

Liberia Ministry of Agriculture



Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents..... **2**

Executive Summary..... 3

1. Introduction 6

2. Project Summary 7

3. Evaluation methodology 8

4. Evaluation Findings..... 10

Executive Summary

This mid-term evaluation was conducted during the course of September-October 2015. The evaluation was conducted with a view to identifying successes and challenges, to determining lessons learned and pathways for achieving optimal results within available resources.

The evaluation noted a number of very positive results, notably in terms of awareness raising, local and political buy-in, and to a certain extent, in terms of piloting of local technologies. However, the evaluation also noted that the project had been plagued with a number of technical and managerial issues that prevented it from delivering the full scope of outputs and achieving intended results to date.

A number of key findings and recommendations were delivered, as follows:

Key findings and recommendations

1. In summary CCAAP performed Moderately Satisfactory (3,5) despite of number of significant technical and managerial challenges that prevented it from achieving its full potential. Key conclusions are as follows:
2. **Conclusion 1: The lines of accountability, management requirements and reporting mechanisms were unclear.** This resulted in the project being divided into two separate, disconnected, components, with no clear link between them. It also resulted in some concerns regarding the overall management and distribution of funds among the components. This could jeopardize the finalization of the project, achievement of outcomes, and upscaling strategy.
3. **Conclusion 2: The project may not achieve the full scope of intended results within available time and resources.** Delays in implementation and execution, along with problems related to the uncertainties regarding fund availability, may prevent the project for achieving all the intended results. Focusing on readily achievable targets may help alleviate this risk.
4. **Conclusion 3: It is unclear whether the piloted technologies can all be considered adequate adaptation technologies.** The selection of technologies, and the lack of observable rationalization or prioritization for these technologies, combined with the need for increased management capacity to implement them, makes for a difficult argument. As assessment on technical grounds may be required before upscaling.
5. **Conclusion 4: The project achieved good levels of awareness raising, and some important achievements in terms of capacity development** among certain stakeholders. The high level of political and institutional buy-in visible in this project, along with the dedication of project staff and the MoA, will assist in maintaining the project's positive outcomes in the long term.

Key Recommendations

6. **Recommendation 1: Improve due diligence and undertake an independent audit of accounts within the next 6 months** with a strong focus on linking expenditures to specific activities and/or outputs, particularly for Component 2. In case expenditures cannot be legitimately attributed to specific project activities, it is recommended that responsible partners be requested to replenish the project funds accordingly, in order to allow for finalization.

7. Recommendation 2: Address issues of unclear accountability within the next three months.

The evaluation recommends that overall responsibility for implementing Component 2 be attributed to the MoA, as originally planned, while the FAO could continue play a technical assistance role, as a sub-contractor, upon request. This would further enhance the national ownership and likely improve the cost-effectiveness of the project. In addition, the Project Steering Committee should ensure that the roles and responsibilities (accountability, transparency, timely implementation, management and achievement of results) are clear to all parties involved. UNDP could provide short training on rules and regulations, and result based management. Lines of accountability and areas of delegated authority should be clarified for all participants in the project.

8. Recommendation 3: Develop an exit strategy within the next 3 months. Review project outcomes, outputs, targets, implementing partners, in light of available funds, and determine what can be realistically achieved in the remaining time (including non-cost extension), ensuring that activities and outputs contribute to the intended outcomes, SMART indicator are used, and that the targets are achievable. We also recommend suspending any upscaling activities until a technical assessment of the piloted technologies is conducted, and until a sustainability plan for the project is in place and followed.

Summary of ratings

	Rating
1. Effectiveness	
1.1 Extent to which planned outputs/outcomes were delivered at the project mid-term	MU
1.2 Extent of effectiveness of interagency cooperation	L
1.3 Effectiveness of management mechanisms	MU
1.4 Extent to which implementation mechanisms were maintained	U
1.5 Review of Outcome to Impact	MS
2. Relevance	
2.1 Links between the project's objectives and national policies, programmes and projects	S
2.2 The project design is appropriate and relevant	MU
2.3 The project is relevant to UNDP and GEF mandate at the time	HS
3. Efficiency	
3.1 Effectiveness of financial planning and management processes	NA
3.2 Degree of cost-effectiveness of process	U
3.3 Timeliness of implementation	U
3.4 Appropriateness of M&E system	MS
3.5 Appropriateness of technical support	MS
3.6 Efficiency of program management	MU
4. Sustainability	
Financial sustainability	
4.1 Likelihood of national resources being available after GEF/UNDP support	Unlikely
Socio-Political sustainability	
4.2 Level of political buy in	HS

4.3 Degree of country ownership	S
4.4 Degree of stakeholder participation and public awareness	MS
4.5 Degree of capacity, accountability and knowhow in place at the time of MTE	S

Environmental sustainability

4.5 Environmental risks and opportunities	U
---	---

The overall rating for the project at mid-term is therefore Moderately Unsatisfactory. The evaluation notes however that there is a potential for remediation during the remaining time of the project, provided that the recommendations above are addressed in a timely manner.

1. Introduction

9. The Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change by Mainstreaming Adaption Concerns into Agricultural Sector Development in Liberia project (20011-2015) (CAAAP) was scheduled for Mid-term evaluation during the last part of 2014 but due to the Ebola outbreak, the evaluation mission was delayed until August 2015.

10. This Mid-term evaluation report is organized as follows: a brief introduction to the evaluation purpose is followed by a project summary, the methodology of the evaluation and the evaluation findings. Evaluation findings can be found in section 4, followed by the conclusions and recommendations.

11. The purpose of the evaluation consists of two aspects: first, it was to provide accountability by assessing the project in terms of their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. In addition to these criteria, the evaluation was to provide advice for strategic reflection, assess the effectiveness of partnerships, and make recommendation for improvement. Second, the evaluation was to facilitate evidence-based learning. Based on the synthesis of project-level findings, the evaluation was to promote learning, feedback, knowledge sharing and identify success factors as well as obstacles and challenges, and make recommendations as to how effective and sustainable adaptation strategies for increased resilience can be further enhanced.

12. In this context, as set out in the terms of reference, which were further detailed in an Inception report prepared in August 2015, and based on the intended outcomes, the evaluation focuses on the following set of **key themes**:

13. The project's design and its relevance to:

- a. National level climate change adaptation priorities
- b. Stakeholders' needs
- c. Country ownership and participation: commitments of governments, states, local authorities and communities
- d. UNDP's mission to provide assistance to the country and to UNDP's adaptation to climate change's focal area
- e. LDCF adaptation guidelines in regards to demonstrating increased adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change and to assessing if and how engaged communities contributed and added value to community adaptation to climate change
- f. Different contexts in Liberia: How the pilot project context is similar to or different from contexts where the project might be adopted/replicated in other environment (county); Report those contextual influences that appeared to significantly influence the project and that might be of interest to potential adopters in the future

14. Project outcomes, outputs and indicators:

- a. Attainment of objectives and planned results: Estimate effects of context on project outcomes; Identify and describe any critical competitors to this project that functioned at the same time and in the project environment; Describe how people in the project general area perceived the project existence, importance, and quality
 - b. Achievement of outputs and activities: feasibility and effectiveness of the work plan; quality, appropriateness and timeliness of the project
 - c. Management arrangements for successful project implementation: general management; financial accountability and efficiency; monitoring and evaluation at the project level
 - d. Timeframe of the project: is the timeframe set in the project design still realistic?
15. Overall success of the project with regards to the following criteria: sustainability, adaptive management, capacity development contribution, potential for replication, synergies with other programmes, knowledge and lessons learnt documentation, codification and dissemination
16. This evaluation is undertaken as a team effort. The team comprises of an international consultant (Okapi Environmental Consulting Inc., represented by Joana Talafré and Susanna Pykala) and a national consultant, Mr. Emmanuel Johnson Nimbuen. The team works in close collaboration with the project management team, namely Mr. Roland Lepol, from the Ministry of Agriculture.
17. The evaluation is taking place in three concurrent steps: a first step consisted in performing an initial documentary analysis, methodology development, and a first analysis of the project's theory of change. A detailed evaluation matrix was developed for this project, established against the following evaluation criteria. The matrix is included in Annex 1, along with an explanation of the scales of rating to be used. The second step consisted in validating any preliminary findings through an evaluation mission. The evaluation mission took place from September 1-8, 2015, including visits to the project pilot sites. The final step consists in this evaluation report, which contains finalized relevant ratings and recommendations.

2. Project Summary

18. The project "Enhancing resilience to climate change by mainstreaming adaptation concerns into agricultural sector in Liberia" was developed in 2010, approved in 2011, and launched in the last quarter of 2012 with the objective of increasing the resilience of poor, agriculturally-dependent communities and of decreasing the vulnerability of the agricultural sector to climate change in Liberia. By doing so the project sought to respond to Liberia's NAPA priorities.
19. This was expected to be achieved through two components, namely: 1) capacity development and 2) enhancing resilience to climate change by mainstreaming adaptation concerns into agricultural sector development in Liberia.
20. Specific contributions toward the reduction of vulnerabilities to climate change are expected to be achieved through the pursuit of specific outcomes including:
- a. integrating concerns into relevant policies and planning processes at the state and national levels;

- b. comprehensive capacity development for individuals in national agencies focusing on agriculture and in pilot counties, and farmers;
- c. demonstration of risk reduction strategies and measures at pilot sites;
- d. strengthening technical capacity to integrate climate change risk management into farmer level agricultural capacity; and
- e. capturing and disseminating lessons learned to key stakeholders.

21. The total project budget is US\$8,726,522, including US\$2,281,400 from GEF and US\$ 6,345,122 in cofinancing from UNDP, the FAO, the Government of Liberia and the Agency for Economic Development and Empowerment (AEDE). It should be noted that, at the time of the evaluation, negotiations on the partnership arrangement with AEDE were still ongoing, and the expected co-financing in the amount of USD 909,632 has not yet been made available.

22. Originally intended to be executed through the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), the project was delivered through a National Implementation (NIM). Executing arrangements also evolved in 2013, when the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), as lead Implementing Partner, requested the FAO to deliver Component 2. This resulted in changes in the project activities diverting from what was originally intended in the project document.

3. Evaluation methodology

3.1 Criteria and Indicators

23. A detailed evaluation matrix was developed for this project, established against the following evaluation criteria. The matrix is included in Annex 1, along with an explanation of the scales of rating to be used. Main criteria are as below:

Relevance

24. This criterion relates to the relevance of the project's design and objectives in regards to national policies, programmes and projects as well as to UNDP and GEF mandates. This is evaluated through the examination of the relevance of and linkages between the project and the country's priorities, as expressed in documents like the NAPA, country development plans, or poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSP). The relevance criterion is also concerned with the appropriateness and the relevance of the project design, which is measured by analysing the Theory of Change of the project. Relevance indicators:

- Links between the project's objectives and national policies, programmes and projects
- The project design is appropriate and relevant
- The project is relevant to UNDP and GEF mandate at the time

Effectiveness

25. The effectiveness criterion is concerned with evaluating the success of the project's implementation, namely: the extent to which planned outputs and outcomes are delivered at the project mid-term; the extent of effectiveness of the cooperation between and among agencies; the effectiveness of project management mechanisms; the extent to which planned implementation

mechanisms are maintained versus used implementation mechanisms; and the review of outcome to impacts, which will determine the likelihood of impact achievement, as per GEF guidelines.. Effectiveness indicators:

- Extent to which planned outputs/outcomes were delivered at the project mid-term
- Extent of effectiveness of interagency cooperation
- Effectiveness of management mechanisms
- Extent to which implementation mechanisms were maintained
- Review of Outcome to Impact

Efficiency

26. The efficiency criterion relates to the degree of cost-effectiveness of the project, mainly measured by evaluating discrepancies between planned and spent budget and by assessing the appropriateness and timeliness of financial planning and management processes. Finally, efficiency relates to the timeliness of implementation measured by analysing planned timelines versus real timelines. Particular attention will be paid to understanding delays in project implementation, their causes, and to propose mechanisms for increasing the overall efficiency of project implementation, where necessary. The evaluation will also include, under efficiency, an analysis of the monitoring and evaluation systems put in place by the project, as well as an assessment of the appropriateness of support received by Implementing Agencies and partners. Efficiency indicators:

- Effectiveness of financial planning and management processes
- Degree of cost-effectiveness of process
- Timeliness of implementation and analysis of delaying factors
- Appropriateness of M&E system
- Appropriateness of technical support
- Efficiency of program management

Sustainability

27. The sustainability criterion includes three sub-criteria, namely: financial, socio-political and environmental sustainability. Financial sustainability of the project pertains to the likelihood of national resources being made available once GEF/UNDP support ends, with a particular view to replicating or up-scaling project results. The socio-political sustainability of the project is evaluated through the level of political buy-in for the project, the degree of country ownership and of stakeholder participation and public awareness, and lastly through the degree of capacity built at the project's mid-term. The project's environmental sustainability is evaluated through the analysis of environmental risks and opportunities and whether they are being reduced or increased since the start of the project's

implementation. Particular attention will be paid to ensuring that options implemented at local level represent adequate adaptation measures. Sustainability indicators:

- Likelihood of national resources being available after GEF/UNDP support
- Level of political buy-in
- Degree of stakeholder participation and public awareness
- Degree of capacity, accountability and knowhow in place at the time of MTE
- Environmental risks and opportunities

3.2 Documents and sources of Information

28. Sources of information include project preparation documents, meeting report, project implementation reports (PIR), financial reports, annual reports, observations, questionnaires and interviews during field visits. A detailed list of documents available is annexed to this report.

3.3 Limitations

29. The execution of this Mid Term Evaluation was delayed by events related to the Ebola crisis in the country and the region. As a result, the evaluation is occurring later than the foreseen mid-term point. In fact, the original foreseen date of completion is December 2015, and no final decision has yet been made on its extension (despite an earlier request). Therefore, this evaluation may take on some aspects of a terminal evaluation.

30. Another limiting factor would be that not all of documents were available to the evaluation. Some of the project board meeting minutes and financial reports including audit reports might have had some bearing on the findings of the evaluation. In addition, there remained some lack of clarity on the level of spent and available funds, as well as on the continued availability of co-financing partnerships, given lengthy delays in confirming them. As a result, this evaluation is unable to provide a clear financial portrait of the project, which would have an impact on the feasibility of certain recommendations.

4. Evaluation Findings

31. Overall, the evaluation has found that the project performed **Moderately Satisfactory**. This is due to various reasons, including a high level of political buy-in and country ownership, as well as a high level of enthusiasm and commitment of different stakeholders, some of whom have implemented and continued to support project activities out of their own initiative and with their own resources.

32. These positive aspects were however offset by lengthy delays, which could be partially attributed to unclear lines of accountability, and to shortcomings in the decision-making processes of the project. The evaluation also noted serious issues with due diligence processes and mechanisms, which led to a lower level of efficiency and effectiveness. Finally, there was a significant disconnect between the intended and implemented outputs, in particular in Component 2, that could be partially attributed to the lack of local technical capacity, the inadequate level of agro-ecological advisory services, and to a potential lack of interest to participate on behalf of certain stakeholders.

33. The pages that follow provide detailed evaluation for each of the main criterion of the evaluation.

4.1 Effectiveness

34. The evaluation found a **Moderately Unsatisfactory** degree of effectiveness. First, the evaluation found that there were lengthy delays in the delivery of various outputs, and that some outputs were not yet delivered at all. Annex 4 lists the intended 'activities' and outputs as listed in the multi-year annual work plan, along with their status of delivery as determined by the evaluation. In addition, it must be noted that many of the activities listed in the original project workplans subsequently changed and that many had diverted from what was intended in the project document.

35. During the evaluation mission, it was observed that the project has been exceptionally successful in raising climate change awareness among the key stakeholders met. For example all projects currently under formulation in the Ministry of Agriculture include climate change considerations as a result of this project's efforts. Another example would be that the students of Grand Gedeh Community College are planning, on their own initiative, an outreach programme as well as community radio shows on climate change. In addition, during the community discussion some persons (not participating in the project) reported having benefitted from the project by being informed of new practices by the Farmer field school participants.

36. However, it is less clear if the desired level of understanding in order to be able to make well informed climate change adaption decisions is in place. First of all, the needed climate and weather information is currently not available. Secondly, none of the documents adequately address, nor did the key informants met make any reference to different temporal scales. It seems that the only temporal scale considered is current vulnerabilities. This indicates that there remain some efforts to be made as regards knowledge sharing and awareness raising, particularly as it concerns transitioning from an "urgent an immediate" adaptation perspective (as conveyed through the NAPAs) to a long-term proactive adaptation planning framework.

37. Other observations made during the evaluation mission was that there seemed to be an incomplete understanding of the drivers of climate change in Liberia. For example, out of all the key informants met during the evaluation, only one student brought up the slash and burn methods as a contributor to climate change, yet it is commonly practiced in Liberia and agriculture in general is known to be one of the sectors contributing to climate change. In another example, the project seems to have omitted to recognize explicitly the links between adaptation and mitigation, particularly concerning tested adaptation technologies, such as the System for Rice Intensification (SRI).

38. Further to that, the evaluation noted that upscaling activities have already been started for both components; capacity development and the local level adaptation. While the capacity building activities have been able to influence the enabling environment by establishing new structures and promoting new synergies between the current organization and structures participating in the project, in the absence of exit strategy this raises some concern on sustainability of the expansion activities. Similarly for the component two while it is currently unclear whether the piloted technologies can all be considered adequate adaptation technologies upscaling them seems slightly irresponsible.

39. The evaluation also found that some of the delays in delivering outputs could be attributed to challenging implementation arrangements and delays in disbursement of funds. The Ebola crisis further exacerbated these delays. Other obstacles were noted by participants, such as for example, not having tools or resources in place, delays in salary payments, not being able to utilize newly acquired skills. For example, the MoA extension officers received training in Climate change risk and vulnerability assessment, but are yet to perform one. Knowledge therefore remains at the theoretical level, which indicates that the strategy for some interventions may not have been fully well designed.

40. The evaluation also found that there was a serious lack of understanding of the NIM modality and what it entailed in terms of accountability, as well as low level of mastery of the principles of result based project management, which seem to have hindered or prevented the delivery of intended outputs, thus seriously jeopardizing achievement of project results. For example, at the time of the evaluation it was noted that outputs to be delivered by CARI, AEDE and CARE had not even started. The lack of engagement with implementing partners that were identified during the project preparation phase is still limiting the progress towards expected outcomes.

41. In terms of reviewing the pathways from outcome to impacts, the evaluation used the reconstructed theory of Change proposed in the Inception report and reproduced in the section below, combined with its assessment of outcome achievement to date, to determine the likelihood of the project achieving its intended impact.

42. Based on this analysis, the evaluation finds that the project's outcomes were not yet fully delivered but that some of the conditions necessary to achieve intermediate states are in place and have produced secondary outcomes or impacts, with moderate likelihood that they will progress toward the intended impact. The ROTI rating was therefore DB, and it could improve provided that some remediation actions are taken in the short term.

4.2 Relevance

43. The evaluation has found that overall relevance of the project is **satisfactory**. For example, the project document made clear and explicit links to national priorities. One of the three objectives of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) 2008-2011 for the agriculture sector during the project development was to strengthen human and institutional capacity. This objective is addressed in Component 1: capacity development and Outcome 1: strengthened institutional and individual capacity to plan and manage climate change in the agricultural sector of Liberia in the project document.

44. The County Development Agenda is the local version of the national PRS that is prepared through a series of District Development Consultation Meetings that utilized the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) method. The Food and Agriculture Policy and Strategy (FAPS), Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Program (LASIP) elaborates from the PRS with specific policies and strategies that will revitalize and strengthen the agriculture sector, of which water and energy are integral components. This project was found to dovetail adequately with the LASIP objectives, and to have influenced further LASIP and country development planning.

45. The project strategies responded well to priorities for adaptation as outlined in the NAPA. It was the top priority project identified for implementation through the NAPA process with the objective of

enhancing resilience to increasing rainfall variability through the diversification of crop cultivation and small ruminants rearing (agriculture). Major adaptation activities identified included: carrying out the timing of crops cultivation in response to changing patterns of rainfall; intercropping, irrigation, and the optimization of lowland/swamp farming practices; pest control including fencing of farms against rodent, regular weeding and echoing bells and maintaining fast growing nitrogen fixing trees species to improved soil fertilizer and using.

46. The project has remained relevant in relation to the new Liberia development agenda, Agenda for Transformation (Aft) which emphasizes appropriate climate change strategies and intervention to help transform the economy. The Aft strategic objectives for the agriculture sector are: 1) Increase agricultural productivity, value-added and environmental sustainability, especially for small-holders, including women and youth. 2) Increase integration of small-holder agriculture with domestic and international markets. 3) Increase fishery production in a sustainable manner. 4) Increase access to machinery, fertilizer, storage, credit, training, technical assistance, market information and improved technologies, and related services, including through farmer groups and nuclear farms. 5) Increase access to land and security of tenure. 6) Improve nutrition for all Liberians. The planned project activities have a clear linkage to particularly objectives 1, 2 and 4.

47. The project is also relevant to UNDP's mandate, which is to support developing countries in designing and implementing national policies for sustainable human development with a focus on poverty reduction and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Building climate change resilience in sectors relevant to pro-poor economic development, including food security and agriculture, are key strategies addressed by UNDP Liberia. The project is aligned with the UNDAF and Country Programme.

48. The project was also adequately linked with the GEF's strategy on adaptation to climate change for the Least Developed Countries. It has two main pillars, which state integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans, programs and decision-making processes and expanding synergies with other GEF focal areas. The project followed LDCF adaptation guidelines by involving various stakeholders, including local communities' participation.

49. The evaluation also conducted an analysis of the project's design and a reconstruction of the project's theory of change, as below:

Goals and objectives

50. There did not appear to be an overarching goal in the project documentation. The project's stated objective is *"to increase resilience of poor, agriculturally-dependent communities and decrease vulnerability of agricultural sector to climate change in Liberia"*. If one considers the broad nature of this statement, compared to the narrower scope of project activities (ie geographically and in nature), this could in fact be the goal of the project, meaning the ultimate long-term result to which the project expects to contribute. In contrast, an appropriate new objective statement might be: *"To reduce the climate vulnerability of the agricultural sector through capacity building and demonstrations in pilot sites"*. This last statement captures the scope of intended project activities (ie what the project intends to influence) as well as the achievable result of these activities.

Pathways from outcomes to objective

51. The project in its original design comprises two main outcomes.

- Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional and individual capacity to plan and manage climate change in the agricultural sector in Liberia
- Outcome 2: Innovative, sustainable, socially appropriate adaptive measures piloted at the community level

52. When examined, one can note that both outcomes related to the development of capacity to respond to climate threats in the agricultural sector, linking clearly to the reformulated objective above.

53. Furthermore, capacity building is often seen as a combination of change in enabling environment, institutional and individual capacities; indeed, the project seeks to address all three of these elements. Outcome 1 is concerned with institutional/central capacity, whereas outcome 2 is focusing on individual/local farmer capacity. Both outcomes contain elements focusing on the enabling environment. Therefore, a more accurate division of outcomes might be achieved along the following lines:

- Outcome 1: Increased institutional capacity to plan and manage climate change in the agricultural sector
- Outcome 2: An enabling environment is established for continued adaptation in the agricultural sector
- Outcome 3: Strengthened local capacity to implement adaptive solutions in the agricultural sector.

54. These three new outcomes clearly demonstrate the underlying logic of the project, that some conditions must be in place in order to adapt the agricultural sector to climate challenges: a long-term enabling environment, that helps create the conditions for sustainability and continued adaptation, supported by concrete capacity to understand, manage and address climate risks within the key ministries, and informed by a practice of adaptation at the local level.

Outputs

55. With these three outcomes clearly delimiting the areas of influence of the project, the outputs may be reclassified, or regrouped differently. The proposed distribution reflects the logical chain of results. The proposed reformulations, while maintaining the original intent of the output, bring the results statement up to par with current standards and practice in terms of RBM. In addition, one output is being proposed for removal from the chain of results: Output 2.4: “Agricultural policies and donor investments are guided by adaptation learning at demonstration sites and integrate a land-use and livelihood strategy that helps local farmers build critically needed climate change resilience”. This is for multiple reasons. First, the activity that would logically link to this output “agricultural policies

are guided by adaptation learning” are already linked to outputs 2.2 and 2.3; furthermore, there are no specific activities related to the influence of donor investments.

56. In fact, this statement reflects a driver of impact, meaning a variable that we are seeking to influence, but which is external to the project’s direct area of intervention. We’ve restored it to its place as an impact driver in the reconstructed theory of change. It illustrates an intermediary stage between our objective and our impact.

Outcomes	Outputs
1. Strengthened institutional and individual capacity to plan and manage climate change in the agricultural sector in Liberia	<p>Output 1.1: Key technical stakeholders in relevant technical departments, parastatals, NGOs and research institutes have increased capacity for Climate Risk Management and adaptation.</p> <p>Output 1.2: In two counties, county planners and extension workers have the technical capacity to provide advice on the climate change impacts on agriculture and on alternative approaches and measures at community level.</p> <p>Output 1.4: National leaders show increased awareness of the threat of climate change to agriculture</p>
2. An enabling environment is established for continued adaptation in the agricultural sector	<p>Output 2.1: Liberian tertiary education system adapted to produce technicians, engineers and scientists knowledgeable about adapting to climate change</p> <p>Output 2.2: Climate change and adaptation are mainstreamed into LASIP and other key agricultural policy initiatives (e.g. Land Policy Reform, Enhanced Land Husbandry drive under LASIP)</p> <p>Output 2.3: County agriculture plans in Bong and Grand Gedeh account for potential climate risks and incorporate building of climate change resilience as a key component.</p>
3. Strengthened local capacity to implement adaptive solutions in the agricultural sector	<p>Output 3.1: A baseline analysis of current livelihood and natural resource use strategies and their vulnerabilities to climate change is undertaken at two ‘demonstration sites’ and community adaptation strategies and plans in place.</p> <p>Output 3.2: At least four adaptation and locally adapted innovations enhancing resilience to climate change tested at demonstration sites.</p>

Underlying assumptions and impact drivers

57. Based on this reconstructed logical pathway, a few key assumptions and impact drivers can be further examined. For example, as noted above, in order to move from our objective to our impact, “agricultural policies and donor investments have to be influenced by adaptation learning at all levels”. Therefore this can be highlighted as a key impact driver, which the project hopes to influence to some degree.

58. A first key assumption in this project is that demonstration activities and pilot investments will be replicated and up-scaled over time in order to achieve resilience in Liberia. It can be legitimately assumed that this project alone will not be sufficient in achieving resilience, therefore a replication strategy should become apparent before the end of the project.

59. Another assumption in this project's design relates to the link between output 2.1 ("the tertiary education system is adapted to produce scientists, engineers and technicians...") and Outcome 2. Indeed, in order for this output to contribute truly to the creation of an enabling environment for adaptation, some of the newly formed scientists, engineers and technicians have to come to work for the public sector, or at least, be employed in the agricultural sector in Liberia. Training alone may not be sufficient to contribute to this enabling environment: conditions should be in place for this training to come to bear during the practice of agriculture.

60. This is also true for the outputs that concern the development of institutional capacity: while the acquisition of skills is an important part of capacity development, the actual use of these skills, tools and methods may require that certain conditions be in place. For example, technical staff in NGOs and governments may need logistical resources to assess climate impacts within their areas of work; mandates of key ministries or directorates may need to be updated, and job descriptions may also need to be revised. The project design therefore assumes that these conditions will be put in place at some point during or after the project, and hence that the skills will be applied effectively.

61. In the next page, we illustrate the reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, along with the drivers and assumptions.

Goal: *to increase resilience of poor, agriculturally-dependent communities and decrease vulnerability of agricultural sector to climate change in Liberia*

Assumption: Mechanisms are designed up upscale and replicate project results

Objective: *To reduce the climate vulnerability of the agricultural sector through capacity building and demonstrations in pilot sites*

Assumption: At least some trained technicians, scientists and engineers come to work in the public sector; or in the agricultural sector in Liberia

Assumption: The legal, institutional and technical conditions are in place for trained staff to apply their skills within their area of work

Increased institutional capacity to plan and manage climate change in the agricultural sector

Key technical stakeholders have increased capacity for Climate Risk

County planners and extension workers have the technical capacity to provide advice

National leaders show increased awareness of the threat of climate change to agriculture

An enabling environment is established for continued adaptation in the agricultural sector

Tertiary education system adapted to produce technicians, engineers and scientists knowledgeable about adapting to climate change

Climate change and adaptation are mainstreamed into LASIP and other key agricultural policies

County agriculture plans account for climate risks and incorporate climate change resilience

Strengthened local capacity to implement adaptive solutions in the agricultural sector

A baseline analysis of current livelihood and natural resource use strategies and their vulnerabilities

At least four adaptation and locally adapted innovations enhancing resilience to climate change tested at demonstration sites

4.3 Efficiency

62. The project's efficiency was determined as a factor of cost efficiency and timeliness. In terms of cost efficiency, the project was rated overall **Unsatisfactory**. While the evaluation found that the capacity development activities (Component 1) were cost-efficient ways of achieving the intended outputs, the same could not be said for Component 2, which exhibited some significant shortcomings. For example, at the time of the evaluation, the FAO, who were responsible for implementing Component 2, reported having incurred a total expenditure of USD 925,737.00 but was unable to demonstrate a correlated contribution to the achievement of results.

63. The evaluation had difficulty in determining the link between spent funds and delivered activities, more specifically for Component 2. There were inconsistencies between the various financial and narrative reports, which led to some concerns. For example, some narrative reports indicated that the majority of the Component funds (USD 831,000.00) were disbursed to FAO at the end of the 2013. However, the UNDP's Combined delivery report for 2014 indicated expenditure of only USD 393,892.40. Further to that, the annual narrative report 2014 indicated that some progress was made in the beginning of the year but that, from May onwards until the end of the year, all project activities were substantially hindered due to the Ebola outbreak. In fact some of the key informant interviews revealed that for good part of the year, the project areas were not accessible due to movement restriction related to the Ebola outbreak.

64. In addition, financial reporting left to be desired. It was not clear whether the attribution of budget line items followed the real allocations or if these were mis-recorded. For example, the UNDP's CDR of 2014 for FAO expenditures indicates that funds were spent on items such as international short-term consultancies amounting to USD 105,380.00, but it was not clear from the narrative reports to what activity, output or result these were related. The sundry costs were USD 75,071.70, which represent 19% of the overall expenditure, which is not in compliance with UNDP's nor GEF financial rules and regulations.

65. In addition it was noted that the project budget in the approved annual work plan for 2014 was USD 1,364,080,53, out of which USD 831,000 was for component 2, while according to the project document the total amount budgeted for year 3 was USD 540,600. The evaluation was unable to ascertain if the change in the yearly budget had been subjected to an approval from GEF or UNDP. We were also not able to determine whether the choice of delivery mechanisms (or of expenditures) originated in any form of cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit analysis on the part of project implementers.

66. While the evaluation recognizes that financial systems of the different partners are not directly comparable, nonetheless, given the above example the evaluation finds this to be a serious issue regarding due diligence and accountability particularly for Component 2. It was noted during the evaluation that, in terms of accountability, the MoA is responsible for the overall achievement of project results and, as the GEF Implementing Agency, the UNDP is ultimately responsible for the GEF funds. However, according to some key informants interviews, the primary line of reporting for FAO country office regarding the project was to the FAO Headquarters. Various narrative and other reports including meeting minutes from the Environment and Energy Project Board, indicated that the FAO country office had not provided financial and narrative reports in a timely manner and that it has been difficult for the MoA/PMU to keep track of the project progress.

67. In addition to accountability, this impacted also the project's due diligence systems. For example the yearly M&E plan includes only component 1. In addition, the evaluation noted that none of the

Annual Project Reports made available to the evaluation included Financial Summaries. Furthermore the evaluation was unable to verify how the funds budgeted for outcome 3: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation in the project document were reallocated as the approved multi-year work plan did not include a budget.

68. In terms of timeliness the project did not perform well. At the time of the evaluation several Inception phase activities were still ongoing, for example negotiations with implementing partners on starting implementation (CARE, AEDE). Particularly alarming are the negotiations with AEDE, since as per the project document USD 909,632 were expected as co-financing from AEDE through a partnership agreement. Other delays were also observed, for example the Farmer Field school facilitator training took place in the first quarter of 2014 only.

69. As mentioned above, mitigating factors included substantial delays of disbursement of funds from UNDP headquarters to FAO headquarters. However, as of November 2013 USD 240.000 had been disbursed to FAO out of which 40% had been reported utilized, and an additional USD 831.000 were reported to having been disbursed by the end of the year 2013. In addition according to key informant interviews, there were some delays of disbursements of funds from UNDP to PMU, particularly the UNDP cofinancing: For example at the time of the evaluation, computers for the MoA extension officers had not yet been distributed to the officers, which should have been part of the project Inception phase activities. Finally, the Ebola outbreak also caused substantial delays in implementation.

70. It must be noted as a mitigating factor that the CCCAAP project is one of the first GEF projects to be delivered in Liberia and surely some lesson to be learned for improvement can be expected and it also must be noted that not all documents were available to the evaluation. However, the level of issues relating to accountability and compliance to UNDP/GEF rules and regulation seems serious.

4.4 Sustainability

71. Despite the above-mentioned shortcomings, the evaluation found that the results that were achieved to date presented an overall rating for sustainability as **Satisfactory**, as explained below.

Financial Sustainability

72. Currently, the Government has provided national resources in the form of office space, technical support and a tax waiver for the project staff. It is not clear whether these resources will remain available for future projects or for adaptation programming in general. In terms of financial sustainability, the likelihood of national resources in the form of financial support being available after the GEF/UNDP is unlikely.

73. However, the stock taking report for the National Adaptation Plan has identified agriculture as one of the priority areas, which indicates that future programming is to be expected, using both national and international resources. In addition, the MoA has prepared a proposal of USD 6,7 million to GEF National Steering committee to extend and upscale this project to 3 new counties. The rating for financial sustainability was **Moderately Satisfactory**.

Socio-political sustainability

74. The overall rating for Socio-political sustainability is **Satisfactory**. As noted during the evaluation, there is high political buy-in for the project. The government has established a national secretariat for

climate change mandated to raise climate change awareness, develop a national climate change policy and mobilize support to mainstream climate change in Liberia's development agenda; it has also completed the first national communication and developed a national climate change and gender action plan and the national REDD+ readiness preparation proposal (RPP). This indicates that the Liberian government is committed to tackling all aspects of climate change.

75. The project identified stakeholders from different sections of the society, including beneficiaries. Stakeholders that were engaged during the project development process include EPA, MOA, FDA, University of Liberia, FAO, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, UNDP, NGOs such as Conservation International, OXFAM, AEDE, CARE and farmers groups including AMENU Farmers Cooperative Society in Grand Gedeh County (Pilot site) AND PANFACO in Bong County. However, during implementation some of these potential partnerships were lost due to delays in developing agreements. Additionally, the project has always involved local traditional chiefs and elders in project implementation.

76. Project Steering Committee meetings allowed for stakeholders to make relevant inputs to the project and during periodic joint monitoring visits, beneficiaries were able to interact with steering committee members. However, the evaluation noted that no specific grievances mechanism for the project beneficiaries was in place, and that there were weaknesses in the enforcement of PSC decisions. There was also no participatory M&E system.

Environmental sustainability

77. In the risk-log, environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project's outcomes and results were not mentioned. There was no explicit assessment of environmental impacts of proposed local adaptation options and technologies, nor was there an effort to conduct a comprehensive ecosystem assessment for adaptation purposes. However, it was observed that the project did not appear to have any negative environmental impacts.

78. The evaluation noted that some of the proposed adaptation practices seemed to have been selected in a very ad-hoc manner, with little thinking on long-term adaptation benefits, and outside of any integrated adaptation vision for the project sites. There did not appear to have been any prioritization process for the selection of adaptation technologies to be piloted, and the theoretical background for the selection was unclear in many cases. In addition, the evaluation noted that the needs assessment proposed various technologies that were not pursued, such as experimenting with alternatives to slash and burn, introducing conservation agriculture; mulching, incorporating leguminous trees, intercropping; use of small ruminants; or to review seed selection and broadcasting practices. It is unclear to the evaluation why these measures were not selected for piloting, because many co-benefits could be reaped even beyond adaptation.

79. The evaluation found that in some cases at least, some of the adaptation technologies could be seen as mal-adaptations, and that the level of success in implementing these technologies may not have been an indication of their long-term viability. It should also be noted that many of the techniques piloted require advanced management capacities in order to truly constitute adaptation alternatives, but that the project was unable to sustainably create this capacity among the pilot communities. For example, the evaluation also noted that one of the more successful innovations being tested is the water management for low land rice paddies which has been replicated by some Farmer field school participants as well non-participants in their own farms. However, in the absence of climate data and longer term predictions, without proper ecosystem assessment on watersheds, this

can potentially lead to maladaptation and financial losses, particularly if heavy investments to water infrastructures are made.

80. As a result of these observations, the environmental sustainability criteria was rated *Unsatisfactory*.

81. The evaluation finds that there should be a technical validation of technologies proposed before making any decisions on upscaling, to ensure that their viability in current and future climate conditions for Liberia is established.

Conclusions and Recommendations

82. In summary CCAAP demonstrated a Moderately Satisfactory performance, owing to a number of significant technical and managerial challenges that prevented it from achieving its full potential. Key conclusions are as follows:

83. Conclusion 1: The lines of accountability, management requirements and reporting mechanisms were unclear. This resulted in the project being divided into two separate, disconnected, components, with no clear link between them. It also resulted in some concerns regarding the overall management and distribution of funds among the components. This could jeopardize the finalization of the project, achievement of outcomes, and upscaling strategy.

84. Conclusion 2: The project may not achieve the full scope of intended results within available time and resources. Delays in implementation and execution, along with problems related to the uncertainties regarding fund availability, may prevent the project for achieving all the intended results. Focusing on readily achievable targets may help alleviate this risk.

85. Conclusion 3: It is unclear whether the piloted technologies can all be considered adequate adaptation technologies. The selection of technologies, and the lack of observable rationalization or prioritization for these technologies, combined with the need for increased management capacity to implement them, makes for a difficult argument. An assessment on technical grounds may be required before upscaling.

86. Conclusion 4: The project achieved good levels of awareness raising, and some important achievements in terms of capacity development among certain stakeholders. The high level of political and institutional buy-in visible in this project, along with the dedication of project staff and the MoA, will assist in maintaining the project's positive outcomes in the long term.

Key Recommendations

87. Recommendation 1: Improve due diligence and undertake an independent audit of accounts within the next 6 months with a strong focus on linking expenditures to specific activities and/or outputs, particularly for Component 2. In case expenditures cannot be legitimately attributed to specific project activities, it is recommended that responsible partners be requested to replenish the project funds accordingly, in order to allow for finalization.

88. Recommendation 2: Address issues of unclear accountability within the next three months. The evaluation recommends that overall responsibility for implementing Component 2 be attributed to the MoA, as originally planned, while the FAO could continue play a technical assistance role, as a sub-contractor, upon request. This would further enhance the national ownership and likely improve the cost-effectiveness of the project. In addition, the Project Steering Committee should ensure that the

roles and responsibilities (accountability, transparency, timely implementation, management and achievement of results) are clear to all parties involved. UNDP could provide short training on rules and regulations, and result based management. Lines of accountability and areas of delegated authority should be clarified for all participants in the project.

89. Recommendation 3: Develop an exit strategy within the next 3 months. Review project outcomes, outputs, targets, implementing partners, in light of available funds, and determine what can be realistically achieved in the remaining time (including non-cost extension), ensuring that activities and outputs contribute to the intended outcomes, SMART indicator are used, and that the targets are achievable. We also recommend suspending any upscaling activities until a technical assessment of the piloted technologies is conducted, and until a sustainability plan for the project is in place and followed.



VACANCY ANNOUNCEMENT
CONSULTANT - MIDTERM EVALUATION OF “ENHANCING RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE BY MAINSTREAMING ADAPTATION CONCERNS INTO AGRICULTURE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT IN LIBERIA (CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AGRICULTURE PROJECT- CCAAP)
PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT UNIT (PMU)
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

Date of Re-Advertisement: 11 May 2015

Deadline for Application: 30 May 2015

Start Date: 20 August 2015

Duration of Assignment: 20 Days including Saturdays

Type of Contract/Consultancy: National (Local) Individual Consultant

Duty Station: Monrovia with not more than five (5) days field visit in two pilot counties

Background:

In 2011 the Government of Liberia (GoL) through the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) signed a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Agreement to implement this Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) project titled: **“Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change by Mainstreaming Adaptation Concerns into Agriculture Sector Development in Liberia” or Climate Change Adaptation Agriculture Project (CCAAP)**. The project will be a vehicle for implementing priority interventions for the agriculture sector identified in Liberia’s National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA). It is a four-year project. The project will support the ongoing process to revitalize the agriculture sector, and ensure that adaptation to climate change is integrated into the revitalization process. Specific contributions toward the reduction of vulnerabilities to climate change will be achieved through the pursuit of specific outcomes including: (a) integrating concerns into relevant policies and planning processes at the state and national levels; (b) comprehensive capacity development for individuals in national agencies focusing on agriculture and in pilot counties, and farmers; (c) demonstration of risk reduction strategies and measures at pilot sites; (d) strengthening technical capacity to integrate climate change risk management into farmer level agricultural capacity; and (e) capturing and disseminating lessons learned to key stakeholders.

The project seeks to increase resilience and enhance adaptive capacity to address the additional risks posed by climate change in the agriculture sectors in Liberia, which will be achieved through three components:

Component (1) Capacity development

- Raise awareness of national leaders (e.g. MOA leaders, Cabinet, FSNTC, ACC) to the threat of climate change to agriculture;
- Climate change mainstreamed into LASIP and other key agricultural policy initiatives (e.g. Land Policy Reform, Enhanced Land Husbandry drive under LASIP, etc...)
- CRM and adaptation capacity in the agriculture sector developed of key technical stakeholders in the ministry technical departments, in parastatals, NGOs and in research institutes (especially those responsible for preparing policies and plans and for overseeing investments)
- Liberian tertiary education system adapted to produce agricultural engineers knowledgeable about adapting to climate change In three counties, county planners and extension workers have the technical capacity to support communities on climate change, by providing advice on climate change impacts on agriculture and on alternative approaches and measures;

Component (2) Demonstration measures to reduce vulnerability

- A baseline analysis of current livelihood and natural resource use strategies and their vulnerabilities to climate change undertaken at two ‘demonstration sites’ and community adaptation strategies and plans in place
- Local community-based adaptation strategies and plans implemented: At least four adaptation and locally adapted innovations enhancing resilience to climate change tested at demonstration sites.
- County agriculture plans in Bong and Grand Gedeh account for potential climate risks and incorporate building of climate change resilience as a key component.
- Agricultural policies and donor investments are guided by adaptation learning at demonstration sites and integrate a land-use and livelihood strategy that helps local farmers build critically needed climate change resilience

Component (3) Knowledge management and up-scaling.

- Establishment of a small bursary programme to promote action-oriented research into climate change and adaptation in community farming;
- Knowledge management website incorporated into MOA website;
- Project lessons prepared for dissemination through the Adaptation Learning Mechanism.

I. Scope and Objective of Consultancy

The consultant will work directly with an international counterpart and the CCAAP team under the direct supervision of the National Project Coordinator, PMU/MOA, in close collaboration with the Director of Monitoring and Evaluation, Department of Planning & Development, MOA, as well as overall supervision of the Director of the Programme Management Unit (PMU), MOA and Deputy Minister for Planning & Development (DPD), MOA.

The objective of the consultancy is to evaluate progress towards achieving expected project outputs, outcomes and goal. It will be a reflective and forward-looking exercise. The consultancy will inform stakeholders on issues relating to the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project as well as prospects for replicating results and lessons learned from the this pilot project into other parts of the country. It will review CCAAP's strategies, management and technical support for the MOA's Food Security and Nutrition programme, the UNDP's Energy and Environment Programme, GoL's Poverty Reduction Strategy II (Agenda for Transformation) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It will reflect on what results have been achieved through the implementation of the project and will analyze lessons learned. The conclusions of the evaluation will then inform decisions on the parameters for continuation and possible extension or replication into other counties of Liberia.

II. Scope of National Consultant's Work

Generally, the National Consultant will support the Lead (International Consultant) with the evaluation for the purpose of the **Knowledge Transfer aims of the Government of Liberia (MOA)** to assess progress towards achieving programme outputs, outcomes and goal of the CCAAP so far. In consultation with key stakeholders including, project team, relevant technical and planning staffs of MOA, EPA, CARE, AEDE, OXFAM, FDA, Farmers Workers Union (FUN), MOGD, CI, FAO, UNDP Liberia's Energy and Environment Unit as well as its GEF staff, MLME, CARI, College of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Liberia, College of Agriculture and Sustainable Development, Cuttington University, the County Development Officers and Development Superintendents of Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties, Cooperative Development Agency (CDA) extension officers in pilot counties, CSOs, etc, the national consultant will support the Lead Consultant to specifically:

- Assess the relevance of the project design
- Assess progress made towards the achievement of planned outputs and outcomes.
- Assess efficiency of the programme strategies and resources in the achievement of the intended results.
- Review the effectiveness of the current implementation framework to further improve the implementation and management of the project
- Review the effectiveness of the project strategies and implementation as relate to the project's contribution to achievement of agriculture sector development as well as overall national development agenda
- Identify challenges and key constraints which would undermine achievement of expected end-term results and recommend adjustments to mitigate these challenges
- Provide advice for strategic reflection and learning on mainstreaming economic empowerment of women in agriculture adaptation to climate change
- Assess and analyze the effectiveness of partnerships and interagency collaborations and cooperation and suggests recommendation for improvements
- Share initial findings (with) with relevant stakeholders for validation
- Submit final report to the Director of the PMU

Key evaluation criteria and questions to be addressed:

Project design and its relevance - 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:

- Climate Change Adaptation priorities at the national level;
- Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;
- Country ownership / drivenness – participation and commitments of government, states, local authorities, and communities;
- UNDP mission to promote assistance to the country to build its capacities in the focal area of adaptation to climate change;
- 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.

- Analyze how the pilot project context is similar to or different from contexts where the project might be adopted in other environment (county)
- Report those contextual influences that appeared to significantly influence the project and that might be of interest to potential adopters meaning Farmers

Project outcomes, outputs and indicators - 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, how the project implementation is progressing towards the achievement of its stated objectives; 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.
- Estimate effects of context on project outcomes
- Identify and describe any critical competitors to this project that functioned at the same time and in the project environment
- Describe how people in the project general area perceived the project existence, importance, and quality

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 relevant GEF/LDCF objectives (as it is stated in the GEF CEO endorsement request, the AMAT Tool and the logframe;
- Delivering climate change adaptation benefits; and
- Achieving financial and environmental sustainability for the project intervention.
- Rapid assessment of actual and potential project impacts and of factors potentially limiting impacts
- Rapid assessment of the actual and potential impacts of the pilot projects on the communities of intervention

Management arrangements focused on project implementation:

- General implementation and management: evaluate the adequacy of the project, planning and implementation structure, including the effectiveness of the Project Board, partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the aspect of compliance to UNDP/GEF requirements and also from the perspective of “good practice model” that could be used for replication;
- Financial accountability and efficiency: assess efficiency against the so far achieved results, including an assessment of the NEX (National Execution) Modality and the cost effectiveness of the utilization of LDCF resources and actual UNDP co-financing for the achievement of project results; Assess the contribution of in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project has been able to leverage additional funding so far.
- Monitoring and evaluation on project level: assess the monitoring and evaluation strategy used by the project implementation, focusing on relevance of the performance indicators, that are Specific; Measurable; Achievable and Attributable; Relevant and Realistic and time bound (SMART indicators)

Timeframe:

Considering the time left till the project’s foreseen termination, the difficulties faced by it in its first three years of implementation and the resources effectively available for programming, is the timeframe set still realistic? If applicable, outline recommendations for revising this timeframe with proposed benchmarks for the remainder of the project implementation time.

Overall success of the project with regard to the following criteria:

- Sustainability - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project,
- Changes: Assess any changes that may have resulted from the project implementation and its impact.
- Contribution to capacity development and knowledge management - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and local institutions to use the positive experiences; ownership of project results;
- Replication – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country and in the region,
- Synergies: with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.
- Knowledge and lessons learnt documentation, codification and dissemination

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Unsatisfactory (US) with an explanation of the rating (see Annex 3).

It is expected that the Consultant will develop an *evaluation matrix* that will further refine the above questions, the areas they refer to, the criteria for evaluating them, the indicators and the means for verification. The evaluation matrix may include additional questions not already included in these TORs that will be of relevance to the evaluation.

Some of the existing sources of information will include annual and other reports from the project. Other documents that are available are the project documents/proposals, concept papers, narrative and mission reports. Liberia's National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) and the project baseline studies undertaken will also provide relevant information for this evaluation.

The final evaluation methodologies to be applied in the evaluation will be developed by the Consultant and presented for approval to the MOA. The methods should be in compliance those of the MOA and with best practices.

II a) Key Specific Tasks of the National Consultant

Under the direct supervision of the Lead/International Consultant, the National Consultant shall

- Contact Lead Consultant and support planning of evaluation process
- Liaise with the CCAAP, PMU, MOA and relevant sector institutions and project stakeholders to book appointments and develop detail itinerary in consultation with Lead Consultant
- Collect and compile reference documents for desk review and share, as well as support Lead Consultant in reviewing these documents
- Arrange meetings with stakeholders and plan field mission with Lead Consultant
- Support / coordinate and facilitate actual field visits including interviews and group discussions
- Support compilation and analysis of data for evaluation report
- Support consolidation and finalization of the evaluation report

The deliverables expected from the consultant include the following;

- An Inception report with refined evaluation questions and evaluation methodology
- A draft evaluation report to be reviewed by stakeholders at a one-day validation meeting to be lead-facilitated by the Consultant
- A power point presentation to be made at the validation workshop
- Final evaluation report which should include annexes specific to findings from the evaluation.

III. Competencies

Core Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling values and ethical standards of international best practices.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Treats all people respectfully and fairly without favoritism.

Functional Competencies:

- Proven ability to analyze and integrate diverse information to provide advice.
- Ability to identify key strategic issues, opportunities and risks.
- Ability to monitor progress against targets, milestones and deadlines.
- Demonstrates understanding of policies, programs and projects as well as procedures and operational activities.
- Demonstrates excellent organizational and strong interpersonal skills.
- Ability to work independently as well as within a team.
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
- Ability to work in rural Africa and to communicate/interact smoothly with rural stakeholders

III. Required Skills and Experience

Qualifications and Experience:

- A master's degree in any social science (A strong BA/BSc with at least five years of relevant experience will suffice)
- At least five years of working experience in evaluation, and at least five years in evaluation of development projects/programs (preferably, agriculture and environmental projects) .
- Experience in evaluation of donor-funded and programme involving multi-countries.
- Proven experience and ability to lead and work with other evaluation experts.
- Knowledge and experience (at least 3 years) or strong familiarity with climate change adaptation and agriculture
- Experience in working with multi-stakeholders essential: governments, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the United Nations/ multilateral/bilateral institutions.
- Experience in participatory approach is an asset.
- Facilitation skills and ability to manage diversity of views in different cultural contexts.
- Ability to produce well written reports demonstrating analytical ability and communication skills.
- Ability to work with the organization commissioning the evaluation and with other evaluation stakeholders to ensure that a high quality product is delivered on a timely basis.
- Fluency in Written and Oral English.

All application should be addressed to:

Atty. Roland J. Lepol
 National Project Coordinator
 Climate Change Adaptation Agriculture Project, PMU/MOA
 Programme Management Unit, MOA Annex, Fendell, University of Liberia

By email: (roland.lepol@moaliberia.org / rolandjlepol@yahoo.com) / johnson.chelleh@moaliberia.org

If hard copy, deliver at: Programme Management Unit, MOA Annex, Fendell, University of Liberia



VACANCY ANNOUNCEMENT-**READVERTISING**

CONSULTANT - MIDTERM EVALUATION OF “ENHANCING RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE BY MAINSTREAMING ADAPTATION CONCERNS INTO AGRICULTURE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT IN LIBERIA (CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AGRICULTURE PROJECT- CCAAP) PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT UNIT (PMU) MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

Date of Advertisement: 29 April 2014

Deadline for Application: 13 May 2014

Start Date: 1 August 2014

Duration of Assignment: 28 Days including Saturdays

Type of Contract/Consultancy: International Individual Consultant

Duty Station: Monrovia with not more than five (5) days field visit in two pilot counties

Background:

In 2011 the Government of Liberia (GoL) through the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) signed a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Agreement to implement this Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) project titled: “**Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change by Mainstreaming Adaptation Concerns into Agriculture Sector Development in Liberia**” or **Climate Change Adaptation Agriculture Project (CCAAP)**. The project will be a vehicle for implementing priority interventions for the agriculture sector identified in Liberia’s National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA). It is a four-year project. The project will support the ongoing process to revitalize the agriculture sector, and ensure that adaptation to climate change is integrated into the revitalization process. Specific contributions toward the reduction of vulnerabilities to climate change will be achieved through the pursuit of specific outcomes including: (a) integrating concerns into relevant policies and planning processes at the state and national levels; (b) comprehensive capacity development for individuals in national agencies focusing on agriculture and in pilot counties, and farmers; (c) demonstration of risk reduction strategies and measures at pilot sites; (d) strengthening technical capacity to integrate climate change risk management into farmer level agricultural capacity; and (e) capturing and disseminating lessons learned to key stakeholders.

The project seeks to increase resilience and enhance adaptive capacity to address the additional risks posed by climate change in the agriculture sectors in Liberia, which will be achieved through three components:

Component (1) Capacity development

- Raise awareness of national leaders (e.g. MOA leaders, Cabinet, FSNTC, ACC) to the threat of climate change to agriculture;
- Climate change mainstreamed into LASIP and other key agricultural policy initiatives (e.g. Land Policy Reform, Enhanced Land Husbandry drive under LASIP, etc...)
- CRM and adaptation capacity in the agriculture sector developed of key technical stakeholders in the ministry technical departments, in parastatals, NGOs and in research institutes (especially those responsible for preparing policies and plans and for overseeing investments)
- Liberian tertiary education system adapted to produce agricultural engineers knowledgeable about adapting to climate change In three counties, county planners and extension workers have the technical capacity to support communities on climate change, by providing advice on climate change impacts on agriculture and on alternative approaches and measures;

Component (2) Demonstration measures to reduce vulnerability

- A baseline analysis of current livelihood and natural resource use strategies and their vulnerabilities to climate change undertaken at two ‘demonstration sites’ and community adaptation strategies and plans in place
- Local community-based adaptation strategies and plans implemented: At least four adaptation and locally adapted innovations enhancing resilience to climate change tested at demonstration sites.
- County agriculture plans in Bong and Grand Gedeh account for potential climate risks and incorporate building of climate change resilience as a key component.
- Agricultural policies and donor investments are guided by adaptation learning at demonstration sites and integrate a land-use and livelihood strategy that helps local farmers build critically needed climate change resilience

Component (3) Knowledge management and up-scaling.

- Establishment of a small bursary programme to promote action-oriented research into climate change and adaptation in community farming;
- Knowledge management website incorporated into MOA website;
- Project lessons prepared for dissemination through the Adaptation Learning Mechanism.

I. Scope and Objective of Consultancy

The consultant will work directly with an international counterpart and the CCAAP team under the direct supervision of the National Project Coordinator, PMU/MOA, in close collaboration with the Director of Monitoring and Evaluation, Department of Planning & Development, MOA, as well as overall supervision of the Director of the Programme Management Unit (PMU), MOA and Deputy Minister for Planning & Development (DPD), MOA.

The objective of the consultancy is to evaluate progress towards achieving expected project outputs, outcomes and goal. It will be a reflective and forward-looking exercise. The consultancy will inform stakeholders on issues relating to the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project as well as prospects for replicating results and lessons learned from this pilot project into other parts of the country. It will review CCAAP's strategies, management and technical support for the MOA's Food Security and Nutrition programme, the UNDP's Energy and Environment Programme, GoL's Poverty Reduction Strategy II (Agenda for Transformation) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It will reflect on what results have been achieved through the implementation of the project and will analyze lessons learned. The conclusions of the evaluation will then inform decisions on the parameters for continuation and possible extension or replication into other counties of Liberia.

II. Duties and Responsibilities

Generally, the evaluation will assess progress towards achieving programme outputs, outcomes and goal of the CCAAP so far. In consultation with key stakeholders including, project team, relevant technical and planning staffs of MOA, EPA, CARE, AEDE, OXFAM, FDA, Farmers Workers Union (FUN), MOGD, CI, FAO, UNDP Liberia's Energy and Environment Unit as well as its GEF staff, MLME, CARI, College of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Liberia, College of Agriculture and Sustainable Development, Cuttington University, the County Development Officers and Development Superintendents of Bong and Grand Gedeh Counties, Cooperative Development Agency (CDA) extension officers in pilot counties, CSOs, etc, the consultant will specifically:

- Assess the relevance of the project design
- Assess progress made towards the achievement of planned outputs and outcomes.
- Assess efficiency of the programme strategies and resources in the achievement of the intended results.
- Review the effectiveness of the current implementation framework to further improve the implementation and management of the project
- Review the effectiveness of the project strategies and implementation as relate to the project's contribution to achievement of agriculture sector development as well as overall national development agenda
- Identify challenges and key constraints which would undermine achievement of expected end-term results and recommend adjustments to mitigate these challenges
- Provide advice for strategic reflection and learning on mainstreaming economic empowerment of women in agriculture adaptation to climate change
- Assess and analyze the effectiveness of partnerships and interagency collaborations and cooperation and suggests recommendation for improvements
- Share initial findings (with) with relevant stakeholders for validation
- Submit final report to the Director of the PMU

Key evaluation criteria and questions to be addressed:

Project design and its relevance - 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:

- Climate Change Adaptation priorities at the national level;
- Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;
- Country ownership / drivenness – participation and commitments of government, states, local authorities, and communities;
- UNDP mission to promote assistance to the country to build its capacities in the focal area of adaptation to climate change;
- 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.
- Analyze how the pilot project context is similar to or different from contexts where the project might be adopted in other

- environment (county)
- Report those contextual influences that appeared to significantly influence the project and that might be of interest to potential adopters meaning Farmers
-

Project outcomes, outputs and indicators - 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, how the project implementation is progressing towards the achievement of its stated objectives; 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.
- Estimate effects of context on project outcomes
- Identify and describe any critical competitors to this project that functioned at the same time and in the project environment
- Describe how people in the project general area perceived the project existence, importance, and quality

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 relevant GEF/LDCF objectives (as it is stated in the GEF CEO endorsement request, the AMAT Tool and the logframe;
- Delivering climate change adaptation benefits; and
- Achieving financial and environmental sustainability for the project intervention.
- Rapid assessment of actual and potential project impacts and of factors potentially limiting impacts
- Rapid assessment of the actual and potential impacts of the pilot projects on the communities of intervention

Management arrangements focused on project implementation:

- General implementation and management: evaluate the adequacy of the project, planning and implementation structure, including the effectiveness of the Project Board, partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the aspect of compliance to UNDP/GEF requirements and also from the perspective of “good practice model” that could be used for replication;
- Financial accountability and efficiency: assess efficiency against the so far achieved results, including an assessment of the NEX (National Execution) Modality and the cost effectiveness of the utilization of LDCF resources and actual UNDP co-financing for the achievement of project results; Assess the contribution of in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project has been able to leverage additional funding so far.
- Monitoring and evaluation on project level: assess the monitoring and evaluation strategy used by the project implementation, focusing to relevance of the performance indicators, that are Specific; Measurable; Achievable and Attributable; Relevant and Realistic and time bound (SMART indicators)

Timeframe:

Considering the time left till the project’s foreseen termination, the difficulties faced by it in its first three years of implementation and the resources effectively available for programming, is the timeframe set still realistic? If applicable, outline recommendations for revising this timeframe with proposed benchmarks for the remainder of the project implementation time.

Overall success of the project with regard to the following criteria:

- Sustainability - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project,
- Changes: Assess any changes that may have resulted from the project implementation and its impact.
- Contribution to capacity development and knowledge management - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and local institutions to use the positive experiences; ownership of project results;
- Replication – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country and in the region,
- Synergies: with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.

- Knowledge and lessons learnt documentation, codification and dissemination

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Unsatisfactory (US) with an explanation of the rating (see Annex 3).

It is expected that the Consultant will develop an *evaluation matrix* that will further refine the above questions, the areas they refer to, the criteria for evaluating them, the indicators and the means for verification. The evaluation matrix may include additional questions not already included in these TORs that will be of relevance to the evaluation.

Some of the existing sources of information will include annual and other reports from the project. Other documents that are available are the project documents/proposals, concept papers, narrative and mission reports. Liberia's National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) and the project baseline studies undertaken will also provide relevant information for this evaluation.

The final evaluation methodologies to be applied in the evaluation will be developed by the Consultant and presented for approval to the MOA. The methods should be in compliance those of the MOA and with best practices.

The deliverables expected from the consultant include the following;

- An Inception report with refined evaluation questions and evaluation methodology
- A draft evaluation report to be reviewed by stakeholders at a one-day validation meeting to be lead-facilitated by the Consultant
- A power point presentation to be made at the validation workshop
- Final evaluation report which should include annexes specific to findings from the evaluation.

III. Competencies

Core Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling values and ethical standards of international best practices.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Treats all people respectfully and fairly without favoritism.

Functional Competencies:

- Proven ability to analyze and integrate diverse information to provide advice.
- Ability to identify key strategic issues, opportunities and risks.
- Ability to monitor progress against targets, milestones and deadlines.
- Demonstrates understanding of policies, programs and projects as well as procedures and operational activities.
- Demonstrates excellent organizational and strong interpersonal skills.
- Ability to work independently as well as within a team.
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
- Ability to work in rural Africa and to communicate/interact smoothly with rural stakeholders

III. Required Skills and Experience

Qualifications and Experience:

- At least a master's degree in any social science.
- Ten years of working experience in evaluation, and at least five years in evaluation of development projects/programs (preferably, agriculture and environmental projects) .
- Experience in evaluation of large programme involving multi-countries.
- Proven experience and ability to lead and work with other evaluation experts.
- Knowledge and experience (at least 3 years) or strong familiarity with climate change adaptation and agriculture
- Experience in working with multi-stakeholders essential: governments, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the United Nations/ multilateral/bilateral institutions.

- Experience in participatory approach is an asset.
- Facilitation skills and ability to manage diversity of views in different cultural contexts.
- Ability to produce well written reports demonstrating analytical ability and communication skills.
- Ability to work with the organization commissioning the evaluation and with other evaluation stakeholders to ensure that a high quality product is delivered on a timely basis.
- Fluency in Written and Oral English.

All application should be addressed to:

Atty. Roland J. Lepol

National Project Coordinator

Climate Change Adaptation Agriculture Project, PMU/MOA

Programme Management Unit, MOA Annex, Fendell, University of Liberia

By email: (roland.lepol@moaliberia.org / rolandjlepol@yahoo.com) / johnson.chelleh@moaliberia.org

If hard copy, deliver at: Programme Management Unit, MOA Annex, Fendell, University of Liberia

Note: Please see deadline for application.

Annex 2 - List of documents consulted

1. Evaluation Coordination	Midterm evaluation - TOR-Int'l-CONSULTANT HRD & Harry
	Revised ITINERARY - FOR FIELD MISSION - MTE CCAAP
2. Documents on Project Design	Capacity Needs Final Report March 2013
	CCM Capacity development plan final doc 260513
	Implementation manual for the capacity development plan
	Final Report - GEF Liberia Needs Assessment
	GEF SCOPING MISSION REPORT 20 11 12
	PIMS_4439_Prodoc_Liberia
3. Documents on Project Implementation	2013 MOA Annual Report (13 Feb 2014 Finalized Version for YEASU Printing - 2013 MOA Annual Report Woods.Gbokie.05.11pm)
	2014 MOA Annual Report - Final Version
	2012 Annual Report – CCAAP
	2013 Annual Report – CCAAP
	2014 Annual Report – CCAAP
	BTOR Liberia Mission Nov 2013: one page mission report summary
	CCAAP-CRM Strategy 29 Sept (2014)
	PSC Minutes, Oct 2012
	PSC Minutes, Jan 2013
	TWG Minutes, Feb 2013
	TWG Minutes, April 2013
	TWG Minutes, May 2013
	EE Oct 2013 Project Board Meeting Minutes
	Inception Workshop Report-Final doc- 20 Sept-2012-
	M&E Plan 2012-2013
	M&E Plan 2014
	M&E Plan 2015
	M&E Annual Report-2013
	PIR 2013
	PIR 2015, draft
4. Evaluation Methodology	Inception Report Template
	Liberia MTE Activities & Outputs Progress
	Liberia MTE Evaluation Grid
5. Financial reports	CDR Q1 2013 (named first quarter Agriculture project.pdf)
	CDR Q3 2013
	CDR Q4 2013
	CDR 2014
	CDR Q1 2015
	CDR Q2 2015
6. Technical reports	Agriculture and Food Security Sector Results Matrix
	Climate Change Research UL CU 2
	Climate Change Research UL CU Final version
	Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy Final - KMCS (2013)

	Final Version of Climate Change Change Modules
	Joint Team Report- High Level Field assess mission
	Network launch-Report-2014
	Network of CC Practitioners-setup Report
	PIR 2015-Obj Rating- Capacity Development - Revised
	Report on risk assessment and vulnerability Draft V0
	Report-Establishment of Monrovia-based Think-tank on climate change and climate risk management - final

Annex 3 – Summary of Evaluation Mission and List of Interviews

List of people interviewed during the mid-term evaluation mission

Name	Sex	Title	Institutions
Farmers			
Baryee Milla	M	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
G. Alex Kahn Sr.	M	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
Aletha Seoh	F	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
George Cheah	M	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
Zarty A Ceasar	M	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
Jeremiah Sayee	M	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
Joseph Kyne	M	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
Seban C. L. George	M	Member – Zleh Town	Farmer Field School - Grand Gedeh Co.
Tohn Penny	M	Member – Bellemu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Younpoe Woah	F	Member – Bellemu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Victoria Kpoqunyan	F	Member – Bellemu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Lorpu Gbotai	M	Asst. Chairlady – Foequellah Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Gormah Malalah	F	Member – Foequellah Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Nyama Paye	F	Secretary – Foequellah Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Nyama Barclay	F	Member – Foequellah Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Francis Paliwoe	M	Chairman – Garmu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Gormah Kpakilah	F	Chairlady – Garmu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Francis P. Kollie	M	Secretary – Garmu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Nyampu Paliwoe	F	Member – Garmu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Nyamah Paliwoe	F	Member – Garmu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Nagbah D. Paliwoe	M	Member – Garmu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
Jeremiah Paliwoe	M	Member – Garmu Town	Farmer Field School - Bong Co.
FAO			
Joseph Boiwu	M	Assistant Representative	FAO
John Emmanuel Paivey	M	Operation Assistant	FAO
J. Kanie Merfee	M	National Consultant	FAO
John B. Yarkpa	M	Field Technician	FAO – Grand Gedeh Co.
Joseph W. Jallah	M	Field Technician	FAO – Bong Co.
Arthur Sohood	M	FFS Facilitator – Pouh Town	FAO –Grand Gedeh Co.
Janet Gaye	M	FFS Facilitator – Tian Town	FAO -Grand Gedeh Co.
Moses Gaye	M	FFS Facilitator – Tian Town	FAO -Grand Gedeh Co.
Nelson Jabah	M	FFS Facilitator – Foequellah Town	FAO - Bong Co.

Augustus Koniseal	M	FFS Facilitator – Bellemu Town	FAO - Bong Co.
MOA			
Roland Lepol	M	Project Coordinator	MOA/PMU –CCAAP
Emmanuel E. Johnson	M	Project M&E Officer	MOA/PMU –CCAAP
Farr Angus Kyne	M	DAEO – Grand Gedeh Co.	MOA/PMU –CCAAP
T. Dehday Beh	M	DAEO – Grand Gedeh Co.	MOA/PMU –CCAAP
James N. Cole	M	DAEO – Bong Co.	MOA/PMU –CCAAP
K. James T. Nyella	M	DAEO – Bong Co.	MOA/PMU –CCAAP
Amos Jalarwo Karr	M	DAO/MOA	MOA
CARI			
Aaron Marshall	M	Head	CARI
UNDP			
Moses Massah	M	Program Specialist	UNDP
Dorsca Farcarthy	M	Team Leader	UNDP
Roberty Dorliae	M	Program Analyst	UNDP
EPA			
Emmanuel Munyeneh		E&E Project Coordinator	EPA
James Z. Aquoi		Finance Officer	EPA
AEDE			
Esther Peagar	F	Executive Director	AEDE
John Y. Brownell	M	Program Manager	AEDE
Tertiary Institution			
Dr. Roland Massaquoi	M	Dean College of Agriculture	University of Liberia
C. Molee Mends-Cole	M	Chairman College of Agriculture	University of Liberia
Philip N. Neoh	M	Head of Agriculture College	Grand Gedeh Community College
Mariama Tiakah	F	Student Agriculture College	Grand Gedeh Community College
Mariama Tiakah	F	Student Agriculture College	Grand Gedeh Community College
Celestine N. Gaye	F	Student Agriculture College	Grand Gedeh Community College
Amos Majek Krayon	M	Student Agriculture College	Grand Gedeh Community College
Daniel Yahba	M	Dean College of Agriculture	Cuttington University
Philip Ndaloma	M	Lecturer College of Agriculture	Cuttington University
Paul M. Bleh	M	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Philemina M. Grant	F	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Wrojay Bardee Poiter, Jr.	F	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Kabeh L. Kolva	F	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Jacob B. Dennis	M	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University

Fayiah M. Bouquet	M	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Wilmot Kollie	M	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Stephenson S. Zeatoe	M	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Emmanuel S. Tarr	M	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Arthur N. Sulonteh	M	Student Agriculture College	Cuttington University
Climate Change Network			
Maxwell G. M. Juwor	M	Chairman	Climate Change Network Grand Gedeh Co.
Richard P. Wennie	M	Treasury	Climate Change Network Grand Gedeh Co.
Climate Change Think-tank			
Harrison Luo	M	Executive Director	Development Management Institute
Cooperative Group			
Isaac N. Kyne	M	Chairman	AMENU – Zleh Town Grand Gedeh Co.
Isaac G. Yarkpawolo	M	Manager	PANFAMCO – Bong County

Annex 4: List of activities and outputs and degree of achievement

Activities	Outputs	Extent and quality of delivery
Strengthened institutional and individual capacity to plan and manage climate change in the agriculture sector in Liberia		
Development of Climate Change Management (CCM) capacity development plan	Climate Risk Management (CRM) and adaptation capacity in the agriculture sector developed of key technical stakeholders	MS
Development of climate risk management strategies for the various actors in the sector		MU
Development of plan of action for the implementation of knowledge transfer strategies on climate change risk management		MS
Set up a Monrovia-based think tank on CRM and adaptation		MU
Support relevant (on-site) climate change management research through small research grants.		MS
Develop a strategy to strengthen the technical and financial capacities private and public local institution to provide farmers with climate information and advices for climate resilient agriculture.		MU
Develop a website on climate change learning for Liberia focusing on the agricultural sector		NA
Website maintenance and updating with key information ensuring		NA

Include county level staff in implementation arrangements for site-level initiatives to facilitate hands-on learning with the project team.	In two counties, county planners and extension workers have the technical capacity to support communities on climate change, by providing advice on climate change impacts on agriculture and on alternative approaches and measures	S
Develop a CCM capacity development plan for county level technical stakeholders in the agricultural sector.		NA
Implement county-level CCM capacity development plan on climate risk management focusing on building the capacity of key actors		NA
Make climate change learning materials accessible to key actors		MU
Support tertiary education institutions in the development of technical support that is responsive to the adaptation strategies identified in the demonstration projects.	Liberian tertiary education system adapted to produce technicians, engineers and scientists knowledgeable about adapting to climate change	MS
Facilitate on-site analysis of the effectiveness of adaptation measures with local level community participation.		U
Establish a network of climate change practitioners and support knowledge sharing and communication on managing climate change risks at the farm level.		MU
Establish an incentive system to encourage sharing of best practices on assessing climate change risk management practices.		NA
Once identified and validated, new technologies, approaches and associated organizational activities will be promoted through an integrated medium strategy.		NA
Develop a detailed knowledge management and communication strategy addressing all intended project outcomes	Raised awareness of national leaders to the threat of climate change to agriculture	MU
Document the local level lessons learned in a systematic manner and develop the validation site capacity to function as local level learning laboratories		NA
Implement specific policy outreach activities for specific target groups.		NA

Link project lessons learned to the international peer community		NA
Formally identify and catalogue policy opportunities, reviews of agricultural sectoral policy but also of donor investment proposals for mainstreaming climate change resilience building opportunities.	Climate change and adaptation mainstreamed into LASIP and other key agricultural policy initiatives (e.g. Land Policy Reform, Enhanced Land Husbandry drive under LASIP)	S
Together with key stakeholders develop joint strategies of mainstreaming climate change concerns into future policy development.		MS
If appropriate, develop climate change mainstreaming tools, integrating lessons from the project intervention.		NA
As part of project review, track and analyze policy impacts.		NA
II. Innovative, sustainable, socially appropriate adaptive measures piloted at the community level		
Undertake gender specific livelihoods assessments in pre-selected demonstration ‘districts’ and identify and agree to partnerships.	A baseline analysis of current livelihood and natural resource use strategies and their vulnerabilities to climate change undertaken at two ‘demonstration sites’ and community adaptation strategies and plans in place.	U
Identify, analyze and document the prevailing natural resource use strategies (e.g. forest resources, shifting agriculture and swamp rice).		MU
Analyze the institutional arrangements of the communities at both the informal and formal levels.		NA
Formulate vulnerability assessment for the selected partner communities and identify the climate information and advisory support these communities will need to reduce their vulnerability to climate change.		NA
Review current FFS curriculum and adapt to local context		?
Select FFS facilitators		S
Conduct 14 days Training of Facilitators (TOF) in FFS methodology and concept		MU
Edit the Facilitators’ guidelines		MU

Identify and document local coping mechanisms	Local community-based adaptation strategies and plans implemented: At least four adaptation and locally adapted innovations enhancing resilience to climate change tested at demonstration sites	MS
Test and adapt innovations to local circumstances		MU
Implement key adaptive measures from the local adaptation strategies and action plans		HU

Using project staff and extension services help farmers adopt local adaptation strategies and plans		NA
Using these strategies and plans with the active participation of the communities, identify the appropriate adaptation measures and the climate information the farmers need		HU
Convey to stakeholders the needed climate and weather information		HU
Document and codify the results and experiences generated as guidelines book, relevant long after the project		NA
Integrate extension officers; negotiate time allocation in work plans provide budgetary support	County agriculture plans in Bong and Grand Gedeh account for potential climate risks and incorporate building of climate change resilience as a key component.	S
Mainstream climate information and lessons learned on climate risk management and adaptation in county – level planning processes		NA
Organize site visits for relevant county representative and other interested communities		
Support the establishment of commercial plots with grants		NA
Establish sub county network out of meeting convened with all established FFS within the same sub county		NA
Develop sustainability strategies (savings mechanism and market linkages and financing opportunities)		NA
Conduct specific policy-maker roundtable events that discuss the key findings from the demonstration sites and make tangible policy contributions.	Agricultural policies and donor investments are guided by adaptation learning at demonstration sites and integrate a land-use and livelihood strategy that helps local farmers build critically needed climate change resilience	?
Discuss the key findings from the demonstration sites		NA
Promote community management of resources and livelihood diversification		?

Strengthen farmers' organizations and marketing opportunities for farmers sustaining incentives to produce above subsistence levels through offering of enabling environment		NA
Meeting with all the facilitators to review implementation process and identify requirement for implementation adjustments		NA
Evaluate the process, share experiences and discuss lessons learned in each session		NA
Meet with non-participants in the targeted areas and from other villages to share experiences and display study and commercial plots		HU
Visit other FFS groups within the same sub counties and from other sub county networks		NA
Organize graduation day for all participants		NA
Identify implementing agencies to carry out further establishment of FFS		NA
Promote FFS concept within local community and central government, national and international NGOs, UN Agencies, Donors among others		?

Annex 5 – Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation ratings Key

HS – Highly Satisfactory (6 points)

S – Satisfactory (5 points)

MS – Moderately Satisfactory (4 points)

MU – Moderately Unsatisfactory (3 points)

U – Unsatisfactory (2 points)

HU – Highly Unsatisfactory (1 points)

NA – Not applicable (0 points)

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK - CRITERIA AND INDICATORS						
				Rating	Points	Sources of information
						Explanatory notes
1. Effectiveness						
		1.1 Extent to which planned outputs/outcomes were delivered at the project mid-term				
		1.1a Planned outputs vs number of delivered outputs	MU	3	project preparation documents; project plans; project reports	Not all of the outputs were produced as planned. Some of the baseline activities have not yet been completed in the manner that was originally intended in the project document. From the onset of the project some activities contributing to the outputs were dropped and others introduced in the component 2.

		1.1b Planned outcomes vs. delivered outcomes	no rating		interviews/questionnaires	Progress towards outcome 1 has been good. The indicators for number of staff trained have been achieved or surpassed. In addition for example 75 female farmers have been trained in the Gbarpolu district. Progress towards Outcome 2 is more difficult to assess as the baseline data is not available and in fact the end of the project target is defined as 80% of targeted households have adopted resilient livelihoods at the demonstrations sites. However, the currently the project targets individual farmers and the number of households participating in the FFS is not known.
		1.2 Extent of effectiveness of interagency cooperation				
		1.2a Number and frequency of interagency coordination venues	L		meeting reports; interviews	The interagency coordination has been very varied during the implementation. During the 2012 and first half of the 2013 the technical working group has been meeting on a monthly basis. Since then the frequency of meetings have been undertaken on a more ad hoc basis or not at all. The PMU has been well supported by UNDP CO and RTA, however for example some of planned M&E activities, mainly monitoring trips, have been delayed due to lack of cooperation from FAO.
		1.3 Effectiveness of management mechanisms				
		1.3a Stakeholders understand project goals	MU	3	questionnaires, field visits	The stakeholders on all levels understand the relevance of the project very well and are very committed to the project objectives. All the stakeholders have been sensitized to climate change, some have a good understanding of risks and the vulnerabilities on sectoral level. However, participatory community level vulnerability assessments have not been undertaken nor have local level adaptation plans been developed. Also, communities do not have access to weather related information and the only temporal scale that has been considered is limited to run of the project.

		1.3b Effectiveness of the project execution units and committees	U	2	project report, questionnaires, interviews	The several recommendation have been made by the Energy and Environment board including setting up two committee to resolve issues relating to the implementations of the Component 2. However, only some recommendations were followed-up on. Project has been faced with serious issues in due diligence and the unclear accountability arrangements have exacerbated the problem. It must be noted that PMU has effectively brought the challenges to the Board and recorded them in Annual report/PIRs with proposed recommendations.
		1.4 Extent to which implementation mechanisms were maintained				
		1.4a Planned implementation mechanisms vs. Used implementation mechanisms	U	2		From the onset of the project the used implementation mechanisms diverted from the planned implementation mechanisms. The farmer field school method was incorporated into project implementation, some of the new activities do not appear to directly contribute to outputs or outcomes.
		1.4b Adjustments to implementation mechanisms and plans	no rating			
		1.5 Review of Outcome to Impact				
		1.5a Reconstruction of the logical pathway from project outputs, to objectives and impacts	A/B/C/D as per GEF ROTI guidelines			
		1.5b The project has contributed or will contribute to strengthening the policy framework on climate change	MS	4	interviews/questionnaires	
		1.5c The project has contributed or will contribute to increased awareness and knowledge of climate change mitigation or adaptation	S	5	interviews/questionnaires	

		2.3b Relevance and linkages to GEF policies and focal areas	HS	6	GEF mandate and Climate change focal area policies and programme documents for period concerned	The project is linked with the GEF program strategy on adaptation to climate change for the Least Developed Countries. It has two main pillars which state integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans, programs and decision-making processes and expanding synergies with other GEF focal areas.
		2.3c Extent to which the project has followed the LDCF adaptation guidelines	S	5	annual reports; interviews/questionnaire	The project has followed LDCF adaptation guideline by involving multiplicities of stakeholders including local communities' participation; it is country driven and implemented by one of the state agencies.
		3. Efficiency				
		3.1 Effectiveness of financial planning and management processes				
		3.1a Financial management structures/processes are clearly set before start of project	n		project's preparation documents	The financial management structures/ process were clearly set before the change of the implementing modality and implementing arrangements. The changes in both has resulted in unclear accountability.
		3.1b Financial reporting occurs at set timelines	n		financial and other reports	Unable to verify but for example the CDR for Q1 2013 very minimal expenses were incurred less than 10.000 with the exception of disbursement to Usd 240.000 to FAO. The CDR only reflect funds from GEF, UNDP or any other funds are not included.
		3.2 Degree of cost-effectiveness of process				
		3.2a Planned vs. spent budget	U	2	project preparation document, project reports, UNDP financial reports	

		3.2b Relevance of means used to achieve project results	U	2	project preparation document, project reports, UNDP financial reports	The project document identifies means and rationale for choosing between methods. However, sometime during the Inception phase the means and the scope of the project changed for example one of the chosen methods was FFS though neither other means or rationale seems to have been recorded. Some of the individual activities have been adapted to capacity, culture and country/local context. Some of the means chosen do not contribute to the achievement of project results.
		3.2c Availability of other cost-effective options	U	2	project preparation document, project reports, UNDP financial reports	project preparation documents identify other means of implementation and justify choice
		3.3 Timeliness of implementation				
		3.3a Planned vs. real timelines	HU	1	project preparation documents, reports	During the evaluation project was coming to the end of the year 3 of implementation and several activities that should have been finalized during Inception phase were still pending including amongst others: MoA extension service staff had not yet received the laptops, negotiations with implementing partners were ongoing (AEDE, CARE). Particularly alarming is AEDE as per project document \$909,632 is expected as co-financing from AEDE. Other delays were also observed for example the Farmer Field school facilitator training took place in Q1 2014.
		3.3b Mitigating factors and delays	U	2	project preparation documents, reports	Mitigating factors include substantial delays of disbursement of funds from UNDP to FAO. However, as of November 2013 240.000 USD had been disbursed to FAO out of which 40% had been reported utilized. The project Steering Committee had not received any reports (financial, narrative) for the remaining 60%. Delays of disbursement of funds from UNDP to PMU particularly UNDP funds had delayed some activities. Ebola outbreak also caused substantial delays in implementation.
		3.4 Appropriateness of M&E system				

		3.4a Project planning documents contain M&E Plan	Y			Project document contain an M&E plan, additionally there are yearly M&E plans for Component 1.
		3.4b M&E Plan covers project development and implementation	N			M&E work plan in the project document covers implementation only. The yearly M&E plan cover Component 1 only-
		3.4c Appropriateness of budget for M&E	MS	4	project preparation/implement documents	The M&E work plan in the project document is costed. The yearly M&E plans do not include a budget, the AWP includes M&E Officer's salary, telecom expenses, fuel for M&E vehicle and the salary of a driver.
		3.4d The indicators are S.M.A.R.T	MS	4	results framework	The project objective indicator addresses only one half of the objective namely increase resilience of rural communities. No indicator has been included RBF for decrease vulnerability of the agricultural sector. Outcome 1 indicator is measuring the number of people trained rather than the impact of the capacity development of the individual skills. Outcome 2 indicator is not specific enough as it suggest household have adopted resilient livelihoods. Perhaps the underlying assumption could be that communities themselves define what resilient livelihoods looks like.
		3.4e Results are reported as per M&E plan	MS		UNDP documentation	Results are reported in the narrative report as per outputs, but also impacts are considered.
		3.4f Results were reported in a timely way	HS/S/MS/MU/U/HU			
		3.4g Planned vs. spent budget for M&E	HS/S/MS/MU/U/HU			Plant vs. Spent budget cannot not be ascertained as the M&E Officers salary, telecom and other cost a part of a lump sum.
		3.5 Appropriateness of technical support				
		3.5a channels of communication with UNDP are perceived as clear and open	Y		questionnaires, field visits	Channels of communication between PMU and UNDP are perceived as clear and open
		3.5b UNDP identifies problems and necessary project adjustments in timely manner	N		questionnaires, interviews	

		3.5c technical assistance and advice is available in timely manner	Y		questionnaire, interviews	Technical assistance relating to subractive issues has been available, the PMU have been well supported by RTA and UNDP Co
		3.5d required resources are mobilized by UNDP to support country objectives	HS/S/MS/MU/U/HU		project documents, questionnaire, interviews	Will require determining which resources were mobilized by UNDP for each country and whether or not country focal points deem this adequate. Evidence of funding or technical assistance should be present. Should include assessment of whether UNDP put at disposal of country the right mix of skills, staff, continuity and frequency/efficiency of field visits
		3.6 Efficiency of program management				
		3.6a effectiveness of UNDP technical and financial oversight	U		questionnaire, interviews	Unclear accountability arrangements, serious challenges with project's overall due diligence.
		3.6b consistency of policy decisions by UNDP and GEF	HS/S/MS/MU/U/HU		questionnaire, interviews	
		3.6c clarity of GEF guidance	HS/S/MS/MU/U/HU		questionnaire, interviews	
		4. Sustainability				
		<i>Financial sustainability</i>				
		4.1 Likelihood of national resources being available after GEF/UNDP support	Unlikely			Unlikely for national resources to be available. However, MoA has prepared proposal of 6,7 million Usd to GEF (GEF 6?) National Steering committee to extend and upscale CCAAP to 3 new counties. Proposal has been submitted to EPA.
		<i>Socio-Political sustainability</i>				
		4.2 Level of political buy in				
		4.2a level of political buy-in for the project	HS	6	letters of endorsement; questionnaire	There is high political buy-in for the project, because the signs for climate change is getting visible by the day and is impacting food production, food security and national security.
		4.3 Degree of country ownership				

		4.3a The project identifies stakeholders from other sectors	S	5	preparation documents; interviews/question naire	The project identified stakeholders from different section of the society including beneficiaries, but most vulnerable group were not specifically identified. Stakeholders that were engage during the project development process include all EPA, MOA, FDA, University of Liberia, FAO, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, UNDP, NGOs such as Conservation International, OXFAM, AEDE, CARE and farmers groups including AMENU Farmers' Cooperative Society in Grand Gedeh County (Pilot site) AND PANFACO in Bong County. Additionally, the project has always involved local traditional chiefs and elders in project implementation
		4.4 Degree of stakeholder participation and public awareness				
		4.4a. Degree of success of the mechanisms put in place to ensure identification and participation of relevant stakeholders	MS	4	project reports, questionnaires and interviews	identify whether all relevant stakeholders were given adequate opportunities to provide meaningful input into the project, the degree of collaboration between the stakeholders and participants and whether any public awareness activities were undertaken during the duration of the project
		4.5 Degree of capacity, accountability and knowhow in place at the time of MTE				
		4.5a institutional and technical achievements as a result of the project	S	5	project reports, questionnaire, interviews	Trained 42 technical and county level staff including CACs in climate vulnerability/risk assessments; Sensitized and trained 200 University and High school students plus 16 instructors.

			4.5b Evidence of increased policy integration or policy change from the project	MS	3	project reports, questionnaire, interviews	Three agriculture related policies/plans were reviewed to identify opportunities for mainstreaming climate change adaptation concerns. These included: the Liberia Agriculture Investment Program (LASIP), the Food and Agriculture Policy (FAP) and the Agenda for Transformation (AFT or PRS2).
			<i>Environmental sustainability</i>				
			4.5 Environmental risks and opportunities				
			4.5a Analysis of environmental risks and opportunities	U		observation	Most of the soil the farmers are cultivating are degraded and there was no soil analysis done. Moreover farmers are cultivating the lowland which are heavily invested with diseases