

Evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe – 2017-2022

United Nations Development Programme

September 2022

Patrícia Carvalho
(patricia.carvalho@impacteconsultants.com)

João Silveira
(joao.silveira@impacteconsultants.com)

Miguel Fonseca
(miguel.fonseca@impacteconsultants.com)



Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title	Country Programme Document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2022)	
Atlas ID	tbc	
Corporate outcome and output	tbc	
Country	São Tomé and Príncipe	
Region	Africa	
Date project document signed	7 July 2016	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	2017	2022
Project budget	\$14 200 000	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	\$38 076 973,40	
Funding source	SDG Joint Program (JP) Fund, Agence Française de Développement (AFD), The Global Fund, Canadian Cooperation, the Global Environmental Fund (GEF), and internal regular and other resources from UNDP	
Implementing party¹	UNDP	

Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)	Evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe (São Tomé and Príncipe) – 2017-2022	
Final/midterm review/other	Final	
Period under evaluation	Start	End
	2017	2022
Evaluators	Patrícia Carvalho, João Silveira, Miguel Fonseca	
Evaluator email address	patricia.carvalho@impacteconsultants.com	
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion
	July 2022	September 2022

¹ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

CONTENT

TABLES	4
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	8
1. INTRODUCTION.....	14
2. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION	15
2.1. PROJECT'S FRAMEWORK	15
2.2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES.....	17
3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	18
3.1. EVALUATION CRITERIA	18
3.2. EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	19
3.3. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.....	21
3.4. DATA ANALYSIS.....	22
3.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	22
3.6. LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES.....	23
4. EVALUATION RESULTS	24
4.1. RELEVANCE	24
4.2. EFFECTIVENESS.....	31
4.3. EFFICIENCY.....	52
4.4. SUSTAINABILITY.....	60
4.5. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY	61
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	63
6. LESSONS LEARNED	65
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	66
ANNEXES	68
1. LIST OF QUALITATIVE INTERACTIONS.....	69
2. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS.....	72
3. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	80
4. TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	83

TABLES

Table 1 – CPD (2017-2021) indicative budget per outcome.....	16
Table 2 – Sample of health indicators in São Tomé and Príncipe	25
Table 3 - Sample of democratic governance indicators São Tomé and Príncipe	26
Table 4 - Sample of sustainable development and resilience to climate change indicators São Tomé and Príncipe	27
Table 5 – Indicative budget vs resources delivered	52
Table 6 – Target progress color scheme	33
Table 7 – Table of results Outcome 1	34
Table 8 – Table of results Outcome 2	40
Table 9 - Table of results Outcome 3.....	44
Table 10 – Financial Execution	54

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AFD	Agence Française de Développement
AFDB	African Development Bank
ART	Antiretroviral Therapy
ASPF	<i>Associação Santomense para a Promoção do Planeamento Familiar</i>
BGFI	Banque Gabonaise et Francaise Internationale
CGS	<i>Célula de Gestão das Subvenções</i>
CNE	National Endemic Center/ <i>Centro Nacional de Endemias</i>
CNES	<i>Centro Nacional de Educação para a Saúde</i>
CONPREC	<i>Conselho Nacional de Preparação e Resposta às Catástrofes</i>
CPD	Country Programme Document
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
DEV	Department of Epidemiological Surveillance
DGEG	Portuguese Directorate General for Energy and Geology
DGRNE	<i>Direção Geral dos Recursos Naturais e Energia</i>
DHIS2	District Health Information System 2
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
EM-DAT	International Disaster Database
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environmental Fund
GFCF	Gross Fixed Capital Formation
GRB	Gender Responsive Budget
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point
HDI	Human Development Index
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
HR	Human Resources
IBBS	Integrated Bio-Behavioral Surveillance
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
ILO	International Labour Organization
INE	National Institute of Statistics
INIC	<i>Instituto de Inovação e Conhecimento</i>
INM	National Meteorology Institute
IOs	International Organizations
IRS	Indoor Residual Spaying
JP	SDG Joint Program
LL	Lessons Learned
LLIN	Long-lasting Insecticidal Nets
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MLSFPQ	Ministry of Labor, Solidarity, Family and Professional Qualification

MM	Million
MoH	Ministry of Health
MSM	Men who have sex with men
NDC	National Determined Contributions
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
OBI	Open Budget Index
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
OR	Operational Recommendations
PARFIP II	Plan of Action for Reforming the Public Finance Management System
PFMS	Public Finance Management Systems
PLHIV	People Living with HIV/AIDS
PND	National Development Plan/ <i>Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento</i>
POPP	Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
Pro	
PALOP-TL	Programme for Consolidating Economic Governance and Public Finance Management Systems (PFMS)
SAI	Supreme Audit Institutions
PwD	Persons with Disabilities
RAP	Autonomous Region of the Príncipe
ROAR	Results Oriented Annual Report
SAIs	Supreme Audit Institutions
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	Small Island Developing State
SIS	Department of Health Information
SME	Small Medium Enterprise
SP	Sex Professionals
SR	Strategic Recommendations
SSC	South-South Cooperation
TB	Tuberculosis
ToR	Terms of Reference
UHC	Universal Health Coverage
UN	United Nations
UN-SWAP	United Nations System Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
US\$	United States Dollars
UTT	Universal Test and Treat

WFP	World Food Programme
WGI	Worldwide Governance Indicators
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Context of the evaluation: The Evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document (CPD) 2017-2022 was conducted from July until September 2022. The Evaluation used in-person and online data collection processes, which included a field mission to São Tomé and Príncipe. The CPD aimed at boosting good governance and public sector reform, promote sustainable and inclusive growth, strengthen human capital and social services delivery, and bolster social cohesion and social protection. The Programme established the following priority areas (outcomes): (i) Health and HIV/AIDS (outcome 1), (ii) Democratic Governance (outcome 2), and (iii) Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change (outcome 3). The CPD implementation began in 2017 and has December 2022 as the end-date. The CDP delivered 38,076,973 USD, which were funded by different sources, including the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund), the Global Environmental Fund (GEF), the European Union (EU), the SDG Joint Program (JP) Fund, the Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Canadian Cooperation, and internal regular and other resources from UNDP.

2. Objectives of the evaluation: The CPD Evaluation responds to the need for vertical and horizontal accountability, as well as to generate knowledge that can help future programming. Specifically, the CPD Evaluation has three specific objectives: (i) make an overall independent assessment of the performance of the CPD for São Tomé and Príncipe with particular emphasis on the outcome area three, (ii) identify key lessons learned from the CPD and propose practical recommendations for the next CPD, and (iii) review the CPD's contribution towards cross-cutting issues, such as human rights, gender, leaving no one behind and capacity development.

3. Methodological Framework: The CPD Evaluation uses as reference the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Gender and human rights considerations were also considered as part of this evaluation. This Evaluation employed a mixed method methodology, which included: (i) desk review, (ii) analysis of secondary data, (iii) semi-structured interviews that reached of 47 key informants (17 female and 30 male) from the UNDP and partner institutions, as well as (iv) structured interviews with 8 final beneficiaries (3 female and 5 male) from entrepreneurship-related activities.

4. Evaluation results (by criteria):

4.1. Relevance: This evaluation has found evidence the CPD outcomes were well aligned with identifiable needs and priorities, with the National Development Plan (*Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento* - PND) 2017-2021, and with sectoral plans and priorities, as well as with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 1, 8, 10 and 16. Additionally, all key informants consulted agreed the outcomes proposed in the CPD, as well as the several Projects/Programmes that followed were relevant.

Data from authoritative sources indicates the relevance of the CPD across the three outcomes. For instance, regarding outcome 1, between 2015 and 2019 São Tomé and Príncipe maintained a Universal Health Coverage (UHC) equal or inferior to 60 percent (up to 64 percent in the sub-index on infectious diseases). On outcome 2, three Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) placed São Tomé and Príncipe below the 0 threshold - in a scale that ranges between -2,5 and 2,5 - between

2017 and 2020, namely government effectiveness, regulatory quality, and rule of law, and the percentage of women in parliament was below 25 percent in both 2014 and 2018. On outcome 3, the business environment had a business density of 3.3 in 2016, and access to energy remained below 80 percent between 2016 and 2020, and renewable energy share in total final energy consumption below 40 percent in 2016 and 2019.

The relevance of the CDP, as well as its alignment with national priorities and needs is explained by two complementary factors. (i) the long history of UNDP implementation in São Tomé and Príncipe enabled the UNDP to formulate an accurate reading of the national context, priorities, and needs, and (ii) there was a consistent effort in auscultating national partners. Further strengthening consultation with national partners, particularly civil society organizations (CSOs) would further strengthen the UNDP's strategic planning capacity. Overall, the UNDP is perceived as a relevant, trustworthy, and valuable partner.

Evidence collected during this evaluation suggests the UNDP was a key partner in assisting São Tomé and Príncipe in addressing the challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic. The UNDP successfully mobilized almost one million USD (\$ 969 817,15) between 2020 and 2022 for its COVID-19 response plan. It contributed to the immediate response by (i) providing technical assistance to the definition of national plans, (ii) assisting in the improvement of infrastructure and equipment to health services, as well as in the digital transition from in-person working environments to online working environment (e.g., the national Assembly), (iii) COVID-tracing, (iv) strengthening of human resources (HR) numbers in the health sector, as well as health professionals capacity-building, and (v) funding of awareness campaigns.

5.2. Effectiveness: This evaluation has found that the CPD implementation has made a significant contribution to the planned objectives. In outcome 1, the UNDP was effective in improving infectious diseases (Malaria, HIV/AIDS, TB) response - including detection, monitoring, access to treatment, and knowledge on key population. The UNDP contributed to the improvement of infrastructure, equipment, technical assistance to improve response, and the development of digital systems to improve data collection, monitoring, and decision making, notably by assisting the country to introduce using the District Health Information System 2 (DHIS2), through providing the necessary requirements to operationalize this (e.g. the IT equipment, hiring technical experts, supporting trainings). Furthermore, the CPD accomplished the transfer of the management of the Global Fund project to the hands of the Ministry of Health.

Under outcome 2, there was a consistent strengthening of state/government institutions (e.g., National Assembly, Ministry of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions) and CSOs in terms of public finance oversight and gender responsiveness budget, and women participation in decision-making bodies, which led to three key achievements including the adoption of a gender responsive national budget in 2021, the approval of public accounts of 2010 to 2017, and the recent approval of the Parity Law in 2022. On human rights, the UNDP supported the ratification of 7 African Union treaties to improve compliance with human rights in São Tomé and Príncipe. On justice modernization, the UNDP took significant steps in strengthening the justice system including infrastructure (e.g., tribunals), capacity-building of staff, and update of laws and legal codes (e.g., *Código de Processo Penal*). The UNDP further contributed to launching the national Data Center; a structural digital infrastructure that strongly contributes to the national digital sovereignty.

Under outcome 3, the UNDP contributed to the resilience and dynamism of the economic landscape of São Tomé and Príncipe by supporting (youth) entrepreneurship, the development of

the agriculture value-chain, and by supporting local communities in finding climate change resilient livelihood alternatives. The UNDP supported the national early warning and disaster preparedness system with capacity-building, equipment, and technical capacity to improve disaster response planning. Moreover, the UNDP contributed to the energy transition of São Tomé and Príncipe with extensive support for the development of legal frameworks for the energy, water and forestry sectors, as well as capacity-building of national partner's structures (e.g., buildings, training) and the development of several feasibility studies for the production of hydroelectricity as well as several integrated watershed management plans. Additionally, the UNDP supported the construction of the first solar plant in the country and the first solar rooftop initiative, currently under construction. At macro environmental level, the UNDP provided technical assistance in 2021 for the update of the National Determined Contributions (NDC).

This evaluation has found evidence that the UNDP's activities contributed to strengthening national government capacity and institutions within state/government and CSO bodies. The key interventions leading to institutional strengthening were: (i) infrastructure building (e.g., courts of law, *Direção Geral dos Recursos Naturais e Energia* (DGRNE) office buildings), (ii) provision of equipment (e.g., office equipment, vehicles), (iii) capacity-building of partner's staff (e.g., gender responsiveness budgeting, Public Finance Management Systems (PFMS) oversight, legal procedures) at managerial and technical level, (iv) improvement of legal frameworks (e.g., energy sector, forestry), (v) strengthening of HR quantity (e.g., four consultants hired to support the national Assembly). The extent of South-South (SSC) and Triangular cooperation varied widely across outcomes. The most consistent use was within the Pro PALOP-TL SAI – Phase II Programme (outcome 2). In other outcomes there were relevant yet *ad hoc* examples of SSC/Triangular cooperation (e.g., Communities of practice, benchmarking activities). Added value and gains in terms of exchange of best practices should be scaled-up.

The most relevant programme areas that the UNDP should consolidate and/or scale up moving forward include: (i) State/Governmental and CSOs institutional support which encompasses (a) equipment and infrastructure and (b) transversal capacity-building of HR, (ii) digital transition, (iii) (green) economic growth, which encompasses the scaling-up of activities to (a) strengthen the internal market and (b) strengthening of internationalization, (iv) energy transition particularly regarding green energy, including through mini-grids, hydropower, and solar, (v) scale-up efforts in modernizing the justice system in São Tomé and Príncipe, including in matters of law revision, capacity-building, infrastructure, and closeness of the justice system to the population, (vi) support the strengthening of primary health services with equipment and capacity-building, (vii) scale-up efforts to increase the availability of socio-economic, and environmental data availability, (viii) develop efforts in the waste management sector, and (ix) scale-up investment in the entire chain of disaster response (e.g., data collection, information analysis and dissemination, post-disaster response).

5.3. Efficiency: The mobilization of resources by the UNDP for the programmed cycle was impressive. From a total indicative budget for the three outcomes of 14,200,000 US\$ in 2016, the UNDP mobilized funds that enabled a delivery of 38,076,973 US\$ by the time of this evaluation. The resources allocated were reportedly adequate to the intended purposes. However, some delays in the attribution of funding were reported, often linked with perceived complexity of UNDP bureaucratic processes. It was also noted an excessive focus on substantial financial execution within the first half of the year, which may result in suboptimal implementation. On M&E, this evaluation has found an opportunity for improved comprehensive strategic communication and learning among the staff from the different outcomes within regular staff meetings. To favor a culture of building institutional knowledge, and sharing of know-how and lessons learned, the

UNDP could potentially devote resources into maintaining an institutional archive. The process of resource mobilization and programme/project design could be further improved with the establishment of a backstopping mechanism to support project design. Higher efforts should be made to install a data collection culture across managing and implementing partners of UNDP projects.

The workflow between the UNDP and its partners is overall positive, and the UNDP is regarded as trusted partner that adds value to its partners. The factors mostly evoked to explain the overall positive assessment of UNDP-Partner's workflow include (i) a spirit of systematic and open dialogue, (ii) UNDP flexibility in adapting activities in perceived changing contexts and beneficiary needs, (iii) overall good relation at operational level, (iv) efficient communication lines, (v) good interpersonal relations between UNDP staff and partner's staff, (vi) UNDP's efficiency in mobilizing resources (funds and HR), (vii) UNDP's capacity of linking with key stakeholders and fostering partnerships, (viii) UNDP's accurate reading of the national context and institutional constraints, and (ix) UNDP's access to high-level decision makers. Across outcomes, three themes emerged as suboptimal aspects of the partnership. Those relate to the complexity of UNDP procedures, external staff/public servants' relation, and financial management of projects/programmes. The aspects mentioned may be overcome with enhanced mechanisms for mutual awareness, as the root causes of tensions appear to be linked with misperceptions and/or lack of awareness.

5.4. Sustainability: Some key achievements of the country programme are highly likely to be sustainable. A clear area of sustainability is the adoption of legal and regulatory frameworks in multiple areas, including the family law, code of criminal procedure, the parity law, the laws on resources use (forestry, water), energy regulation, among many others. Laws and procedures solidify change, and the adoption of new principles and practices. Capacity-building and strengthening of state/government partners as well as CSOs is another area that offer signs of sustainability. Some institutions that were strengthened during the CPD have reportedly become part of the governmental organic (e.g., Incubadora Central) and likely to continue. An area which may offer a high level of sustainability relates to the improvement of the digital infrastructure of the country. The Data Center established in the INIC has the potential of aggregating data from multiple ministries, which may enable sharing of costs. The positive signs are, however, contingent to the availability of resources from national counterparts. São Tomé e Príncipe is highly dependent on foreign aid, and in that sense, the UNDP's acute *modus operandi* of seeking partnerships and in establishing synergies and networks is relevant in the continuous effort of funding mobilization. Likewise, the investment in the private sector, and in the emergence of an economically sustainable internal market is the seed for a more dynamic economic landscape, which in the long-term may assist São Tomé e Príncipe in achieving higher levels of growth and reducing poverty.

5.6. Cross-cutting issues: The CDP addressed key human rights including, for example, equal rights of men and women, adequate standard of living for health and well-being, and the right to work. Vulnerable groups such as female sex workers, men who have sex with other men, and prisoners were addressed within the Malaria, HIV/AIDS, and TB, activities. The CPD proposed to target persons with disabilities (PWD), however this evaluation has found limited evidence that PwD were particularly targeted. The example conveyed to this evaluation related to the inclusion of a disability criteria in the variables to select vulnerable families in the context of the Social Registry. On gender and youth, the UNDP youth entrepreneurship activities were gender inclusive, and the project Muala+ was purposely directed towards female entrepreneurs. Gender equality was relevant within the CPD. As previously discussed, the UNDP contributed to actual changes in

norms and behaviors, which is well exemplified, for instance, by the approval of a GRB in 2010, as well as by the approval of the parity law.

6. Lessons learned: Several lessons (LL) have been drawn from the implementation of the Project, based on the evidence gathered in the evaluation process:

LL1. A solid project design phase with in-depth consultations with key stakeholders from governmental, CSO, IOs, and other UN agencies is key to ensure that the programme has a clear, feasible, and realistic projects/programmes strategy.

LL2. Solid data on key socio-economic and environmental indicators is essential for accurate and well-suited programme design planning, decision-making, and monitoring of programme outcomes. Particularly when the Agenda 2030 approaches its culmination, accurate and credible data availability is indispensable to enhance knowledge, and track results and effective change.

LL3. Leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies and mobilizing additional funding contributes to cost-effectiveness. The UNDP was successful in leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies, as well as with other partners, and in securing additional funding, which has contributed to Programme cost-effectiveness.

LL4. Ensuring the existence of clear monitoring and evaluation mechanisms from the inception phase of the programme – such as an assigned team/unit monitoring tool to record progress on outcomes outputs and activities as well as a centralized programme library which is shared with all team members -, enables sharing of crucial information on relevant initiatives between the teams of different outcomes, enabling them to understand the progress made in other outcomes and what synergies can/should be explored. It can also further inform management decisions.

7. Main recommendations: Based on the evidence, findings and lessons learned, collected during the evaluation, the evaluation team identified a set of Strategic (SR) and Operational (OR) recommendations.

7.1. Strategic Recommendations (SR):

SR1. Consider continuing undertaking efforts for in-depth consultations and discussions at the design phase of the CDP and other thematic projects and initiatives, with both governmental and CSO representatives to ensure that the programme has a clear, feasible and realistic strategy, well suited to the national context in all its dimensions.

SR2. Consider enhancing the coordination between different Programme outcomes/projects, with the establishment of an M&E unit with the clear role to centralize the information/knowledge (including indicator tracking) produced across the multiple projects/programmes, maintain an updated UNDP's archive/library, promote strategic level opportunities, and promote cross-fertilization of lessons learned across outcomes, as well as sharing of best practices and knowledge within UNDP.

SR3. Consider enhancing efforts in data collection initiatives of key socio-economic and environmental trackers in order to enable the systematic monitorization of the context of São Tomé and Príncipe. Strengthening of the National Statistics Institute, as well as providing capacity-building of key governmental staff on data collection and statistical analysis may contribute to improve monitoring capacity, as well as country situational awareness.

SR4. Consider intensifying efforts in the systematic involvement of the private sector and CSOs in the multiple projects/programmes, from inception to implementation. Taking advantage of private sector perspectives and foster private sector engagement in UNDP activities may assist in revitalizing the economic landscape tissues of São Tomé and Príncipe, and in improving the sustainability of UNDP actions.

SR5. Consider continuing strengthening South-South and triangular cooperation activities in order to enhance interaction between technical staff from different countries, including training, exchanges and sharing of experiences, especially in a face-to-face format.

7.2. Operational Recommendations (OR):

OR1. Consider developing an induction guidance toolbox for new UNDP staff members, including consultants and volunteers. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors the quick integration of new staff into the practices, methods, language, processes, and procedures of the UNDP. Such integration is crucial in small offices with high staff turnover.

OR2. Consider improving guidance for UNDP implementing partners. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors a good communication with implementing partners, and a thorough transmission of operating instructions, particularly on payment procedures/access funding and the implementation of activities/projects' monitoring and reporting (including financial reporting).

OR3. Consider developing or activating a backstopping mechanism (on-sight or remote) to support consultants on the technical specifications of project/programmed/proposal writing (including theories of change, intervention logic, results frameworks, indicators). Particularly in a small office, highly reliant on volunteers and external consultants that are experts on particular areas/sectors but that sometimes lack experience on the development of project/programme proposals, a backstopping mechanism could assist in improving the quality of projects/programmes design, as well as in mobilizing additional resources.

OR4. Consider developing a Communication and Visibility Strategy. An effective visibility strategy promotes greater understanding and ownership of the project among stakeholders, and allows the UNDP's successes to be projected, as well as the beneficiary and donor countries. It also promotes the replicability of good practices developed by entities outside the scope of the programme.

OR5. Considering developing projects/programmes targeting PwD.

1. INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document (CPD) for São Tomé and Príncipe was contracted in June 2022, and carried out from July and September 2022

The CPD started in 2017 and it will end in 2022². The Programme was implemented by the UNDP, and it aimed to strengthen the health system of São Tomé and Príncipe, boost good governance and justice sector reform, promote sustainable and inclusive growth, strengthen human capital and social services delivery, increase climate change environmental and social resilience, and bolster social cohesion and social protection.

The evaluation intends to respond to the need for vertical and horizontal accountability³. Additionally, it intends to generate knowledge that can help improve the following CPD for the country. This evaluation aims specifically at assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues of the CPD. Its main users include the UNDP, donors, state/governmental UNDP partners, civil society organizations (CSOs), and final beneficiaries.

The report begins with a context chapter that explains the framework of the Project, as well as the objectives of the evaluation. Following, a methodological framework chapter explains the methodological processes, the criteria of the evaluation, the evaluation questions, the methods of evaluation, as well as the ethical consideration and limitations of this evaluation. Subsequently, the evaluation results chapter presents the findings of the evaluation, segmented by evaluation criteria, namely, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. Finally, this report has dedicated chapters to present its key conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. In the **Annexes**, this report presents additional information pertaining the methods, objectives, and conclusions of this evaluation, namely, the list of stakeholders consulted, data collection instruments, bibliographical references, and the terms of reference for this evaluation.

² At design, the CPD duration was between 2017 and 2021. However, the Country Office granted one year extension due to COVID-19 challenges.

³ Assess the use of resources allocated to the Programme for donors (vertical responsibility) and beneficiaries (horizontal responsibility).

2. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

2.1. PROJECT'S FRAMEWORK

The CPD was implemented in São Tomé and Príncipe; a Small Island Developing State (SIDS) situated in the Gulf of Guinea – off the western equatorial coast of Central Africa - which faces severe socioeconomic difficulties. In 2014 São Tomé and Príncipe was ranked “medium” in the Human Development Index (HDI)⁴, with a score of 0.555⁵. Five years later (2019), São Tomé and Príncipe remained as an HDI medium country, but its score improved to 0.625⁶. In income groupings São Tomé and Príncipe was considered a lower-middle income country both in 2017⁷ and 2021⁸.

São Tomé and Príncipe population is exposed to vulnerabilities, in a context of modest social safety nets, as only 11.5 percent of the population was covered by at least one social protection benefit in 2020⁹, and the Universal Health Coverage (UHC) service coverage did not surpass 60 percent in 2019¹⁰. Furthermore, São Tomé and Príncipe has a low number of health professionals (e.g., medical doctors, nurses, and midwives)¹¹. Access to energy is not universal as it reached only 77 percent of the population. Energy access is lower in rural communities¹². Information on the labor market is scarce and tendentially outdated. The business environment is not vibrant as São Tomé and Príncipe registers low new business density (2.21 in 2020)¹³. In 2017 São Tomé and Príncipe scored relatively low on key governance indicators, including government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law¹⁴, and national budget transparency¹⁵. According to the World Bank, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) – current United States Dollars (US\$) – has consistently increased since 2015, having reached almost 550 million US\$ in 2021¹⁶. Despite the ascendent trend, the national budget remains insufficient to address the needs of the state and the almost 228 thousand *santomeans* (2022). In fact, roughly 97 percent of public investment is financed through debt and external aid¹⁷.

It is in this context of transversal challenges that the UNDP developed the CDP, which focused on three key areas (outcomes): (i) Health, (ii) Democratic governance, and (iii) Sustainable

⁴ HDI included the following categories: Very high: 0.800 to 1, High: 0.700 to 0.799, Medium 0.550 to 0.699, Low: 0 to 0.549.

⁵ UNDP (United National Development Programme), “Human Development Report 2015”, 2015.

⁶ UNDP (United National Development Programme), “Human Development Report 2020”, 2021.

⁷ ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2017-2019”, 2017.

⁸ ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2020-2022”, 2021.

⁹ ILO (International Labour Organization): “SDG indicator 1.3.1 – Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/system (%) – Annual”, SDG_0131_SEX_SOC_RT_A, June 2022, <https://ilostat.ilo.org/data/#> (consulted 06/08/2022).

¹⁰ WHO (World Health Organization): “UHC Service Coverage Index (SDG 3.8.1)”, UHC_INDEX_REPORTED, November 2021, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/uhc-index-of-service-coverage>, (consulted 03/08/2022).

¹¹ WHO (World Health Organization): “Global Health Workforce Statistics Database: Nursing and Midwifery Personnel (per 10.000)”, 2022, (consulted 03/08/2022).

¹² WHO (World Health Organization): “Global Health Workforce Statistics Database: Medical doctors (per 10.000)”, 2022;

¹³ IEA (International Energy Agency), IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), UNSD (the United Nations Statistics Division), the World Bank, and WHO (World Health Organization): “Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report”, n.d., (consulted 05/08/2022).

¹⁴ World Bank: “Entrepreneurship Database”, n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

¹⁵ WGI (Worldwide Governance Indicators): “Interactive Data Access”, 2021 (consulted 07/08/2022).

¹⁶ IBP (International Budget Partnership): “Open Budget Survey 2017 São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2018.

¹⁷ World Bank: “GDP (current US\$) – Sao Tome and Principe”, NY.GDP.MKTP.CD, 2022.

¹⁸ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation”, December 2021.

development and resilience to climate change. The establishment of the three outcomes took into consideration what the UNDP perceived to be its institutional comparative advantages, as well as its past achievements¹⁸. The CPD outcomes directly respond to the following Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Goal 1 (End poverty in all its forms everywhere), 8 (Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all), 10 (Reduce inequality within and among countries), and 16 (Peace, justice and strong institutions). All SDGs covered in the CPD were considered priority by national authorities¹⁹.

For the entire period of implementation (2017-2022) the CPD established an **indicative total budget of 14,200,000 US\$ for all outcomes**, as shown in **Table 1**. Yet, as this evaluation will show, the actual budget delivered to São Tomé and Príncipe was vastly superior, as a consequence of the UNDP's successful resources mobilization performance between 2017 and 2022. Given the specificities of each outcome, this evaluation now proceeds in explaining each outcome, as defined in the CPD.

Table 1 – CPD (2017-2021) indicative budget per outcome

	Regular	Other	Total
Outcome 1	250,000 US\$	3,644,000 US\$	3,894,000 US\$
Outcome 2	2,256,000 US\$	750,000 US\$	3,006,000 US\$
Outcome 3	500,000 US\$	6,800,000 US\$	7,300,000 US\$
		Total	14,200,000 US\$

Source: UNDP: "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

2.1.1. OUTCOME 1 - HEALTH AND HIV/AIDS

According to the CPD, outcome 1 envisaged the strengthening of the national health system of São Tomé and Príncipe, in three key areas of intervention: (i) health information, (ii) drugs and medical products procurement, and (iii) community system. The UNDP's intervention included a strong focus on reducing the prevalence of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) and Tuberculosis (TB), as well as on eliminating Malaria. In this regard, the UNDP's HIV/AIDS and TB plan included facilitating to ensure that the national HIV/TB program implemented interventions to specifically cater for key population groups such as sex workers²⁰ (SP), who were regarded as especially vulnerable to HIV/AIDS and TB. The CDP was designed before the global COVID-19 epidemic. Nonetheless, as this report will further explore below, the UNPD integrated activities to assist São Tomé and Príncipe's COVID-19 response.

Another key element of the CPD was the strengthening of the Ministry of Health (MoH) in terms of financial management capacity to manage funds from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund). Until recently, the UNDP was the principal beneficiary of the Global Fund, thus responsible for the financial management of the funding. Under the CPD 2017-2021 the UNDP sought to transition the Global Fund Programme to national management²¹.

¹⁸ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

¹⁹ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation", December 2021.

²⁰ For matters of consistency with output-level indicators terminology, this evaluation will employ the terminology sex worker interchangeably with the terminology SP.

²¹ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

2.1.2. OUTCOME 2 – DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

The CPD's Outcome 2 placed an emphasis "on ensuring equitable access to justice and increasing citizen participation in decision-making bodies". To that end it focused on building the capacities of the Ministry of Justice, Parliament, the electoral commission, the courts, the Police Crime Unit, and Civil Society Organizations (CSO). Specifically, the CPD sought to (i) strengthen the justice system, (ii) introduce an alternative dispute resolution mechanism, (iii) improve the realization of human rights among population, (iv) support capacity-building of public administration and local/regional governmental personnel, (v) support the participation of women in decision-making process, (vi) support the government in formulating strategies, plans, and development policies leading to the achievement of the Governmental objective of leaving no one behind, (vii) support decentralization of governmental services and operations, and (vi) improve accountability and transparency. Additionally, the UNPD established the goal of contributing to strengthening the capacity of the National Institute of Statistics (INE) in providing reliable data. All activities under Outcome 2 were designed to address socioeconomic vulnerabilities, and purportedly targeted women and youth²².

2.1.3. OUTCOME 3 - SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE

With outcome 3, the CPD directed its focus on "developing policy instruments for natural resources management and disaster preparedness together with plans to address disaster risk and climate change impact". Specifically, the CDP identified the following areas of intervention: (i) support agriculture traders, and fisherfolk, (ii) support the blue economy²³ to reduce poverty and encourage public and private investment in disaster risk prevention and reduction, (iii) develop renewable energies, and mitigate energy deficit in rural areas, (iv) increase economic growth and provide job opportunities for vulnerable groups, particularly youth and women, and (v) facilitate the formulation of a vulnerability profile of São Tomé and Príncipe. Outcome 3 purposely targeted vulnerable groups, including women, young girls and boys, and persons with disability (PwD) that are part of the labour force²⁴.

2.2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

2.2.1. GENERAL OBJECTIVES

According to the Terms of Reference (ToR)²⁵, this evaluation assessed the CPD 2017-2022. It captured evidence on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the implementation. The evaluation covered the full extent of interventions funded by the UNDP resources, donors and government funds, while analyzing its contribution towards supporting national development priorities, as well as the inclusion of cross-cutting issues (e.g., human rights, gender). Special attention was paid to the Outcome 3.

²² UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

²³ There is no consensual definition of "blue economy". For that reason, the evaluation team used the definition provided by the World Bank: the blue economy is "the sustainable use of ocean resources for economic growth, improved livelihoods, and jobs while preserving the health of ocean ecosystem". The World Bank: "What is the Blue Economy?", June 2017 (consulted 07/07/2022).

²⁴ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.; UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation", December 2021.

²⁵ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation", December 2021.

2.2.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The CPD Evaluation specific objectives included:

- I. Make an overall independent assessment of the performance of the CPD for São Tomé and Príncipe with particular emphasis on the Outcome 3. Upon UNDP request, the results of Outcome 3 were extracted from this evaluation report into a standalone Outcome 3 report.
- II. Identify key lessons learned from the CPD and propose practical recommendations for the next CPD.
- III. Review the CPD's contribution towards cross-cutting issues, such as human rights, gender, leaving no one behind and capacity development.

2.2.3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

According to the ToR the scope of the evaluation was as follows:

- I. **Thematic Scope.** The CPD Evaluation focused on the UNDP's contribution to support the key outcome areas of (i) Health, (ii) Democratic governance, and (iii) Sustainable development and resilience to climate change.
- II. **Chronological scope.** The CPD Evaluation covered the period of implementation of the CPD: 2017 to 2022, including a one-year prorogation.
- III. **Geographic scope.** The geographic scope of the CPD Evaluation included initiatives in São Tomé and Príncipe, including the autonomous region of the Príncipe (RAP).

3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Final Evaluation was based on the four of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Gender, human rights, and good governance considerations were also considered as part of this evaluation.

Relevance

The term "relevance", in the context of an evaluation, refers to the appropriateness of the explicit objectives of the Project in relation to the socio-economic problems it is supposed to address. In ex ante evaluation, questions of relevance are the most important because the focus is on the choosing the best strategy or on justifying the one proposed. In intermediate evaluation, the aim is to check whether the socio-economic context has evolved as expected and whether this evolution calls into question a particular objective.

Effectiveness

The term "effectiveness" concerns whether the objectives formulated in the Project are being achieved, what the successes and difficulties have been, and how appropriate the solutions chosen have been and what is the influence of external factors that come from outside the Project.

Efficiency

The term “efficiency” is assessed by comparing the results obtained or, preferably, the impacts produced, and the resources mobilised. In other words, are the effects obtained commensurate to the inputs? (The terms ‘economy’ and ‘cost minimisation’ are sometimes in much the same way as efficiency).

Sustainability

The term “sustainability” refers to the extent to which the results and outputs of the intervention are durable. Often evaluations consider the sustainability of institutional changes as well as socioeconomic impacts. (The criterion of sustainability is also linked to the concept of sustainable development which can itself be regarded as one definition of utility, particularly if, sustainable development is defined as concerning the maintenance of human, productive, natural and social ‘capitals’ rather than just the maintenance of the environment for future generations).

Source: the evaluation team based on OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development): “*Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully*”, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/543e84ed-en>, 2021.

3.2. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The ToR presented a set of evaluation questions to guide this evaluation. The evaluation team revised, reorganized, and regrouped them at the inception report.

3.2.1. RELEVANCE

1. *To what extent has the current UNDP programme supported the government of São Tomé and Príncipe in achieving the national development goals and implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development?*
2. *To what extent has the UNDP programme responded to the priorities and the needs of target beneficiaries as defined in the programme document?*
3. *To what extent is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving Health, Governance, sustainable development and resilience to climate change in São Tomé and Príncipe?*
4. *Have the efforts made by UNDP and national partners to mobilize resources and knowledge been in line with the current development landscape? How?*
5. *Has UNDP been able to effectively adapt the programme to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in São Tomé and Príncipe?*

3.2.2. EFFECTIVENESS

1. *By reviewing the programme results and resources framework, is the UNDP programme on track to achieve intended results at the outcome and output levels? What are the key achievements and what factors contributed to the achievements or non-achievement of those results?*
2. *By examining the small-size initiatives funded by UNDP regular sources, how have these projects fulfilled their objectives? What are the factors (positive and negative) that contribute to their success or shortcomings? Are there recommendations or lessons that can be drawn from this approach?*

3. *To what extent has the UNDP programme contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening? How could UNDP enhance this element in the next UNDP programme?*
4. *Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up going forward?*
5. *To what extent did the UNDP programme promote SSC/Triangular cooperation?*

3.2.3. EFFICIENCY

1. *To what extent has there been an economical use of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) in a timely manner? What are the main administrative constraints/strengths?*
2. *To what extent is the results-based management system operating effectively and is monitoring data informing management decision making?*
3. *To what extent has UNDP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in São Tomé and Príncipe?*
4. *How well does the workflow between UNDP and national implementing partners perform?*
5. *How well did UNDP perform in the implementation of support services in the context of an MOU with an implementing partner?*

3.2.4. SUSTAINABILITY

1. *What outcomes and outputs have the most likelihood of sustainability and being adopted by partners and why?*
2. *To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?*
3. *To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?*
4. *To what extent have national partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?*
5. *To what extent do existing partnerships with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners are able to sustain the attained results?*

3.2.5. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY

1. *To what extent have has the inclusion of vulnerable groups been addressed in UNDP's work? What barriers have been found and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?*
2. *To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the programme's strategic design, implementation, and reporting? Are there key achievements? In what way could UNDP enhance gender equality in the next country programme?*

3.3. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The methodology developed for this evaluation took into consideration the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines, as well as the UNEG Evaluation Standards and Norms *vis-à-vis* the integration of cross-cutting elements, a human rights-based approach, equity and gender equality. It is aligned with the Guidance Document Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, and the United Nations System Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP).

The evaluation used the *Contribution Analysis* approach to provide information on the contribution of the Project to the expected results. To that end, it employed a mixed method methodology of data collection and analysis which included desk review, primary qualitative data analysis (e.g., interviews), and secondary qualitative and quantitative data analysis (e.g., news sources, statistics from authoritative organizations). The evaluation used different lines of evidence and triangulation of sources to further verify its results.

The methodology included the incorporation of gender principles in all stages of the evaluation, including in the design of data collection and analysis tools, sampling of stakeholders and beneficiaries of the Country Programme, and disaggregation of data by categories (e.g., type of institution, location, gender).

3.3.1. DESK REVIEW

The desk review collected information from the programme documents, progress reports, grey literature, news, among others. This information was important to get an overview of the initiative, triangulate information, identify knowledge gaps, and help developing/supporting hypotheses about the evaluation criteria (see Annex 3).

3.3.2. ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY DATA

Secondary data analysis considered data collected at baseline shared by the UNDP's team (e.g., CPD indicators), as well as other relevant statistical data that came up from other sources during data collection phase. Additionally, the secondary analysis included statistical data reported in databases or trackers from credible national or international organizations (e.g., HDI; World Health Organization (WHO) stats, International Labour Organization (ILO) stats, World Bank Stats).

3.3.3. SEMI-STRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

This evaluation conducted semi-structured interviews that reached 47 key informants (17 female and 30 male) from the UNDP (16), government/state partners (21), national and international CSOs (9), and International Organizations partners (one).

By outcome, 7 key informants were linked with outcome 1, 15 with outcome 2, and 22 with outcome 3. Outcome 1 had fewer key informants consulted because key implementation activities were concentrated within the MoH. Differently, the CPD activities under outcomes 2 and 3 were institutionally more dispersed. The consultation of a larger sample of outcome 3 key informants relates on the one hand with the explicit UNDP request for this evaluation to devote more resources to outcome 3, and on the other hand to the fact that outcome 3 interviews often included more than one key informant *per* interview.

All key informants were purposively identified based on recommendations from the UNDP team and through the snowballing sampling technique. The interviews contributed to fill knowledge gaps emerging from the desk review. The questions for the key informants were specifically designed to reveal the extent of the respondents' awareness of the programming and the perception of changes or improvements resulting from the implemented approaches by the UNDP, as well as their recommendations for the new CPD.

The list of key informants consulted, as well as the interview guides are provided in Annex 1 and 2, respectively.

3.3.4. STRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

This evaluation organized structured qualitative interviews with 8 (3 female, and 5 male) final beneficiaries from outcome 3, namely those participating in the Youth Entrepreneurship and Muala+ activities. The interviews were carried out by phone (WhatsApp) in August 2022. The final beneficiaries were randomly identified based on a list of participants provided by the UNDP team. The list provided included only final beneficiaries whose business activities remained open and/or were in the process of opening.

The list of interactions and instruments for data collection are presented in Annex 1 and 2. The names of the final beneficiaries were proposedly hidden to respect their right of privacy.

3.4. DATA ANALYSIS

The evaluation team conducted a systematic review and analysis of all data, to identify key themes, patterns, relationships, and explanations relevant to the issues and indicators in the evaluation matrix. Content analysis techniques were used for the analyses of the interviews. The content analysis process was composed of two sequential steps: 1) direct content analysis for identification of the themes addressed by the interviewees by evaluation criteria, and 2) conventional content analysis, for identification of emerging themes and patterns within the categories previously selected through the direct content analysis. In this process, the semi-automatic content analysis software Dedoose was used.

3.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The evaluation complied with ethical guidelines, applied at all stages. Data collection and processing was carried out in full compliance with the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, and its principles, namely:

- Intentionality: take into account the usefulness and the need for an evaluation from the beginning;
- Conflict of interests: exercise the commitment to avoid conflicts of interest in all aspects of work, thus maintaining the principles of independence, impartiality, credibility, honesty, integrity and responsibility;
- Interactions with the participants: appropriate and respectful involvement with the participants in the evaluation processes, maintaining the principles of confidentiality and anonymity and their limitations; dignity and diversity; human rights; gender equality; and damage prevention;
- Evaluation processes and products: ensuring accuracy, integrity and reliability, inclusion and non-discrimination, transparency, and fair and balanced reports that recognize different perspectives; and

- Finding irregularities: discreetly reporting the discovery of any apparent misconduct to a competent body.

With regard to human rights, equity and gender, the evaluation took into account the integration of cross-cutting elements (human rights-based approach, equity and gender equality), based on the Guiding Document Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations and the UN-SWAP.

Specifically, the evaluation team took the following steps to respect these ethical principles:

- Ensured informed (oral) consent by key informants and beneficiaries;
- Requested permission to record audio and / or photographs in all interactions;
- Respected confidentiality and anonymity;
- Included specific evaluation questions to address the issues of equity, gender and human rights in the design of the evaluation, definition of the respective indicators and sources in the evaluation matrix and their integration in the information collection instruments within the scope of the evaluation.

3.6. LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

As summarized below, the evaluation team has identified three key limitations that have negatively impacted the evaluation process:

- I. The **challenging timeframe** in which this evaluation was carried out limited the evaluation process both in terms of data collection and report writing. The number and breath of evaluation questions to be answered was demanding to the available time, particularly when considering the CDP included three major outcomes in distinct fields, under which there were multiple projects/programmes covering interrelated yet distinct priority areas. As a mitigation measure this evaluation held in-depth meetings with UNDP staff and key UNDP partners to ensure all relevant information was quickly obtained by the evaluation team. An unintended consequence was that interviews ended-up being strenuous for all parts involved, which was suboptimal, but indispensable to cover all the enunciated evaluation themes. Furthermore, after agreement with UNDP management, an additional two team elements accompanied the evaluation team leader to the field mission to further expedite data collection.
- II. As soon as the initial list of key informants was agreed, the evaluation team send-out invitations to schedule interviews. However, this evaluation faced **low levels of responsiveness**, particularly from national partners. To mitigate low responsiveness, the evaluation team reached out key informants by phone to schedule interviews. The mitigation measure held positive results, as the evaluation team secured a high number of interviews.
- III. In the inception report **it was envisioned the application of an online survey** to increase the inputs from national partners, without the necessity of in-person interviews. Since there were low levels of e-mail responsiveness, this evaluation expanded the number of interviews *in lieu* of the online survey.

4. EVALUATION RESULTS

This chapter aims to answer the evaluation questions for the different evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and human rights and gender equality), presenting evidence for each question.

3.7. RELEVANCE

3.7.1. ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES, SDGs, AND PRIORITIES AND NEEDS OF BENEFICIARIES

To evaluate the relevance of the CPD, this evaluation resorted to three sets of indicators: (i) data from standardized and internationally recognized data sets (ii) documental analysis of strategic documents, and (iii) perception of stakeholders.

The CPD elected three key intervention outcomes (i) health, (ii) democratic governance, and (iii) sustainable development and resilience to climate change. **This evaluation has found evidence the CPD outcomes were well aligned with identifiable needs and priorities, with the National Development Plan (*Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento - PND*) 2017-2021, and with sectoral plans and priorities, as well as with the SDG's 1, 8, 10 and 16. Additionally, all key informants consulted agreed the outcomes proposed in the CPD, as well as the several Projects/Programmes that followed were relevant.**

On outcome 1, key health system indicators (see **Table 2**) suggest **the relevance of interventions focusing on building the resilience of the health sector in São Tomé and Príncipe**. For example, only 58 percent of the population was covered by UHC service in 2015²⁶, and the number of available health professionals was relatively low, as there were only 3.16 medical doctors and 22.17 nursing and midwifery personnel *per* 10.000 people in 2015. Alike, the number of medical and pathology laboratory technicians was low, with only 44 being reported in 2004. The most recently available data, suggests interventions in the health sector remains relevant. The fact that the most recently available data is often outdated further reinforces a structural need of the country in improving the reliability, consistency, and comprehensiveness of national data collection mechanisms.

On health, the CPD focused on increasing communication systems, which are essential to maximizing the efficiency of a system with low resources. Furthermore, the UNDP contributed to improving the quality and availability of human resources (HR) through training to existing professionals, and placement of consultants and volunteers. The fragilities of the health sector of São Tomé and Príncipe, including budget constraints, equally made relevant the UNDP's intervention in the prevention, detection, and treatment of communicable diseases, such as Malaria (incidence of 11.01 in 2016)²⁷, HIV/AIDS (prevalence of 0.4 percent in 2016)²⁸, and Tuberculosis

²⁶ WHO (World Health Organization): "UHC Service Coverage Index (SDG 3.8.1)", UHC_INDEX_REPORTED, November 2021, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/uhc-index-of-service-coverage>, (consulted 03/08/2022).

²⁷ WHO (World Health Organization): "The Global Health Observatory: Estimated Malaria Incidence (per 1000 Population at Risk)", May 2022, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators> (consulted 03/08/2022).

²⁸ World Bank: "Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49) - Sao Tome and Principe", SH.DYN.AIDS.ZS (UNAIDS), (consulted 10/08/2022).

(incidence of 162 in 2016)²⁹. Indeed, the UHC service coverage on infectious diseases was relatively low (59 percent) in 2015³⁰.

The UNDP's intervention aligned with the PND ambitions of strengthening the national health system, including in matters of improvement of infrastructure, fight against endemic diseases and strengthening of the National Endemic Center (Centro Nacional de Endemias - CNE), as well as improvement of the health information management system³¹. It equally aligned with sectoral strategies, such as the National Strategic HIV/AIDS Response Plan (Plano Estratégico Nacional de Resposta ao HIV/SIDA) 2013-2017, and 2018-2022, to which the CPD contributed, for instance, with drugs, condoms, and equipment, as well as with funding to the implementation of the first Integrated Bio-Behavioral Surveillance (IBBS) report on HIV/AIDS targeting SP, men who have sex with men (MSM), and inmates³². The UNDP's intervention was relevant in addressing the most vulnerable, which in São Tomé and Príncipe are very exposed to external shocks particularly because in 2020 only 11.5 percent of the population was covered by at least one social protection benefit³³, which means the availability of public safety nets is incipient. The incipency of public safety nets affects vulnerable groups the most, for instance, in 2020 only 1.6 percent of persons with severe disabilities collected disability protection benefits³⁴.

Table 2 – Sample of health indicators in São Tomé and Príncipe

Indicator	Baseline	Latest available year	
UHC service coverage index ¹	58 (2015)	60 (2019)	(+2)
Medical Doctors (per 10.000) ²	3.16(2015)	4.88 (2019)	(+1.72)
Nursing and midwifery personnel (per 10.000) ²	22.17 (2015)	21.49 (2019)	(-0.65)
Medical and Pathology Laboratory Technicians (number) ²	44 (2004)	-	-
Estimated Malaria Incidence (per 1.000 population at risk) ¹	11.01 (2016)	8.82 (2020)	(-2.19)
Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49) ³	0.4 (2016)	0.3 (2020)	(-0.1)
Incidence of tuberculosis (per 100.000 population per year) ¹	162 (2016)	118 (2020)	(-44)
UHC service coverage sub-index on infectious diseases ¹	59 (2015)	64 (2019)	(+5)
Population covered by at least one social protection benefit ⁴	-	11.5% (2020)	-

Source: ¹WHO: "The Global Health Observatory", ²WHO "Global Health Workforce Statistics Database", ³World Bank: "Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49) – Sao Tome and Principe", ⁴ILO: "SDG indicator 1.3.1 – Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/system (%) – Annual".

On outcome 2, key democratic governance indicators (see **Table 3**) suggest the relevance and need of the interventions proposed. For instance, the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) - a perception-based tools to measure governance, and built upon a survey of firms, households, commercial business providers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), multilateral organizations, and public-sector bodies³⁵ - qualifies São Tomé and Príncipe borderline positively in matters of voice and accountability, political stability and absence of violence/terrorism, as well as

²⁹ WHO (World Health Organization): "The Global Health Observatory: Incidence of Tuberculosis (per 100 000 Population per Year)", October 2021, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators> (consulted 03/08/2022).

³⁰ WHO (World Health Organization): "UHC Service Coverage Sub-Index on Infectious Diseases", November 2021, (consulted 03/08/2022).

³¹ São Tomé e Príncipe: "Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento 2017-2021", 2017.

³² INPG (Instituto Nacional para Promoção da Igualdade e Equidade de Género), and PNLs (Programa Nacional de Luta contra SIDA): "Relatório do Estudo Biocomportamental HIV/SIDA nas Populações Chave (TS, HSH e Prisoneiros) em São Tomé e Príncipe", 2019.

³³ ILO (International Labour Organization): "SDG indicator 1.3.1 – Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/system (%) – Annual", SDG_0131_SEX_SOC_RT_A, June 2022, <https://ilostat.ilo.org/data/#> (consulted 06/08/2022).

³⁴ ILO (International Labour Organization): "SDG indicator 1.3.1 – Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/system (%) – Annual", SDG_0131_SEX_SOC_RT_A, June 2022, <https://ilostat.ilo.org/data/#> (consulted 06/08/2022).

³⁵ Kaufman, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi: "The worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues", Policy Research Working Paper 5430, The World Bank, 2010.

corruption control. However, it qualifies the country negatively in matters of government effectiveness, regulatory quality, and rule of law³⁶. Likewise, the International Budget Partnership's Open Budget Survey, which assesses country budget transparency levels in its Open Budget Index (OBI), qualifies³⁷ negatively São Tomé and Príncipe in terms of budget transparency and oversight³⁸. Furthermore, the female representativeness in decision-making bodies was low, for instance, the percentage of women in parliament was only 20 percent in 2014³⁹.

The **CPD addressed all enunciated fragilities of the São Tomé and Príncipe's democratic governance system, which is consistent with the PND that envisioned improvements in public finance management, governance, and gender equality**⁴⁰. Alike, outcome 2 priorities aligned with sectoral strategies, such as the national gender equality strategy⁴¹, and the strategy for the reform of public finance management⁴². Furthermore, outcome 2 included provisions to support the INE in providing reliable data, which was relevant particularly when considering the absence and/or outdated data on multiple features of São Tomé and Príncipe (e.g., labor market). Indeed, the latest available year of the indicators on **Table 2**, **Table 3**, and **Table 4**, are often outdated, which indicates a structural need of improving data collection, monitoring, and reporting.

Table 3 - Sample of democratic governance indicators São Tomé and Príncipe

Indicator	Baseline	Latest available year	
WGI: Voice and accountability [-2.5 lowest, 2.5 highest] ¹	0.30 (2017)	0.35 (2020)	(+0.05)
WGI: Political stability and absence of violence/terrorism [-2.5 lowest, 2.5 highest] ¹	0.19 (2017)	0.48 (2020)	(+0.29)
WGI: Government effectiveness [-2.5 lowest, 2.5 highest] ¹	-0.75 (2017)	-0.64 (2020)	(+0.11)
WGI: Regulatory quality [-2.5 lowest, 2.5 highest] ¹	-0.83 (2017)	-0.90 (2020)	(-0.07)
WGI: Rule of law [-2.5 lowest, 2.5 highest] ¹	-0.70 (2017)	-0.69 (2020)	(+0.01)
WGI: Control of Corruption [-2.5 lowest, 2.5 highest] ¹	0.16 (2017)	0.16 (2020)	-
OBI: Transparency (OBI score) [0 Lowest, 100 highest] ²	31 (2017)	31 (2021)	-
OBI: Budget Oversight [0 Lowest, 100 highest] ²	46 (2017)	44 (2021)	(-2)
Percentage of Women in Parliament ³	18,2% (2014)	23.6% (2018)	(+5.4)

Source: ¹WGI: "Interactive Data Access", 2021, ²IBP: "Open Budget Survey 2021 São Tomé and Príncipe", 2022., ³IPU: "Historical dataset on the percentage of women in parliament between 1945-2018", 2019 and IPU: "Monthly ranking of women in national parliaments", 2022.

Sustainable development and resilience to climate change (**outcome 3**) linked indicators (see **Table 4**) equally suggest the relevance of the CPD. For example, the CPD focused on agriculture, forestry, and fishing; sectors that in 2017 represented almost eleven percent of the São Tomé and Príncipe's GDP⁴³. Such sectors represented a value added of 44 Million (MM) US\$ in 2017⁴⁴, and a

³⁶ WGI (Worldwide Governance Indicators): "Interactive Data Access", 2021 (consulted 07/08/2022).

³⁷ A transparency score of 61 out of 100 is the minimum threshold "signifying that sufficient amount of information are publicly available and can support informed public debate on the budget".

³⁸ IBP (International Budget Partnership): "Open Budget Survey 2021 São Tomé e Príncipe", 2022.

³⁹ IPU (Inter-Parliamentary Union): "Historical dataset on the percentage of women in parliament between 1945-2018", 2019. And IPU (Inter-Parliamentary Union): "Monthly ranking of women in national parliaments", 2022.

⁴⁰ São Tomé e Príncipe: "Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento 2017-2021", 2017.

⁴¹ São Tomé e Príncipe: "III Estratégia Nacional para a Igualdade e Equidade De Género em São Tomé e Príncipe 2019-2026", 2019.

⁴² São Tomé e Príncipe: "Estratégia de Reforma da Gestão das Finanças Públicas", 2020.

⁴³ FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): "Aquastat, Agriculture, Value Added (% GDP)", <https://www.fao.org/aquastat/statistics/query/index.html?lang=en>, 2022.

⁴⁴ FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): "Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Value Added (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)", May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.

gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) of 1.9 MM US\$⁴⁵. Focusing on sustainable development, and building a resilient business environment is relevant, particularly when considering the low dynamism of the São Tomé and Príncipe economy, both in terms of new limited liability companies created, and business density⁴⁶. On energy, the national access to energy by the population was relatively low in 2016 (69 percent), and lower in rural areas (59 percent). The share of renewable energy in total final energy consumption was 39 percent⁴⁷. The levels of CO₂ emissions *per capita* was relatively low⁴⁸, which would be expected considering the lack of intensive industry in São Tomé and Príncipe. Another relevant aspect was the ambition of contributing to increase the disaster preparedness of São Tomé and Príncipe. Data is scarce on the type, number, and effects of natural disaster in São Tomé and Príncipe. However, the International Disaster Database (EM-DAT) recorded that in 2021 almost 220 thousand - virtually the entire population - were directly or indirectly affected by floods in São Tomé and Príncipe, and eight lost their lives⁴⁹. The absence of comprehensive data suggests the national capacity for monitoring and reporting natural disasters was low when the CPD was designed, which indicates the relevance of actions in this area, and further stresses the need for improving data access and reliability as a means to improve situational awareness, and decision-making capacity.

Alike in the previous outcomes, **the action areas defined in the CPD aligned with the PND, including the ambition of promoting agricultural resilience to climate change, development of the blue economy, support the improvement of the business and entrepreneur environment in São Tomé and Príncipe, increase the production of renewable energy, and the strengthening of institutional and legal arrangements in disasters management**⁵⁰. Moreover, the CPD aligned with sectoral strategies, such as the national programme for the promotion of decent work 2018-2021⁵¹.

Table 4 - Sample of sustainable development and resilience to climate change indicators São Tomé and Príncipe

Indicator	Baseline	Latest available year	
Agriculture, value added (%) GDP ¹	10.88% (2017)	11.12% (2018)	(+0.24)
Value Added (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing) ²	\$ 41 MM (2017)	\$ 53 MM (2020)	(+12)
Gross Fixed Capital Formation (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing) ²	\$ 1.9 MM (2017)	\$ 2.7 MM (2020)	(+0.8)
Number of new limited liability companies ³	360 (2016)	268 (2020)	(-92)
New business density ³	3.3 (2016)	2.21 (2020)	(-1.09)
Access to electricity (% of population) ⁴	69% (2016)	77% (2020)	(+8)
Access to electricity, rural (% of rural population) ⁴	59% (2016)	71% (2020)	(+12)
Access to electricity, urban (% of urban population) ⁴	74 (2016)	78% (2020)	(+4)
Renewable energy share in total Final Energy Consumption (%) ⁴	39% (2016)	37% (2019)	(-2)
CO ₂ emissions (metric tons per capita) ⁵	0.6 (2016)	0.7 (2019)	(0.1)
Total population affected by flood ⁶	-	219 668 (2021)	-

⁴⁵ FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): "Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Gross Fixed Capital Formation (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)", May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.

⁴⁶ World Bank: "Entrepreneurship Database", n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

⁴⁷ IEA (International Energy Agency), IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), UNSD (the United Nations Statistics Division), the World Bank, and WHO (World Health Organization): "Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report", n.d., (consulted 05/08/2022).

⁴⁸ Climate Watch: "GHG Emissions. Washington", 2020.

⁴⁹ EM-DAT (The International Disaster Database): "Custom Request: disaster classification (all natural), location (Sao Tomé and Principe), range (1900-2022)", n.d. (consulted 03/08/2022).

⁵⁰ São Tomé e Príncipe: "Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento 2017-2021", 2017.

⁵¹ São Tomé e Príncipe: "Programa de Promoção do Trabalho Digno 2018-2021 de São Tomé e príncipe", 2018.

Source: ¹FAO: “Aquastat, Agriculture, Value Added (% GDP), 2022, ²FAO: “Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe”, 2022., ³World Bank: “Entrepreneurship Database”, n.d., ⁴IEA et al.: “Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report”, n.d., ⁵Climate Watch: “GHG Emissions. Washington”, 2020, ⁶EM-DAT: “Custom Request: disaster classification (all natural), location (Sao Tomé and Príncipe), range (1900-2022)”, n.d..

According to key informants, the relevance of the CDP, as well as its alignment with national priorities and needs is explained by two complementary factors. First, the long history of UNDP implementation in São Tomé and Príncipe enabled the UNDP to formulate an accurate reading of the national context, priorities, and needs. Second, a consistent auscultation of national partners in the strategic definition of UNDP priorities was reported, which was conducive for the definition of priorities and activities that were relevant and well aligned with both national and sectorial strategies, as well as with institutional priorities of partners.

Regarding the auscultation of partners, it is worth separating State/Governmental and CSOs partners. State/Governmental partners have consistently reported a strong and consistent dialogue with the UNDP in defining strategic orientations, as well as in implementing plans. Differently, CSOs reported that the dialogue and auscultation took place during specific implementation plan/projects definition, but not during macro strategic orientation definition.

In assessing the 2007-2011 and 2012-2016 CPD, the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) concluded that the partnerships between NGOs and the UNDP were limited to contractual relationships for implementation, and no steps had been made to build a strategic partnership⁵². Evidence collected during this evaluation indicates improvements in this area, and a consistent UNDP effort in improving strategic partnerships with CSOs (e.g., partnerships with Birdlife, OIKOS, Fundação Príncipe, among others) which is relevant particularly in a country where CSOs are fragile.

According to key informants improving the rapport with CSOs would strengthen the UNDP strategic planning capacity. Tapping into CSOs knowledge could assist the UNDP in better refining its specific activities targets, as well as specific areas of action. The full use of CSOs as strategic partners may require further UNDP action in strengthening CSOs institutional and HR capacity, as well as national/local implementation.

Another relevant aspect to further boost UNDP’s strategic planning is access to reliable, consistent, and comprehensive databases with quantitative and qualitative data on multiple features of São Tomé and Príncipe. This process is hindered by fragilities in data collection mechanisms of São Tomé and Príncipe linked with insufficiency of national HR, as well as transversal suboptimal data monitoring and communication systems from São Tomé and Príncipe authorities both at INE level, and within multiple state/government bodies. Building a culture and capacity for data collection and monitoring seems to be crucial both to the UNDP’s strategic planning, as well as to improve national responses and decision-making in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

3.7.2. STAKEHOLDER’S PERCEPTION ON UNDP PRESENCE IN SÃO TOMÉ AND PRÍNCIPE

This evaluation was asked to shed light on the extent to which the UNDP is perceived as a strong advocate for improving health, governance, and sustainable development and resilience to climate change in São Tomé and Príncipe. In questioning UNDP partners, this evaluation has found that the perception of partners is overall positive, as the UNDP is perceived as a relevant, trustworthy, and valuable partner. The extent the UNDP is valued as a partner varies across

⁵² IEO (Independent Evaluation Office): “Assessment of Development Results, Evaluation of UNDP Contribution São Tomé & Príncipe”, United Nations Development Programme, 2016.

partners from the different outcomes. A consistent key aspect in UNDP recognition is the UNDP's access to specialized technical assistance experts, as well as its funding mobilization capacity.

Outcome 1. Key informants recognized the successful history of UNDP implementation in the health sector of São Tomé and Príncipe. The UNDP is recognized as a valued partner in matters associated with information systems, access and management of funding – particularly Global Fund –, capacity-building of HR, procurement of equipment and drugs, and infrastructure development. **Outcome 2.** Key informants considered the UNDP as the main partner in matters of good governance, public finance transparency, gender equality, and election support. **Outcome 3.** On strengthening economic resilience and fostering economic growth, key informants conveyed a shift in perception, whereas only recently the UNDP became perceived as an obvious partner. It was reported that if it was not for public calls for the implementation of CPD activities key economic-linked informants would not have considered the UNDP as a natural partner. Projects/Programmes such as the social and youth entrepreneurship as well as support to the agribusiness value-chain were often stressed as perception turning points. It should be noted that from 2019 onwards the UNDP started targeting Micro and Small Enterprises (MSE) and the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem, which represented a new stream of UNDP work that normally works with Government institutions. On climate resilience key informants recognized the UNDP's relevance on resources mobilization and management but have not conveyed the perception of the UNDP as a strong partner in terms of conservation and disaster preparedness, due to lack of institutional specialization.

3.7.3. COVID-19 EFFECTS AND RESPONSE

Evidence collected during this evaluation suggests the UNDP was a key partner in assisting São Tomé and Príncipe in addressing the challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite not being enshrined in the CPD – as the CPD precedes the COVID-19 pandemic – the UNDP effectively adapted its outcomes to the effects of the pandemic, including immediate response, and post-pandemic response. According to the CPD 17-22 Financial Execution⁵³, the UNDP successfully mobilized almost one million USD (\$ 969 817,15) between 2020 and 2022 for its São Tomé and Príncipe COVID-19 response plan.

As this evaluation now briefly summarizes, COVID-19 negatively affected the implementation of the CPD, and led to an institutional response.

a. COVID-19 implementation effects

During the COVID-19 outbreak, health services globally were called upon to address the effects of the pandemic, there were national lockdowns worldwide, restrictions of movement, and the global logistic system lowered its responsiveness. According to key informants, the pandemic had a negative effect in the implementation of all outcome activities, including in the achievement of the established goals. The findings of this evaluation on the negative effects of COVID-19 to outcome implementation confirm the conclusions of the *2020 Results Oriented Annual Report*⁵⁴ (ROAR), as well as project-specific evaluation reports such as the *Final Evaluation Report Global Fund Grant São Tomé and Príncipe-Z-UNDP*⁵⁵. To summarize, COVID-19 had the following key negative effects:

⁵³ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REV1", 2022.

⁵⁴ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2020.

⁵⁵ Roma-Reardon, Josianne: "Global Fund Grant São Tomé e Príncipe-Z-UNDP Final Evaluation Report", 2021.

- I. **Logistical constraints** delayed the delivery of equipment and products which were crucial for implementation including, for example, retroviral drugs and condoms (outcome 1), or renewable energy-linked materials (outcome 3).
- II. **Obstacles to community engagement, close contact activities, and outreach** due to lockdowns, and fear of spreading of COVID-19. Such obstacles affected negatively the implementation of outcome 1 as populations feared contact with health professionals, and the influx of patients to the CNE and other health services reduced. Furthermore, health services reduced due to lockdowns⁵⁶. The obstacles to the exchanges between the community and health services/professionals lowered the capacity of outreach campaigns – e.g., through community agents -, as well as access to antiretroviral drug and condoms. The reduction of health services-patients interactions may be a contributing factor in explaining lower notification of cases of HIV, TB, and Malaria both in 2020 and 2021, the decrease of TB treatment success rates, as well as the worsening of the already suboptimal distribution of long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs). Likewise, under outcome 2, the activities to bring the justice system closer to the populations (e.g., *Justiça Mais Próxima* Project) had to be interrupted, as were in-person training activities. Some capacity-building activities transitioned to online format, yet very technical training that require on-the-job activities had to be delayed. Technical assistance activities also suffered delays due to the transition of the work model from presential to remote, and impossibility of conducting field visits. Likewise, south-south cooperation (SSC) activities were delayed due to travel restrictions.
- III. Specific for outcome 1, the **focus of health professional and health services on COVID-19** response, as well as overload of health professions on COVID-19 related tasks (e.g., immediate care, vaccination), reduced and/or slowed focus and engagement on implementation of new working practices. Additionally, some equipment was directed towards COVID-19 response such as TB detection equipment.

b. COVID-19 Response

According to key informants, upon COVID-19 linked adversity the UNDP reacted with national partners to contribute to immediate response, and post-COVID-19 economic recovery.

Immediate Response:

- I. It was reported that the UNDP contributed **with technical assistance to the definition of national plans** to address the COVID-19 pandemic.
- II. **Infrastructure and equipment delivery**, including for outcome 1 the acquisition of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), oxygen concentrators, laboratory capacity, and motor vehicles. In terms of infrastructure, the UNPD is working on supporting the strengthening of the São Tomé and Príncipe oxygen plant, installation of infection diseases room, and installing solar energy panels. On other outcomes (2 and 3), the UNDP equally contributed with equipment, including masks and alcohol gel. Additionally, the UNDP contributed with equipment that assisted in the digital transition from in-person working environments to online working environment. In the case of the National Assembly, for instance, the UNDP funded equipment (e.g., computers, webcams) enabled the transmission of parliamentary activities with mitigated potential losses of public oversight.

⁵⁶ Between March and May 2020 just 7 main health centers and 2 hospitals were open out of 440 health services (“Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2020).

- III. **COVID-19 tracing**, in which COVID-19 added urgency to move forward the implementation of the *District Health Information System 2* (DHIS2), as a mechanism to collect and assist in the reporting of data. The UNDP further supported the health services in terms of data collection and supervision, fuel, and data visualization and reporting.
- IV. Strengthening of health **HR**, including nurses, laboratory technicians, and epidemiologists.
- V. Support **capacity-building** of field epidemiologists, as well as laboratory technical staff.
- VI. In order to mitigate the adverse effects of COVID-19, across outcomes all activities that could be moved online (e.g., capacity-building, technical assistance) were moved online. The **transition of activities into an online mode** enabled, in some cases, the full continuation of activities, while when transition was not possible (e.g., training that require interpersonal proximity) there were disruptions or delays in implementation.
- VII. **Awareness campaigns** that attempted to mitigate the spread of COVID-19, and increase population awareness on the recommended behaviors were funded. For instance, the UNPD funded the youth-led campaign “*Salve Vidas Higienizando as Mãos*” (outcome 2).

COVID-19 Economic Recovery:

- I. The UNDP **funded/adapted entrepreneurship activities**, including the Youth Social Entrepreneurship, the Youth Entrepreneurship, and the Muala+ projects. For example, the first call for the Youth Social Entrepreneurship project focused on COVID-19 projects, which included social projects for the production of alcoholic cleaning solutions. The Youth Entrepreneurship, and the Muala+ projects sought to contribute to the post-pandemic economic revitalization. For instance, the Muala+ assisted female entrepreneurs in gaining knowledge and equipment to sustain/expand their business.
- II. Adding to entrepreneurial activity, the UNDP’s economic recovery action equally included efforts to **strengthening the agriculture value chain**.

3.8. EFFECTIVENESS

3.8.1. KEY RESULTS

The macro country indicators collected on **Table 2**, **Table 3**, and **Table 4** suggest São Tomé and Príncipe registered improvements in the three main areas of intervention established by the CPD. On health (outcome 1), between 2015 and 2019 the UHC service coverage index increased, inclusive the UHC coverage on infectious diseases, and there was a general lowering of the prevalence of infectious diseases such as Malaria, HIV/AIDS, and TB between 2016 and 2020. The improvements occurred in a context of relatively low number of medical doctors, and nurses per 10.000 habitants.

Democratic governance macro indicators equally suggest country improvements. Between 2017 and 2020 São Tomé and Príncipe improved its WGI score in key indicators, including voice and accountability, political stability and absence of terrorism/violence, government effectiveness and rule of law. Scores remain suboptimal, but the ascendent path should be registered. On other indicators, there has been no alteration, including control of corruption, and transparency (2017-2021). In two areas where the CPD has had incidence – regulatory quality and budget oversight – indicators suggest a slight worsening of the situation, which is revealing of the pertinence of UNDP action on such areas. However, qualitative information collected in this evaluation indicate that these two areas have registered improvements in the sequence of UNDP investments in the strengthening the capacities of the National Assembly (e.g., hiring of four consultants to provide

law formulation support), as well as Public Finance Management Systems (PFMS) capacity-building to parliament staff and deputies, supreme audit institutions (SAIs), and CSOs. Future information will provide a better overview on the progress of these indicators.

On sustainable development and resilience to climate change, it was registered an increase of the value added, and GFCF of agriculture, forestry, and fisheries. Business environment indicates a worsening of the new business density, yet data refers to 2020 which was one of the years the COVID-19 pandemic hit the most on businesses. Electricity access indicators equally improved between 2016 and 2020. The brief collection of indicators here presented indicate an overall improvement in the areas of the CPD, as well as insufficiencies in data availability.

Information collected during this evaluation indicates that the UNDP has had an overall positive intervention in São Tomé and Príncipe, which was conducive to actual change between 2017 and 2022. Across outcomes, the UNDP focused on four key processes: (i) infrastructure building (e.g., refurbishment of buildings, development of digital infrastructure) and equipment acquisition (e.g., medicine, computers, vehicles), (ii) capacity-building of HR from state/governmental and CSOs staff on a myriad of areas (e.g., health management systems, public finance oversight, gender responsive budgeting, financial literacy), (iii) technical assistance leading to the development/update of national plans, strategies, legal regimes, studies, participation on international regimes, and (iv) advocacy on key areas of interests, such as gender equality, and the adoption of environmental sustainable business practices leading to sustainable and inclusive socioeconomic growth.

This evaluation will briefly discuss the main results within each outcome below. Yet, it is worth highlighting three key contributions of the UNDP, in the areas of **digital transition, energy transition, sustainable economic growth, and governance and women participation in decision-making bodies.**

On **digital transition**, the UNDP has developed consistent efforts to introduce digital processes that improve management, monitoring, accountability, transparency, and decision making. Already in implementation is, for instance, the DHIS2 system (outcome 1) which is contributing to optimizing the health management system. Another key achievement was the establishment of a central data center with capacity to potentially host digital data from all ministries in São Tomé and Príncipe. The data center was envisioned within the justice modernization programme to host the justice case management systems - which is currently in process of procurement -, but the infrastructure can serve ministries beyond the Ministry of Justice, thus the potential positive effects of the data center are scalable. Digital data was often stored outside São Tomé and Príncipe due to lack of infrastructure. Despite in the early stages, interventions in this domain are contributing to the digital sovereignty of São Tomé and Príncipe, which in the future may contribute to more cost-effective options, as well as better public service quality and data.

On **energy transition**, the UNDP has contributed to the country's transition into renewable energies . With technical assistance, the UNDP has assisted the São Tomé and Príncipe government in strengthening the body of legislation, regulation, and codes intended at de-risking investment in Renewable Energies, in conducting feasibility studies on hydroelectric and photovoltaic plants, drafting integrated watershed management plans and improving the national stakeholders capacities to manage the energy transition . Furthermore, UNDP, in partnership with AfDB, has built the first photovoltaic plant in São Tomé and Príncipe, which is expected to produce a peak production of 540 kilowatts. The plant (Santo Amaro) was inaugurated by the Prime Minister in August 2022. A second phase of the plant is expected to be

financed by the African Development Bank (AFDB) and it is expected to reach to 1.5 megawatts at peak production⁵⁷. The continuation of UNDP and its national partners work by another organization indicates the leadership role of the UNDP in identifying core needs and processes. It further indicated the sustainability and governmental ownership of activities.

On **sustainable economic growth**, the UNDP has identified key intervention areas that according to key informants are essential to the future development of the country. The UNDP was innovative on focusing on sustainable agriculture value chain practices, and in assisting local communities in transitioning into economically feasible, viable, and sustainable activities. Additionally, the UNDP has supported youth entrepreneurship programmes which, according to key informants have contributed to instill a business culture among youth, and in imprinting a new vibrancy in the private sector. Indeed, it was reported to this evaluation that the entrepreneurship programmes attracted private partners, and the model followed is expected to be reproduced by other donors.

On **governance and women participation in decision-making bodies**, the UNDP was key partner in increasing the capacities of sovereign bodies and CSOs in better addressing public finances oversight, and gender responsive budgeting. Apart from capacity-building, three key achievements include the adoption of a gender responsive national budget in 2021, the approval of public accounts of 2010 to 2017, and the recent approval of the Parity Law in 2022..

Besides these four key results, the UNDP had relevant achievements in other areas, including improvement of the health system and justice systems, democratic governance, capacity-building of state/governmental and CSOs partners, among others. Because each outcome has idiosyncrasies, this evaluation proceeds in discussing the main results under each outcome. To discuss the main results, this evaluation departed from the analysis of the outputs defined for each outcome in the CPD. To ease the identification of the level of achievement, this evaluation built a color scheme as presented in **Table 5**. It should be noted that this evaluation did not proceed to an exhaustive reporting of results, instead it focused on key processes and achievements. Additionally, this evaluation covered achievements beyond what was presented in the results framework in order to provide a more accurate reading of the UNDP achievements.

Table 5 – Target progress color scheme

 Goal achieved	 Goal without progress
 Goal partially achieved	 No information available

a) Outcome 1 – Health and HIV/AIDS

Outcome 1 represents a large share of the CPD’s investment in terms of financial execution⁵⁸. As summarized in **Table 6**, in the three outputs defined the CPD contributed to the improvement of São Tomé and Príncipe’s health system. Considering the most recent data available (2019 for malaria indicators or 2021 for HIV/AIDS and TB indicators), the country improved the percentage of children under five who sleep under an insecticide-treated net during night, reduced the prevalence of female sex workers infected by HIV, and reduced the number of tuberculosis cases notified within key and high-risk population. The positive results were below the initial targets

⁵⁷ Observador: “São Tomé e Príncipe inaugura Primeira Central de Energia Fotovoltaica”, 25 August, 2022.

⁵⁸ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REVI”, August 2022.

planned in the CPD, yet yearly data shows a positive progress in all outputs. However, as targets were initially defined with limited information available on specific population at the time of the CPD design, they have not been reached for outcome 1. This may also be associated with the increased capacity to detect HIV/AIDS and TB in the country.

The depth of UNDP's involvement in strengthening the health system in the country is not entirely reflected in the outputs established in the CPD. Indeed, the CPD provided the basis for a larger involvement in the health sector. Besides improving infectious diseases (Malaria, HIV/AIDS, TB) response - including detection, monitoring, access to treatment, and knowledge on key population -, the UNDP contributed to the overall improvement of the São Tomé e Príncipe health system through the improvement of infrastructure, equipment, technical assistance to improve response, and development of digital systems to improve data collection, monitoring, and decision making, notably with the UNDP's participation in the introduction and roll-out of the DHIS2, and of its linkages to other systems such as the Social Registry. The two systems, which are currently in use, represent a significant achievement in strengthening the São Tomé e Príncipe's health system, that is transitioning from a paper-format to a digital-format communication system. Both the Social Registry and the DHIS2 are basal in building the resilience and response capacity of the health system and may lead to overall gains in the future in terms of public health and quality of decision-making.

On procurement, the UNDP alongside the MoH worked during 2021 in the introduction of the M-Supply software, for management of pharmaceutical supply chain. It was piloted at the central level and, according to the UNDP Team, it is in the process of being rolled out to decentralized levels. Reportedly, the introduction of the software will improve the planning for health supplies for the MoH, and “distribution will guarantee that no stock ruptures will be found in the main health centers of the country”. It is worth noting the UNDP's work in training the core team in charge of feeding the system nationwide⁵⁹.

Another key aspect concerns the accomplishment of the CPD's ambition of transferring the management of the Global Fund project to the hands of the MoH, which has become Principal Recipient of the Global Fund grants.

As this report now discusses, the achievements faced obstacles, which required the adoption of mitigation measures. Hence, to further improve UNDP's future activities, this evaluation now briefly discusses the key results, processes, and obstacles of outcome 1 implementation.

Table 6 – Table of results Outcome 1

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Latest year available	
CPD Output 1.1: Key and vulnerable groups, particularly children and women, use quality health services, within a legal framework and strengthened national systems				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of children under 5 who sleep under an insecticide-treated net during the night 	61.1 % (2014)	85% (2018)	Total: 62.60%: Female 66.50%; Male 59.90% (2019)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of female sex workers infected by HIV 	1.1 (2013)	0.5% (2021)	0,9 % (2021) 1,6% (2018)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of tuberculosis cases notified within key and high-risk populations 	91 (2013)	77 (2017)	82(2021) 91 (2020) 142(2019) 152(2018)	●

⁵⁹ “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2020.

Source: The evaluation team, based on information provided by the UNDP Team

Malaria, HIV/AIDS, and TB. The UNDP's strategy for the three Global Fund programmes - Malaria, HIV/AIDS and TB - was developed in partnership with the CNE, as well as key institutions at activity level. It aimed to reduce the incidence of Malaria, reduce morbidity among people living with HIV/AIDS, and increase the treatment success rate for all forms of TB.

Regarding **malaria**, there was a general reduction of malaria cases, yet there was a slight increase of cases in 2020, which key informants attributed to COVID-19. The activities included funds for Indoor Residual Spaying (IRS), distribution of LLIN, awareness campaigns, and improved malaria testing, diagnostic, epidemiological surveillance, and case finding, as well as access to medicine. Besides the CNE, the activities counted with the participation of the Red Cross to distribute LLIN, as well as Zatona-Adil to raise awareness and provide IRS to households. Despite the reduction of malaria cases, insufficiencies were reported in mapping all malaria cases, as well as in the distribution of LLIN, which were insufficient to the size of population⁶⁰. According to the WHO, in 2019 the percentage of children under 5 who sleep under an insecticide-treated net during night – an output indicator of the CPD - was 62.60 percent in 2019⁶¹, which is an improvement when compared to the 2014 baseline (61.1 percent), but far from the 85 percent target for 2018.

Additionally, key informants noted insufficiencies of the awareness campaigns, which did not lead to actual change of population behavior. Some key informants linked with governmental structures considered the UNDP's option for not partnering with the Centro Nacional de Educação para a Saúde (CNES) – a governmental body – was one of the reasons for the insufficiencies of awareness campaigns. For awareness campaigns the UNDP partnered with the Associação Santomense para a Promoção do Planeamento Familiar (ASPF). Due to its limited time, this evaluation was unable to reach the ASPF. Nonetheless contracting with CSOs should not be regarded as an hinderance *per se*, as in São Tomé and Príncipe CSOs often attain a closeness to communities which does not occur in governmental structures. For that reason, future endeavors should strive to conciliate and bridge governmental and CSOs efforts. Also relevant in the fight against malaria, an agreement was signed with the University of California to investigate how to genetically modify mosquitoes to make them sterile, thus stopping the spread of malaria. According to UNDP Team, the project is currently in implementation, and results are expected within the next CPD period.

The **HIV/AIDS** trajectory in São Tomé and Príncipe has been positive. According to the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) estimates in 2020 the prevalence of HIV in population ages 15-49 was 0.3, which is an improvement when compared to the 0.4 in 2016⁶². With the UNDP's assistance, São Tomé and Príncipe adopted, for instance, the WHO's Universal Test and Treat (UTT) strategy and increased the quality of life and access to treatment for people living with HIV/AIDS (PLHIV) as there was a good antiretroviral therapy (ART) coverage. Furthermore, awareness campaigns reportedly assisted in reducing HIV stigma towards PLHIV⁶³. According to the 2020 ROAR 100 percent of (4631) of pregnant women attending antenatal clinics and/or giving birth at a facility were tested for HIV⁶⁴. In the HIV/AIDS action there are some signs of concerns, namely the reduction of condoms acquisition and distribution due to decreased funding. According to key

⁶⁰ Roma-Reardon, Josianne: "Global Fund Grant São Tomé e Príncipe-Z-UNDP Final Evaluation Report", 2021.

⁶¹ WHO (World Health Organization): "Proportion of children under five who sleep under an insecticide-treated net. Year 2019", n.d., (consulted 10/08/2022).

⁶² World bank: "Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49) – Sao Tome and Principe", SH.DYN.AIDS.ZS (UNAIDS), (consulted 10/08/2022).

⁶³ Roma-Reardon, Josianne: "Global Fund Grant São Tomé e Príncipe-Z-UNDP Final Evaluation Report", 2021.

⁶⁴ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2020.

informants the strategies for resources mobilization have yet to produce positive results in this area.

On specific vulnerable groups there are also some signs of concern. According to the IBBS 2018 (published in 2019), the prevalence of HIV among sex workers was 1.4 *percent*, among MSM 3.2 *percent*, and among prisoners 8.2 *percent*⁶⁵. According to the UNDP team, in 2021 the prevalence of HIV among sex workers reduced to 0.9 *percent*. Therefore, the CPD target was not achieved on sex workers, as the target was a prevalence of 0.5 *percent*. From the information collected during this evaluation not meeting the targets on sex workers HIV prevalence was not necessarily an implementation shortcoming but, instead, an overly ambitious target to a population whose characteristics were not completely known in the design of the CPD. This evaluation was informed that the UNDP is working – through a consultant – on a situation analysis to inform the development of a revised nationally HIV strategy (i.e., the 95-95-95 strategy which replaces the current 90-90-90 strategy), and review of issues relating to key populations and estimation of key indicators will be at the core of the strategy and consequent plan. In addition, the UNDP is also supporting (through another consultant) the implementation of a follow-up to the IBBS survey, which should generate new estimates (e.g., numbers of key populations).

It is worth noting the UNDP contributed to the **2018 IBBS**, which was the first study of the kind in São Tomé and Príncipe. The IBBS shed, for the first time, light on the behaviors and HIV prevalence among MSM in São Tomé and Príncipe. According to key informants, the next IBBS is scheduled to begin in September 2022. IBBS studies are recommended to take place between 1-3 years in key populations⁶⁶, hence the next study will begin with a slight delay. Despite the delay, the intention of repeating the IBBS suggests the practice is taking roots within the STP MoH, which is indicative of institutional change. Moreover, the realization of a second IBBS may provide additional information, which may assist in tackling HIV/AIDS among vulnerable population. For IBBS it is hard to identify the targeted groups for both sex workers and MSM since members of these groups tend not to come in the open due to social implications / perspectives on the practice. Therefore, improving the accuracy and usefulness of the IBBS may require awareness campaigns to destigmatize sex workers and MSM, and improve the connection between these groups and health services, which may take place through the strengthening of CSOs.

According to key informants, the levels of **TB** detection with GenXpert remain suboptimal. The 2020 ROAR found that the treatment coverage of TB was 100 *percent* since 2018⁶⁷, yet according to a 2021 evaluation report TB success rate of treatment was low comparatively to global target of 90 *percent* success rate⁶⁸. Moreover, key informants reported to need to strengthen awareness campaigns at community level, including with the involvement of CSO, as well as the need to conduct national-levels surveys to improve TB data reliability and access.

To improve health services, the UNDP has contributed with **technical assistance and support** at both strategic and operational level. For instance, at strategic level with inputs to the definition of national plans to address the COVID-19 pandemic, and at operational level with the technical contribution to development or evaluation of national guidance procedures or documentation drafts (e.g., participating in technical task meetings evaluating the draft for Rapid Response Teams for public health emergencies in STP), or provision of technical expertise in laboratory and clinical

⁶⁵ INPG (Instituto Nacional para Promoção da Igualdade e Equidade de Género), and PNLS (Programa Nacional de Luta contra SIDA): “Relatório do Estudo Biocomportamental HIV/SIDA nas Populações Chave (TS, HSH, e Prisioneiros) em São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2019.

⁶⁶ WHO (World Health Organization): “Biobehavioural Survey Guidelines for Populations at Risk for HIV”, 2017.

⁶⁷ “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe”, 2020.

⁶⁸ Roma-Reardon, Josianne: “Global Fund Grant São Tomé e Príncipe-Z-UNDP Final Evaluation Report”, 2021.

services (COVID-19), as well as field support and supervision visits with the department of health information (SIS) and with the department of epidemiological surveillance (DEV).

Adding to technical assistance the UNDP contributed with infrastructure building/refurbishment, as well as equipment delivery. For instance, it was reported to this evaluation efforts in assisting the improvement of medicine logistics in São Tomé and Príncipe, including the construction of a central and adequately equipped warehouse to store and distribute medicine across São Tomé and Príncipe, for which, according to the UNDP Team, the plans are at an advanced stage as of the time of evaluation. The improvement of national logistics will require capacity-building of HR in matters of drugs logistics (e.g., storage, control. distribution), and it is fundamental step in further strengthening the health system.

As previously mentioned, during implementation the UNDP contributed to developing and implementing the **Social Registry** to identify vulnerable families, and the **DHIS2** to improve health data reporting, and management.

Within the scope of the Joint SDG Fund, and in partnership with the international Labour Organization (ILO), UNICEF and WHO, the UNDP contributed to the development and implementation of the **Social Registry database**. It focused on identifying vulnerable families. Building a database on vulnerable families was first designed to support the Ministry of Labor, Solidarity, Family and Professional Qualification (MLSFPQ), but the objective was that the database would have linkages with other areas of social protection including health and education, thus strengthening the MoH and Ministry of Education as well. The expectation was that the database would be interoperable with different monitoring information systems of social programmes, which would improve access of vulnerable and extreme poor families to cash transfer schemes, as well as social services in three out of the six districts of São Tomé and Príncipe. The social registry implementation suffered several delays, some of which attributed to COVID-19⁶⁹. According to key informants, other than COVID-19, political misalignment as well as the transition of the Social Registry to a private company prevented the interoperability of the Social Registry with other social protection systems, including the DHIS2 (Health). After several multi-sectorial advocacy meetings, a compromise, was reached, whereby the interoperability was designed as a semi-automatic procedure partially requiring manual input for information to be routinely fed from the Social Registry into the DHIS2⁷⁰. The set-up was however done towards end of the project hence there was still need to assess its operation, as of the time of this evaluation.

With funding from the Global Fund and GAVI, the UNDP, in collaboration with WHO, contributed to the implementation of the **DHIS2** in order to reinforce the health information system. The health information system in São Tomé and Príncipe was previously built on paper reporting, which was considered to be less reliable, slower, and prone to inaccuracies. The DHIS2 software was selected by the MoH, and according to what was reported by multiple sources the system is currently operational, despite initial delays in implementation⁷¹. According to key informants, the delays were the consequence of insufficiencies in the contract designs of consultants, insufficiencies in communication, high staff rotativity, and lack of a supervision mechanism.

The UNDP's contribution to the implementation of the DHIS2 included, for instance, hiring of a consultant to assist in the implementation of the DHIS2, capacity-building of health professionals

⁶⁹ Joint SDG Fund: "Joint Programme 2020 Annual Progress Report". 2021.

⁷⁰ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Strengthening Health Human Resources in São Tome and Principe: report period 1 April to 31 May 2022", 2022.

⁷¹ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2019.

on how to use and manage the software, design of a manual for DHIS2, as well as on the acquisition of tablets and computers - with the software installed - to health centers across the country. According to key informants the software is intuitive and user friendly, and the capacity-building provided to health professionals (e.g., nurses) was adequate and of quality.

It was understood from the onset that the transition from paper to electronic-based information system would be slow, as it signified a change in health workers responsibilities and practices. The implementation took place using a modular system in which each disease has a specific module, (e.g., HIV, TB). Because it is modular, the system has room for expansion (e.g., adding new disease modules and or adding customizations (i.e., modifications specifically needed in the São Tome country program context) to existing modules). Other innovative uses that were still in the pipelines include (i) use of the DHIS2 modules for incoming travelers surveillance using the paperless approach and (ii) rolling out the unique identifier module to link all health consultations for each patient). The data collection started with aggregated data in order to enable the production of monthly statistics. Future developments include both the introduction of additional modules, and the introduction of disaggregated data to enable individual tracking.

Despite relevant and steady steps towards implementation, it was reported to this evaluation lack of ownership by health professionals across the country. The adoption of the system has been slow by health professionals at district level even despite good appropriation levels by senior staff within the MoH, including the SIS and the CNE, which are engaged and recognize the relevance of the DHIS2. Currently paper reporting remains in place as a back-up system. This evaluation has found no evidence of any systematic study to fully understand the resistance of health professionals in adopting the DHIS2. The most commonly mentioned hypothesis for the resistance includes (i) low digital literacy, (ii) difficulties in internet connection stability, (iii) COVID-19 demands, (iv) lack of sufficient equipment, and (v) perception that the DHIS2 increases the workload.

In order to incentivize the adoption of the software financial incentives were provided to workers with tasks connected with digitalization. The model has later been replaced by a performance-based incentive scheme to improve DHIS2 data quality. Steps were made to develop and apply a tool to calculate performance of health workers in their usage of DHIS2. At the time of writing of this evaluation, three-month data acquired from the tool seems to suggest that performance-based incentives produced improvements in terms of completeness and timeliness of reporting⁷². Some key informants, however, consider the use of financial incentives to foster implementation of new work practices to be counterproductive, as the adoption of new practices by health professionals should be regarded as a regular part of their professional duties. Therefore, if a system of incentives becomes the main reason for implementation, the sustainability may be jeopardized as the São Tomé and Príncipe government is not likely to be able to sustain a system of incentives. According to what was reported, the services of the MoH are engaging in awareness campaigns as well as trimestral supervisions in order to increase the use of the DHIS2 among health professionals, which may further contribute to the full implementation of the system.

A key shortcoming of the DHIS2 often mentioned by key informants was the lack of interoperability between the DHIS2 and the Social Registry. According to information provided to this evaluation from May 2020 there was set in place a system through with data from the Social

⁷² UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Strengthening Health Human Resources in São Tome and Principe: report period 1 April to 31 May 2022", 2022.

Registry is exported to the DHIS2 on weekly basis. The system agreed remains semi-automatic, and interoperability contingent to bureaucratic processes⁷³, yet it is a positive mitigation measure.

The adoption and full implementation of the DHIS2 may be a game changer in the health information system of São Tomé and Príncipe, as it may enable a more accurate, timely, and precise decision-making process. Furthermore, the establishment of the data center will enable the digital sovereignty of São Tomé and Príncipe, as data from different government institutions (including DHIS2 and SR databases) can now be stored in São Tomé and Príncipe, and not abroad as previously.

As planned in the CPD, **the UNDP successfully completed the transfer of The Global Project to the MoH**. Currently the MoH is the Principal Recipient of the Global Fund grants, with a dedicated management cell for the effect (Célula de Gestão das Subvenções - CGS) located at the CNE premises. The UNDP contributed with funding for the Headquarters of the CGS's, as well as with assistance to the recruitment and training of staff⁷⁴. According to key informants the transition was gradual, which enabled professionals to acquire experience in progressively managing funds. It was reported that since the transition the MoH has showed management capacity in implementing funds, and that the CGS is committed to uphold high standards of transparency. Key informants perceived the transition as a positive step in the autonomy of São Tomé and Príncipe health institutions.

b) Outcome 2 – Democratic Governance

Based on CPD output indicators, outcome 2 has mostly either achieved or closely achieved the established targets. As **Table 7** indicates, the UNDP contributed to strengthening the National Assembly, the Supreme Audit Court, the Ministry of Finance, and the Electoral Commission in terms of control, transparency and accountability. On women participation in decision-making bodies (National Assembly and government) the UNDP exceeded the established targets. Justice modernization output indicators suggest a medium level of achievement: the number of alternative conflict resolution and legal information mechanisms created were lower than expected, as were the number of updated alternative justice mechanisms. Conversely, the number of disputes settled through alternative mechanisms more than doubled what was targeted. Lastly, the objective of collect, compile, and analyze relevant data for mainstreaming the SDGs into national plans, policies, and strategies and for coordination of aid for better implementation of the 2030 Transformation Agenda was partially achieved. The UNDP accomplished the number of plans, policies and strategies integrating SDGs, and almost accomplished the number of public institutions strengthened for Aid Coordination. Yet, the UNDP underperformed on the number of trainings in data gathering and analysis for INE.

These outputs, however, do not provide an accurate reading of the UNDP's performance, as it delivered other achievements not explicit in the CDP. For instance, there was a consistent strengthening of CSOs in terms of capacity-building of public finance oversight and gender responsiveness budget which are not reflected in **Table 7**. Likewise, justice modernization outputs do not reflect UNDP intervention in improving the justice system, including buildings/infrastructure (e.g., tribunals), digital infrastructure, and capacity-building. Furthermore, relevant activities are not covered by any established output, such as the support provided to the electoral processes, and the support for São Tomé e Príncipe to ratify relevant human rights African Union treaties. Most UNDP interventions under outcome 2 cover sensitive sovereign aspects of São

⁷³ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Strengthening Health Human Resources in São Tome and Principe: report period 1 April to 31 May 2022", 2022.

⁷⁴ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2021.

Tomé e Príncipe, which justifies the UNDP's attention to respecting national timings, democratic processes, and institutional internal processes that are often slow but key for a sustainable and effective change. This evaluation now briefly discusses key UNDP results within outcome 2

Table 7 – Table of results Outcome 2

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Latest year available	
CPD Output 2.1: The capacities of national institutions at central, regional and local levels are strengthened in terms of control, transparency and mutual accountability.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of institutions (Parliament, courts, Electoral Commission and ministries) strengthened in terms of control, transparency and accountability 	1 (2015)	4 (2021)	4 (2022) 4 (2021) 3 2020; 3 2019; 1 2018; (Parliament; Supreme Audit Court; Ministry of Finance; Electoral Commission)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of women to men in decision-making body 	18% (2015)	30% (2021)	30% National Assembly 40 % Government (2022)	●
CPD Output 2.2: Capacity of justice and human rights institutions enabled and/or expanded to provide quality services and uphold the rule of law and redress				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of alternative conflict resolution and legal information mechanisms created at local level 	0 (2015)	7 (2017)	3 (2022) 2 (2021);	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of disputes settled through alternative mechanisms 	1 (2015)	10 (2021)	Total:27 - 18 Male and 9 Female (2022) Total: 7 - 4 Male and 3 Female) (2021);	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of updated alternative justice mechanisms (laws and annual regulations) 	4 (2015)	8 (2021)	4 (2022)	●
CPD Output 2.3: Public and private institutions are able to collect, compile and analyse relevant data for mainstreaming the SDGs into national plans, policies and strategies and for coordination of aid for better implementation of the 2030 Transformation Agenda.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of plans, policies and strategies integrating SDGs 	1 (2015)	5 (2021)	5 (2021)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of public institutions strengthened for Aid Coordination 	1 (2015)	5 (2021)	4 (2022)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of trainings in data gathering and analysis for National Institute of Statistics 	0 (2015)	15 (2021)	3 (2022)	●

Source: The evaluation team, based on information provided by the UNDP Team

A relevant recent achievement refers to the **approval of the Parity Law** (*Lei da Paridade*) in July 2022, which established the obligation of 40 percent gender parity in parliament and governmental seats; a considerable advancement in São Tomé and Príncipe's political system. According to key informants, the process leading to the approval of the parity law united a strong network of CSOs, which gathered support both from the public opinion and decision makers. It was reported the UNDP was a key advocate and promoter of alliance building between CSOs. Moreover, **key informants perceived the gains in terms of gender equality to be non-reversible as the slow process for approval was based on both high-level advocacy efforts at ministry and parliamentary level, and grass roots advocacy campaigns that went directly to the communities and found expression in the national media.** The effort to gather support for

gender equity legislation reached the diaspora, meaning the endeavor contributed to social cohesion.

According to key informants, to **support the electoral process**, the UNDP invested, for instance, in the capacity-building of judges that could be called upon to settle potential electoral legal dispute. The training focused on the clarification of electoral law articles as to provide a certain level of uniformity in law interpretation. Additionally, the UNDP supported CSOs in developing awareness campaigns directed towards youth on the relevance of voting.

With the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and funding from Sweden, the UNDP has provided support for São Tomé and Príncipe to **ratify seven African Union treaties to improve compliance with human rights**⁷⁵. Besides ratification, it has been reported, the UNDP is assisting São Tomé and Príncipe in implementing treaties. The above-mentioned parity law is an example of national incorporation of international treaties. Furthermore, the UNDP is supporting São Tomé and Príncipe in its third periodic human rights evaluation, as well as supporting the constitution of national institution dedicated to human rights *via* the Ombudsman. As in other areas the UNDP is equally supporting the digital transition by supporting the digitalization of treaties.

On *public governance and gender equity* the CPD had a profound effect in São Tomé and Príncipe, particularly through the Programme for Consolidating Economic Governance and Public Finance Management Systems (PFMS) in the PALOP-TL (Pro PALOP-TL SAI – Phase II). It has been considered an international best practice. In São Tomé and Príncipe it was reported **that the UNDP contributed to the capacity-building of staffs from state/governmental agencies such as the National Assembly, the Ministry of Finance, the Supreme Audit Institution (Tribunal de Contas), as well as CSOs** in topics such as gender responsive budgeting, and PFMS oversight. For instance, more than 100 ministerial level staff, CSO, and parliamentary staff were capacitated in Gender-Sensitive Budgeting, and 35 court auditors were capacitated in budget oversight⁷⁶.

Besides capacity-building, **institutions were strengthened with equipment** (e.g., computes, webcams), and HR. For example, the National Assembly was reportedly strengthening with four consultants to support law redaction, as well as with equipment that enable the institution to begin its digital transition, which included the website of the National Assembly, capacity to broadcast parliamentary seasons, as well as initial step towards the constitution of a data center to collate parliamentary information.

As a result of the UNDP implementation, **it was reported an overall improvement of the quality of laws produced, a general improvement of the PFMS transparency, the approval of the public accounts of 2010 to 2017, the introduction of a gender responsive budget in 2021, as well as the mainstreaming of gender within the water and sanitation sectors**. The UNDP also supported the elaboration of the national strategy for reforming the public finance management system as well as its respective plan of action (PARFIP II)⁷⁷. According to key informants, public finance reforms have been slow, but steady, and have been producing relevant gains. The UNDP equally assisted São Tomé and Príncipe in other strategic reforms, yet it has been reported that national partners have shown tiresomeness of strategic planning processes. It has been reported

⁷⁵ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2019

⁷⁶ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2019

⁷⁷ MPFEA (Ministério do Planeamento, Finanças e Economia Azul): "Estratégia de Reforma da Gestão das Finanças Públicas: ERGFP 2020-2030", 2020.

to this evaluation, that partners wish more actionable activities that show short-term gains, instead of only long-term goals.

On **justice modernization** (Project to Support the Justice Sector Reform 2017-2021), the UNDP gave significant steps towards strengthening the justice system. UNDP interventions were based on baseline studies as well as on a consistent auscultation of key justice stakeholders including the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, Judicial Courts, the Supervisory Court, Prison services, and the Public Prosecution Office. The overall objectives of the UNDP interventions included to increase transparency and accountability, reduce delays, and increase the efficiency of the system so the system can be closer to the population and be effective.

To that end, the **UNDP supported the refurbishment of infrastructure** including, for instance, the Court of Lembá, the House of Justice in Caué – which houses courts, a public prosecution office, and an advisor center for domestic violence -, and a prison wing, a legal medical office at the Hospital Sr. Ayres Menezes. In this regard, it should be noted São Tomé and Príncipe had no previous capacity to conduct medical examinations in cases of sexual assault. Furthermore, it was reported to this evaluation that additional infrastructure is in the process of accomplishment, including the refurbishment of the Court in the RAP. Besides infrastructure, the **UNDP provided key equipment**, including the acquisition of a vehicles to the judiciary police (in São Tomé and in the RAP), and one to the Prison services.

Adding to infrastructure and equipment, **the UNDP contributed with capacity-building of key HR**, including, for instance, training to professionals (Ministry of Justice, Judiciary policy, and Public prosecution Office) in the area of health, and training to court clerks, lawyers, public prosecutors on multiple areas of the justice system. According to key informants, the capacity-building resulted in improvements of organization, support to the public, as well as control and accountability of processes.

A relevant aspect for justice modernization was to **update laws and legal codes**. In this regard, it has been reported the UNDP provided support to the establishment or update of key frameworks. For instance, it was reported the adaptation and implementation of the *Lei de Levantamento de Capitais*, of the *Código de Processo Penal*, and of the *Lei da Família*. Other legal adaptations are in process such as the revision of the judicial system law, and the code of court fees. Because of sensitive nature, some of legal adaptations are slow. Key informants noted despite the achievements additional legislation requires updating to increasing the resilience of the justice system, including, for instance, the *lei do estatuto dos magistrados públicos* (law on the status and role of public prosecutors), or the *lei de acesso à magistratura* (law of access to the judiciary). Updating legal instruments is challenging particularly in a system with slim resources. More than formulating good-on-the-paper legislation, it is necessary to design legislation that is actionable, which requires deep legal, institutional, and context understanding of São Tomé e Príncipe.

In order to **approximate the justice system to the public, and increase public awareness on citizen rights as well as knowledge on how to access justice**, the UNDP supported initiatives such as the the *Justiça Mais Próxima*. The project takes to local communities' legal experts (e.g., public prosecutors, lawyers, jurists) to provide free legal advice. The activities of proximity with populations were disrupted during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the evaluation team had access to a document outlining the next dates/places for the *Justiça mais Próxima*, which indicates the project its resuming its activity. Moreover, the UNDP is supporting a cycle of district debates that often unites in the same room the President of the Bar Association, the President of the supreme Court of Justice, the General Attorney of the Republic, and representatives of the Ministry

of Justice to debate with local and district leaders' issues of the justice system and collect inputs from those leaders. **It has been reported the two initiatives are contributing to improve the relation between citizens and the justice system.**

Most key informants indicated that a structural key achievement of the UNDP was **the launch of a national data center to host a justice case management system** at the *Instituto de Inovação e Conhecimento* (INIC). The type of digital infrastructure provided include physical servers with sufficient capacity to host virtual servers, which may multiply the available capacity. More than exclusive to the justice sector, the data center reportedly has capacity to host servers from several ministries. Moreover, because lines of communication between the data center and the ministries are state owned, all ministries that join the data center can communicate virtually for free. The constitution of a centralized data center has the potential of reducing maintenance costs, as costs may be shares across ministries, thus increasing the sustainability of the project.

Moreover, digital data that was previously stored outside the country, can be stored nationally, which contributes to the digital sovereignty of São Tomé and Príncipe. The infrastructure further opens the potential of e-Government solutions to boost governmental efficiency. The larger the digital capacity of the country, the higher is the margin to invest in the digitalization of the country, which may bring efficiency gains, as well as assist in data collection; a key element for improved decision making. A centralized and sole data center may present security risks. Yet key informants reported the data center projects included redundancy measures, such as the storage of information in physical drivers to be stored in a different location.

In the case of the justice system, it was reported that the process of selection of the case management system was inclusive of key justice stakeholders, from selection to procurement of companies to implement the case management system. As in the DHIS2 system, for the case management system the UNDP equally invested in a modular system. The criminal module was the first selected to be implemented. According to key informants, a procurement for the criminal module was already launched. **The future implementation of the case management system may bring efficiency, accountability, and transparency to the justice system of São Tomé and Príncipe.** Despite optimism, key informants were cautious. During interviews it was often acknowledged that the insufficiencies in the national legal frameworks, the insufficiency in the number and capacities of HR, and the low availability of state resources may derail the achievements made insofar. Furthermore, the potential lack of appropriation by intermediate justice system structures may delay implementation. Therefore, key informants considered indispensable to scale up efforts in increasing the capacity-building of HR in order to increase the likelihood of effective implementation.

c) Outcome 3 – Sustainable development and resilience to climate change

As The table of result provides an interesting indication of the results achieved. Other key implementation areas of work for UNDP include early warning systems, and support to negotiations in trade agreements. An area where results have not yet been achieved relates to blue economy investments (a CPD established priority) whose implementation is reportedly delayed at country level. This evaluation now briefly discusses key results under outcome 3.

Table 8 suggests, outcome 3 has overachieved the output targets established in the CPD. According to information provided by the UNDP team, the implementation of the CPD was successful in contributing to the structural transformation of productive capacities, creation of green jobs, and development of activities that benefit community's livelihood. Regarding the

business environment, indicators suggest a considerable job creation, as well as a relevant insertion of Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs), NGOs, and cooperatives within the financial services system. Additionally, the UNDP exceeded the targets on institutions instilled with environmental principles, as well as on the number of institutions and rural communities using natural resources for inclusive growth. At output level, according to the UNDP team, there is an indication that the renewable energy currently being injected in the national grid is coming from hydropower plant (1,5 MW), which is roughly a 7.9% increase. Furthermore, UNDP data sent to this evaluation indicates the Santo Amaro solar plant will inject 10 percent of the current demand, and the Papagaio MHPP will cover 50 percent of the demand of the RAP.

The table of result provides an interesting indication of the results achieved. Other key implementation areas of work for UNDP include early warning systems, and support to negotiations in trade agreements. An area where results have not yet been achieved relates to blue economy investments (a CPD established priority) whose implementation is reportedly delayed at country level. This evaluation now briefly discusses key results under outcome 3.

Table 8 - Table of results Outcome 3

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Latest year available	
CPD Output 3.1 National, local and regional systems and institutions (environment, climate change and disaster risk reduction) enabled to achieve structural transformation of productive capacities that are sustainable and support employment/livelihoods				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of policies, systems and/or institutional measures in place at central, local and regional levels to generate and strengthen employment and livelihoods 	1 (2015)	4 (2021)	5: Youth Connekt, 3 Innovation challenges, REINA network, NDC (2022)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of green jobs created 	0 (2015)	150 (2021)	1 833 (2022)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of communities benefiting from livelihood initiatives 	0 (2015)	150 (2021)	195 (2022)	●
CPD Output 3.2: The private sector, especially small-and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), NGOs in urban and rural areas, and populations of the most vulnerable communities are able to increase their contribution to inclusive growth and employment through better access to markets, technical assistance and financial aid.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of persons from most vulnerable communities self-employed, disaggregated by sex and areas 	0 (2015)	150 (2021)	784 (2022) (disaggregated information by sex and area not provided)	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of SMEs, NGOs and cooperatives that access financial services 	(2015) 0 SMEs 0 NGOs 0 Cooperatives	(2021) 5 SMEs 5 NGOs 5 Cooperatives	123 (2022) (Without disaggregated information)	●
CPD Output 3.3: Public and private institutions and rural communities are able to apply sustainability principles for better use of natural resources, biodiversity conservation and protection for inclusive growth.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of public and private institutions and rural communities that adopt environmental principles 	(2015) 1 Public 1 Private 1 Rural community	(2021) 3 Public 3 Private 3 Rural community	(2022) 7 Public 33 Private 10 rural communities	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of institutions and rural communities using natural resources for inclusive growth 	2 (2015)	7 (2021)	10 rural communities	●
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of renewable energy injected into national electric grid 	5 % (2015)	25% (2021)	7.9% (Santo Amaro SOLAR will also inject 10% of the current demand)	●

			Papagaio MHPP will inject 50% of the current demand in Principe Island)	
--	--	--	---	--

Source: The evaluation team, based on information provided by the UNDP Team

With regards to encouraging the entrepreneurial ecosystem, UNDP gave progressive and consistent steps that marks the entrepreneurship landscape in São Tomé and Príncipe. It was reported to this evaluation that the model implemented has contributed to instill a culture of entrepreneurship in São Tomé and Príncipe, attracted private investment, and it is currently in process of being replicated. Proof of concept interventions are institutionally risky, particularly in the field of entrepreneurship where the failure of ideas and new business is believed to be tendentially high over a five-year period⁷⁸.

According to information collected, the first UNDP approach to entrepreneurship activities was through **social entrepreneurship** (Empreendedorismo Social), and in partnership with the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Entrepreneurship. The objective was to instill a culture of entrepreneurship in youth, via development of business to address social problems. Upon public call, 1.000 youth received information of the project, roughly 120 completed remote business training, 88 submitted a business idea, and 15 ideas received a funding of between two to three thousand dollars. The 15 ideas funded involved 22 youth, and created 45 part time jobs⁷⁹. According to key informants from, the 15-business financed in 2019, 10 remained active at the time of this evaluation. The initiative, the first of the kind for the São Tomé and Príncipe UNDP, contributed to raise the UNDP profile as a partner to private sector development.

In the sequence of the social entrepreneurship project, and in partnership with the Incubadora Central (Ministry of Youth, Sport and Entrepreneurship), the UNDP contributed to launching the **youth entrepreneurship programme** (*Empreende Jovem*) directed to the youth. The project expected to finance 15 projects. According to the UNDP Team the project was intended at improving Youth's entrepreneurial capacities and contribute to the economic growth. This project developed a Digital Platform for Entrepreneurship, a business database and rehabilitated a colonial building to host the REINA, National Network of Business Incubators. To boost business activities directly, this project launched three innovation challenges, that ended up funding 55 businesses. These challenges were conceived as COVID response and recovery mechanisms. A relevant feature of the project was that some of the projects funded were from the diaspora.

According to final youth beneficiaries consulted that participated in these initiatives, by the evaluation team, the mains channels of communication on the start-up challenge and the tourism 2.0 were the radio, internet, family referral, and participation in the social entrepreneurship project. The motives for participation were similar; a business idea and an entrepreneurial spirit, but insufficient resources and knowledge to launch a business.

Regarding knowledge, when inquired what were the key training knowledge acquired and that were useful in the implementation of their business, answers included, financial literacy, business

⁷⁸ It is usually referred data form the US Bureau of Labor Statistics which indicates that approximately 19 percent of new businesses fail in the first year, 45 percent in the first five years, and 65 percent in the first ten years. Such data should be interpreted with cautious, as the US reality and economic vibrancy is not comparable to the one of São Tomé e Príncipe. An accurate reading of company success rate in São Tomé e Príncipe can only be well established once there is sufficient data to measure company creation/closure, and informality rates drop.

⁷⁹ "Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé e Príncipe", 2019.

plan, business management, sales, marketing, management of supplied and suppliers, and customer service. During the project, there was a partnership with the Banque Gabonaise et Francaise Internationale (BGF), which offered entrepreneurs the possibility of opening a bank account free of charge.

Upon completion of the training, it was reported the financial envelop to fund the entrepreneurs' ideas took between two to six months. It was reported by final beneficiaries that they were unaware of the schedule to the delivery of the funds. All final beneficiaries consulted mentioned their business remain active and has contributed to generating employment. A relevant aspect was the consistent feedback that the Incubadora Central makes post-training monitoring of the entrepreneurs funded. However, it was unclear to this evaluation the success rate of businesses funded by the grants.

When asked on recommendations to improve future editions, most final beneficiaries stressed two aspects: 1) the clear definition of a chronogram that clearly shows the time gaps between training and funding, and 2) the creation of a follow-up financing line for businesses that remain active and may require additional funding that was unforeseen.

Linked to Empreende Jovem, the Muala+ came as a Joint Programme between the PNUD, OIT and UNICEF, and it was a COVID-19 response project proposedly targeting informal businesswomen that had been negatively affected by COVID. The objective was to support women-led businesses with training, raw materials, equipment, and infrastructure. More than 2000 applications were received. From those, 256 received training in business management and 44 women were funded. According to final beneficiaries consulted, the Muala+ provided support for businesses during the hard period of COVID-19. It was reported the training was useful in matters of financial and business management, business plan, customer service, and marketing. The delivery of equipment reportedly was slow (2-6 months), yet the process relatively simple with the exception of the slow-motion culture of São Tomé e Príncipe. According to what was reported, the Incubadora Central monitors entrepreneurs after training. The project assisted in improving beneficiaries' businesses and acquiring equipment that otherwise they would not be able to acquire.

Besides entrepreneurs the project assisted in strengthening institutional governmental capacity of Incubadora Central, which was established and developed as the entrepreneurship projects were being implemented, According, to key informants the establishment of the Incubadora Central is a benchmark in the process of instilling a business culture in São Tomé and Príncipe and dynamizing the business environment.

Another area in which the UNDP has contributed to sustainable economic growth relates to the agrobusiness value chain. UNDP equally supported the increase of agricultural production and exporting with both governmental (e.g., Ministry of Commerce) and CSO partners mainly Micro and Small Enterprises and cooperatives . According to the UNDP Team, tailor-made support packages for 23 MSE were designed. The packages included seven typologies of support lines: marketing and communication, knowledge acquisition, food quality, product development, equipment & reconstruction of production units. The support packages were agreed between the Implementing Partner -Secretary of State for Trade and Industry (SSTI) - and each MSE that in return committed to contributing to sustainable development goals, setting concrete targets.

The support to the agribusiness included market studies – elaborated by externally hired consultants) -, business benchmark activities (e.g., to the Camaroon) in pepper sector, participation

in international trade shows and fairs (e.g., BIOFACH), acquisition of small equipment, training, and Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) certification. According to key informants, the strategy that is being followed is to place São Tomé and Príncipe agribusiness products into biologic market niches (spices, coconut, coffee). It was reported the governmental ambition is to maintain a fully biological production.

In the implementation of entrepreneurship projects, and in the promotion of the local business environment, it was reported that the slow-motion culture of the country, the incipiency of the local market, lack of resources, as well as deficiencies in the national business legal framework are key hinderances. According to key informants, the UNDP, the World trade organization (WTO) and the World Bank are currently contributing to the improvement of national legislation, capacity-building of staff of the Ministry of Commerce in matters of trade agreements.

It was reported the UNDP was visionary in assisting communities in transition into environmental and economic sustainable business activities that are resilient to climate change⁸⁰. Furthermore, according to key informants, the UNDP, along with national and international partners, is contributing to need of preserving biodiversity by improving the use of natural resources. In the area of conservation, the UNDP focus was on strategic planning, which included the assistance in the update of the National Determined Contributions (NDC-São Tomé and Príncipe); a key document guiding the relation between economic growth, climate change and environmental protection⁸¹.

With the objective of building resilience and capacity in addressing disasters, the UNDP engages with national partners in establishing an early warning system, as well as capacity to manage disaster response. Upon assessment, the UNDP supported the establishment and improvement of the Conselho Nacional de Preparação e Resposta às Catástrofes (CONPREC), which was established with the Decreto-Lei 14/2011. CONPREC receives, validates, and disseminates information to multiple emergency disaster related bodies, including the National Meteorology Institute (INM), the Coast Guard, Fireman, the military, health services, coast guard, among other. According to key informants the CONPREC has been instrumental in the adaptation of legal frameworks, as well as national risk assessment. The UNDP supported CONPREC with infrastructure, equipment (e.g., office equipment, vehicles, clothing, tents, communications), and capacity-building, and technical assistance to the elaboration or update of disaster response planning (e.g., contingency planning). It further supported the establishment of local committees for risk management – 31 teams nationwide with a total of 450 members. It was reported the UNDP assisted in improving the disaster response system in São Tomé and Príncipe. Furthermore, it was reported the UNDP strongly encouraged the constitution of networks and partnerships (e.g., the World Bank and the Red Cross) in order to improve efficiency and increase the sustainability of the system. According to key informants, the system remains fragile in terms of access to key information (e.g., meteorological information), analysis, and energy sustainability.

Another key area in which the UNDP was consequential was in its assistance to the energy transition that will eventually lead to greening the energy mix of São Tomé and Príncipe via hydro energy and solar energy. In this regard, and in partnership with the *Direção Geral dos Recursos Naturais e Energia* (DGRNE) and other partners supported an extensive legal and plan framework

⁸⁰ Lueva, Lili, Antonio Correia and Marion Denantes: "Project terminal Evaluation: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Cantagalo and Lobata (CMLPLCL)", 2019.

⁸¹ São Tomé e Príncipe: "São Tomé e Príncipe National Determined Contributions (NDC-São Tomé e Príncipe) Update", 2021.

revision (e.g., Plano de Gestão Integrado de Bacias Hidrológicas, Lei-Quadro de Recursos Hídricos, Lei base de sistema elétrico nacional, Decreto lei 26/2014, Plano de Manejo Florestal), and feasibility studies including, hydroelectric and solar use, and watershed management plants.

The UNDP equally supported the elaboration of the national Training Plan for Energy Transition and within this, the capacity-building of 208 public servants from 15 public institutions. The capacity-building was deemed adequate and improved the capacities of public institutions. Additionally, the UNDP supported with infrastructure and equipment (e.g., the DGRNE building, which was rehabilitated and equipped with solar panels).

The government requested an investment to build the first solar photovoltaic plant of São Tomé and Príncipe. The UNDP developed the feasibility and other technical studies for the construction of the solar plant in Santo Amaro. According to national stakeholders, the UNDP further supported in the mobilization of resources, setting of partnerships, and sectoral coordination including with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the World Bank, and the AFDB. As noted previously the solar plant was inaugurated in August 2022, which represents a key achievement of the UNDP and its partners.

3.8.2. STATE/GOVERNMENT AND CSOs INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

As previously explained and demonstrated, this evaluation has found evidence that the UNDP's activities contributed to strengthening national government capacity and institutions within state/government and CSO bodies. The key interventions leading to institutional strengthening were: (i) infrastructure building (e.g., courts of law, DGRNE office buildings), (ii) provision of equipment (e.g., office equipment, vehicles), (iii) capacity-building of partner's staff (e.g., gender responsiveness budgeting, PFMS oversight, legal procedures) at managerial and technical level, (iv) improvement of legal frameworks (e.g., energy sector, forestry), (v) strengthening of HR quantity (e.g., four consultants hired to support the national Assembly). According to key informants, the strengthening resulted in an overall improvement of services and practices. For CSOs, the support provided assisted CSOs in raising their profile, visibility, and community implementation, which is a relevant step towards building the resilience and sustainability of CSO partners.

The current UNDP's intervention model addresses the structural elements of partner's needs. The pertinence of these core processes remains valid and necessary, as the institutional fabric of São Tomé and Príncipe (both at state/government and CSO levels) remains fragile.

3.8.3. FUTURE PROGRAMME AREAS FOR CONSOLIDATION AND SCALE UP

As part of the interview data collection process, the evaluation team consulted key informants in their areas of expertise about the most relevant programme areas that the UNDP should consolidate and/or scale up moving forward. Key areas include:

- I. **Sate/Governmental and CSOs institutional support.** Key beneficiaries consistently noted a structural need to continue strengthening state/governmental bodies as well as CSOs. The support referred to the evaluation team includes:
 - o Equipment and Infrastructure. Key informants considered relevant the scaling up of projects to improve infrastructure and support the procurement of equipment and goods. For instance, under outcome 1, it was considered relevant to invest in

the infrastructure of primary health services, as well as procurement of drugs. Under outcome 2, it was mentioned the continuous investment in strengthening justice-linked infrastructure (e.g., courts of law, investigation capacity), and under outcome 3 the need to further invest in infrastructure to collect weather information, as well as equipment for disasters response (e.g., flood response).

- o Capacity-building. Improving the capacity-building of HR in the country in multiple areas was consistent feedback across key informants, including on-the-job training, professional training, and tertiary education. In terms of targets, key informants referred the need for vertical training within state/governmental and CSOs, as a mechanism to ensure actual institutional change, and proper ownership. Digital literacy was transversally identified as a key area. Key informants from each outcome identified outcome-specific areas of capacity-building needs, as following⁸²: (i) Outcome 1: warehouse logistics management, health statistics, health information analysis, identification, analysis and investigation of diseases outbreaks, and points of entry control. (ii) Outcome 2: social protection, gender, public finance oversight, constitutional law, transparency, legislative process, law writing, and legal procedures (iii) Outcome 3, financial literacy, business management, weather forecast, data collection and reporting.

- II. **Digital Transition.** São Tomé and Príncipe has relatively low internet usage (33 percent of population in 2020)⁸³, yet key informants have recognized the added value of digital systems to improve effectiveness, efficiency, monitoring, and decision-making. Therefore, it was considered relevant to scale-up UNDP efforts in the digital transition of the country, which may include targeted capacity-building to HR, infrastructure building, equipment acquisition, as well as broad digital literacy programmes to the population. Key informants from all outcomes referred the need to scale up digitalization, thus digital transition is a transversal need. In this field the UNDP already gave consequent steps, notably with the implementation of the DHSI2 system, and the building of the Data Center (INIC). Consolidating the steps already made, represents both an opportunity and a challenge that may have plenty of positive externalities from increased efficiency in implementation of policies and decision making, to data availability, accountability, and potentially transparency.
- III. **(Green) Economic Growth.** During the current CPD the UNDP gave steps towards building a stronger economic sector in São Tomé and Príncipe. Key informants regard a stronger business environment as a foundational step to improve the resilience and capacity of São Tomé and Príncipe. It is considered the economic sector maintains severe limitations, and requires interventions at internal and external levels. At internal market level it is considered the UNDP could scale-up its interventions in improving the internal business environment by (i) providing support to enhance internal legislation, including quality standard setting, (ii) through activities to promote national products and services, and (iii) by providing incentives to the constitution of businesses, for instance, through incentives to (young) entrepreneurs and SMEs, micro-credit, as well as capacity-building in the areas of business management, and financial education. At external level, key informants stressed assistant to the internationalization of the São Tomé and Príncipe economy through (i) supporting the establishment of cooperatives – a means to mitigate the lack of scale of the São Tomé and Príncipe economy -, (ii) supporting participation of national

⁸² In an attempt to scrutinize priority areas, the evaluation team requested key informants to provide only one or two examples of capacity-building needs. Therefore, the list of identified needs may be more extensive than those reported here.

⁸³ ITU (International Telecommunication Union): "World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Database", n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

business in international trade shows, as well as (iii) supporting and providing technical assistance to the participation of São Tomé and Príncipe in regional trade agreements. Governmental and CSOs key informants often conveyed to the evaluation team that investing in biological/eco-friendly production could be an appropriate pathway, as it could potentially place São Tomé and Príncipe in relevant international market niches. In this regard key informants mentioned the relevance of integrating forestry management with agrobusiness investments in order to ensure sustainable development.

- IV. **Blue economy:** Protecting marine areas and enhancing the blue economy (e.g., coastal tourism) were stressed as areas of interest with potential to assist in improving the national economy, and the environmental sustainability of the country. Key informants noted the need to improve the quality of marine ecosystems – particularly close-to-shore ecosystems -, such as mangrove forests, which may have a triple positive effect in the environment (marine ecosystem-recovery), food-security, and tourism. The UNDP Team stressed the need for a dedicated and continuous effort to protect the islands' ecosystem and renewable natural resources in order to support São Tomé and Príncipe in meeting SDG targets, as well as the country's commitments under the Rio Conventions.
- V. **Energy Transition.** It was deemed relevant for the UNDP to further contribute to the resilience of the energy sector in São Tomé and Príncipe, particularly regarding green energy, including through mini-grids, hydropower, and solar. On hydropower, for instance, it was noted to this evaluation that studies in some hydrographic basins have already been made -some of which with UNDP support, thus in the future it would be relevant to take the studies into implementation.
- VI. **Justice and Governance.** Key informants noted the need to scale-up efforts in modernizing the justice system in São Tomé and Príncipe, including in matters of law revision, capacity-building, infrastructure, and closeness of the justice system to the population. The matter of corruption was often mentioned as a potential priority area. In matters of laws, some key informants mentioned the need for technical assistance in improving the quality of laws, including the constitution. Scaling-up efforts to increase governance, public oversight over state affairs, domestic violence, and integration of women in decision-making (including in businesses) were key themes referred.
- VII. **Primary Health Services and expansion of coverage.** Support the strengthening of primary health services with equipment (e.g., x-ray machines) and assist in strengthening HR, in order to reduce the pressure on hospital services.
- VIII. **Data and Statistics.** Transversal across outcomes the issue of socio-economic, and environmental data availability was recurrent across key informants. Improving situational awareness is regarded as quintessential to improve decision making and monitor progress. In this regard, the digital transition can assist in the reliability of data. Yet, further work is required to increase the capacities, including HR, of the INE as well as other state/governmental bodies and CSOs. A culture of data collection should be instilled across public and private services as a means to increase cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- IX. **Waste Management.** Key informants from multiple outcomes referred waste management as a priority area in São Tomé and Príncipe, as at the present waste management is an underdeveloped area in the country.
- X. **Disaster response.** Despite investment, the disaster response of São Tomé and Príncipe remains suboptimal, thus key informants noted the need to scale-up investment in the entire chain of disaster response, including data collection, information analysis and dissemination, coordination and capacity in the theater of operations, as well as post-disaster response.

XI. **Biodiversity and climate change:** Considering the decree-law 17/2022, which officialized key measures included in the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC), the UNDP Team stressed the need to support the country in achieving the targets established in the NDC (e.g., greenhouse gas emissions reduction of 109.000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, corresponding to a 27 percent emission reduction compared to its 2030 Business as Usual projected emissions). Accordingly, the UNDP Team suggested the provision of technical and financial assistance, in several areas of interests, namely: (i) increase in renewable energy share integrated in the national grid, (ii) reduction in power grid losses and increase of energy efficiency, (iii) reduction in the transport sector's carbon footprint, (iv) reduced use of nitrogen-based fertilizers in agriculture, (v) water management, (vi) fisheries, (vii) resilience in coastal areas, (viii) sustainable management of forests, and (ix) waste management.

XII.

3.8.4. SOUTH-SOUTH (SSC) / TRIANGULAR COOPERATION

According to key informants SSC/Triangular cooperation took place in the implementation of the CPD. The extent of the practice varied widely across outcomes. The most consistent use was within the Pro PALOP-TL SAI – Phase II (outcome 2). In other outcomes there were relevant yet ad hoc examples of SSC/Triangular cooperation. Key informants reported added value and gains in terms of exchange of ideas for practices and considered the practice should be scaled-up. This evaluation now briefly highlights SSC and triangular cooperation examples within each outcome.

In the health sector key informants reported that under outcome 1 instances of SSC and triangular cooperation were tangential, thus they did not generate a noteworthy result in the implementation of the CPD. Despite the lack of initiatives, key informants considered it could have been positive, and one key-informant mentioned that a partnership with the Instituto Nacional de Saúde Ricardo Jorge (Portugal) could be beneficial in strengthening the health system in São Tomé and Príncipe. According to some key-informants, there are plans to increase SSC with Guinea Equatorial, and Ivory Coast.

Within outcome 2, key informants reported SSC and triangular cooperation as equally tangential for the most part. The great exception was reportedly the Pro PALOP-TL SAI – Phase II, that fostered and catered extensive SSC and triangular cooperation initiatives for both state/governmental and CSO partners. Examples abound and include the participation of National Assembly and Ministry of Planning and Finance representative in a community of practice (CoP) in Angola in 2020, CSOs (e.g., Platform for Human Rights and Gender Equity) capacity-building of Gender Responsive Budget (GRB) in Angola, Brazil, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, the first CoP in Cape Verde with the directors of the Ministry of Finance, among others. It was reported SSC and Triangular cooperation enabled the development of ideas and practices for national implementation. For instance, it was reported the São Tomé and Príncipe ambition of improving its legal framework on accrual accounting (Contabilidade Patrimonial) derived from a CoP. The travel restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 did not prevent the development of SSC/Triangular cooperation, as activities moved online. For instance, the Pro PALOP-TL SAI – Phase II organized a cycle of webinars that assisted in reaching a larger public than what was envisioned for on-site training⁸⁴. Outside the Pro PALOP-TL SAI – Phase II, SSC area meager but exist, including a

⁸⁴ Carvalho, Patrícia and João Silveira: "Final Evaluation of the Program for the Consolidation of Economic Governance and Public Finances Management Systems in the Official Portuguese Speaking African Countries and East Timor (Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II)", IMPACTE – Consultants for Dev, 2021.

benchmark visit to Rwanda for public officers to learn from the Rwanda’s example on the implementation of the case management system, which is considered an international best practice, the 2019 participation in the Forum against corruption in Nairobi (Kenya), and the exchanges of information of São Tomé and Príncipe public prosecutors in Benin.

Within outcome 3, SSC and triangular cooperation were mostly focused on internationalization activities of São Tomé e Príncipe businesses (e.g., benchmarking in the Camaroon, Youth Connekt); signing of African Union Treaties; and exchanges in the context of the energy transition (e.g., Taining of Trainers (ToT) for forestry staff in Benin, visit to the Portuguese Directorate General for Energy and Geology (Direçãoop-Geral de Energia e Geologia -DGEG), and benchmark to the University of Évora (Portugal) for photovoltaic technology assessment.

3.9. EFFICIENCY

3.9.1. FINANCIAL EXECUTION AND RESOURCES EFFICIENCY

According to the CPD 17-22 Financial Execution⁸⁵, the UNDP had an impressive mobilization of resources (see **Table 9**). When compared to the outcome indicative budget established in the CPD, the actual resources delivered almost tripled what was initially envisioned. Indeed, the total indicative budget was 14,200,000 US\$, and by the time of this evaluation the UNDP had delivered 38,076,973 US\$.

Table 9 – Indicative budget vs resources delivered

	Indicative ¹	Delivered ²	
Outcome 1	3,894,000 US\$	15,164,960 US\$	(+11,270,960)
Outcome 2	3,006,000 US\$	7,730,973 US\$	(+4,724,973)
Outcome 3	7,300,000 US\$	15,181,039 US\$	(+7,881,039)
Total	14,200,000 US\$	38,076,973 US\$	(+23,876,973)

Source: ¹UNDP: “Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)”, September 2016. ²UNDP: “CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REV1”, August 2022.

Outcomes 1 and 3 had a similar financial delivery (roughly 15 MM US\$ each), and outcome 2 had a lower delivery (roughly 7.5 MM US\$). The programmatic area that absorbed more resources was ‘HIV/AIDS, TB, Malaria and Building Resilient Health’, with a fund delivery of roughly 6.7 MM US\$ (outcome 1). Under outcome 1, the transition of the Global Fund management into the MoH equally absorbed substantial funds: 2.7 MM US\$. The second programmatic area with more funds delivered was renewable energy, with roughly 5 MM US\$ delivered (outcome 3), followed by the Modernization of the Justice System, which absorbed almost 3.5 MM US\$ (outcome 2) (see **Table 10**).

This evaluation has found evidence partnerships were positive in terms of mobilization and sharing of knowledge and resources. As a non-specialized United Nations (UN) agency, the UNDP often bridged partners and fostered the establishment of networks which, according to key informants, had significant effects in the mobilization efforts. For instance, under outcome 1, the UNDP, WHO, and the World Food Programme (WFP) joined efforts to prepare a joint project on Green Energy for Health and Food Security to Shell Oil. Furthermore, the UNDP supported the São Tomé and

⁸⁵ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): “CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REV1”, August 2022.

Príncipe government in securing the commitment of Portugal, Brazil, China, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), UNICEF, and WHO to jointly co-finance the UNDP/Global Fund. Likewise, under outcome 3 key informants reported UNDP partnership was indispensable to access funds from the European Union (EU).

According to the key informants, the resources allocated to the several projects were adequate to the intended purpose. Key informants reported delays in the attribution of funding. The delays were often attributed to bureaucratic processes which partners – and UNDP staff members - perceive as being complex, thus creating delays. Furthermore, some key informants noted an excessive pressure for substantial financial execution within the first half of the year, regardless of the stage of implementation. The pressure may result in suboptimal implementation, as some projects/programmes may require initial periods of implementation without substantial financial execution in order to achieve a cost-effective, well-thought, and adequate implementation. This is the case, for instance, in projects that involve community engagement - which require confidence-building measures with population before substantial project financial delivery -, or that require lengthy procurement strategies.

Regarding HR, it was generally acknowledged that the consultants hired by the UNDP to either manage or assist in the implementation of projects/activities had adequate expertise. Most key informants noted the importance of Portuguese speaking consultants for knowledge sharing. The practice of hiring external consultants to suppress HR national needs enabled access to knowledge that was otherwise unavailable in the country. However, the practice equally results in a loss of accumulated institutional knowledge, as consultants leave by project end. Moreover, key informants from partners institutions noted a paradox relation with external consultants. On the one hand, key informants recognized their added value. On the other hand, because consultants are external they are often not integrated within national teams, and are sometimes perceived as a 'strange' body within the institutions.

Table 10 – Financial Execution

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total	% total
Total	\$6 185 759,54	\$5 441 751,74	\$4 253 469,13	\$7 207 380,88	\$7 065 789,97	\$7 922 822,14	\$38 076 973,40	100%
OUTCOME 1	\$3 599 248,07	\$2 615 378,95	\$1 805 017,54	\$2 882 880,57	\$1 778 729,14	\$2 483 706,26	\$15 164 960,53	39.8%
OUTCOME 2	\$720 773,35	\$597 749,94	\$617 461,08	\$1 247 413,64	\$1 847 215,24	\$2 700 360,14	\$7 730 973,39	20.3%
OUTCOME 3	\$1 865 738,12	\$2 228 622,85	\$1 830 990,51	\$3 077 086,67	\$3 439 845,59	\$2 738 755,74	\$15 181 039,48	39.9%

Activity	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total Geral
OUTCOME 1	\$3 599 248,07	\$2 615 378,95	\$1 805 017,54	\$2 882 880,57	\$1 778 729,14	\$2 483 706,26	\$15 164 960,53
HIV; TB; Malaria and building resilient Health			\$2 564 089,78	\$1 719 491,04	\$2 064 370,80	\$387 235,12	\$6 735 186,74
Support MoH implement Global Fund Investing Malaria Elimination		\$2 453 090,15	-\$5 199,52			\$785 927,77	\$1 989 574,30
São Tomé and Príncipe COVID19 Response Plan					\$638 931,28	\$273 885,87	\$57 000,00
Scalping-up Response Tuberculosis	\$613 132,13	\$7 149,63					\$620 281,76
Strengthen. HIV/AIDS Response Risk Populations	\$501 872,40	\$1 548,33	-\$1 111,07				\$502 309,66
University of California Malaria Initiative Health Information System and youth entrepreneurship					\$142 529,37	\$212 184,61	\$59 308,00
Country Coordination mechanism	\$25 943,98	\$47 788,45	\$31 121,12	\$37 049,12	\$32 098,94	\$36 406,75	\$210 408,36
Implementation of SDGs				\$55 516,45			\$55 516,45
Response against HIV-AIDS	\$5 121,05	\$2,28					\$5 123,33
Renforcement contre la Malaria	\$44,59						\$44,59
Consolidating Efforts Towards Malaria Elimination	\$43,77						\$43,77
OUTCOME 2	\$720 773,35	\$597 749,94	\$617 461,08	\$1 247 413,64	\$1 847 215,24	\$2 700 360,14	\$7 730 973,39
Modernization of the Justice System					\$344 309,03	\$1 455 689,61	\$1 689 775,00
Planfication Et Programm-Pays	\$80 083,56	\$133 261,53	\$240 195,30	\$424 695,05	\$113 932,35	\$257 581,50	\$1 249 749,29
ProPALOP TL SAI - Phase II			\$179 098,16	\$171 338,40	\$160 345,91	\$403 652,00	\$914 434,47
PROGRAMME REFORME JUSTICE	\$82 663,97	\$190 782,85	\$177 917,58	\$39 510,07			\$490 874,47

Support Electoral Cycle and DemGov					\$95 510,77	\$196 000,00	\$291 510,77
Appui au processus electoral	\$267 372,39	\$4 851,94	-\$3 752,04		-\$225,12		\$268 247,17
PALOP-TL SAI-ISC support for external control	\$266 963,30						\$266 963,30
Extra Budgetary Project				\$221 733,44			\$221 733,44
APPUI AU PROGRAMME DE PAYS	\$197 584,47						\$197 584,47
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT TO THE AFRICAN BANK UNIT				\$43 119,67	\$20 231,56	\$48 678,04	\$112 029,27
Strengthening Capacity-Justice Reform	\$69 537,88	\$6 333,17	\$15 398,10	\$6 460,02	\$1 730,16		\$99 459,33
African Union Treaties						\$99 360,00	\$99 360,00
CPR Policy and Planning	\$14 469,57						\$14 469,57
Strengthening African Engagement in Global Development	\$9 470,60						\$9 470,60
Joint UNDP-DPPA Programme on conflict prevention						\$5 313,60	\$5 313,60
OUTCOME 3	\$1 865 738,12	\$2 228 622,85	\$1 830 990,51	\$3 077 086,67	\$3 439 845,59	\$2 738 755,74	\$15 181 039,48
Pims4602 - Renewable Energy	\$458 174,74	\$1 034 216,88	\$1 081 946,90	\$931 423,61	\$1 270 536,47	\$234 055,00	\$5 010 353,60
Resilient Capacities Communities	\$1 011 290,00	\$940 485,53	\$336 208,12	\$10 980,97	\$690,84		\$2 299 655,46
Young Social Entrepreneurship				\$1 370 465,26	\$556 023,97	\$131 090,03	\$2 057 579,26
Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation; Sust Land and Nat R				\$37 426,76	\$393 725,15	\$1 083 079,00	\$1 514 230,91
Export Value Chain					\$732 515,73	\$750 000,00	\$1 482 515,73
Delivering Climate Promise in São Tomé and Príncipe NDC Support Programme				\$380 352,17	\$449 537,88	\$158 782,00	\$988 672,05
Preparedness Warning System	\$396 273,38	\$253 920,44	\$24 999,64	\$4 700,00			\$679 893,46
Implementation of SDGs				\$270 726,95		\$271 881,71	\$542 608,66
Partnership for the SDG Autonomous Region of Príncipe			\$295 514,29	-\$4 066,87	\$97,54		\$291 544,96
Biodiversity Resilience Degradation Land			\$87 299,88	\$54 450,99			\$141 750,87
CliMateSud - Strategic Accelerator Partnership				\$20 238,92	\$36 718,01		\$56 956,93
PPG African Minigrids Program São Tomé and Príncipe						\$50 000,00	\$50 000,00
Recovery and Resilience-Building in Response to Floods						\$50 000,00	\$50 000,00

Climate resilience in Agriculture			\$9 868,00	\$9 868,00
Innovation Facility	\$4 926,62	\$394,13		\$5 320,75
Promoting the empowerment of Girls	\$95,06	-\$6,22		\$88,84

3.9.2. UNDP MANAGEMENT, STRUCTURE, AND M&E

The São Tomé e Príncipe's UNDP team is relatively small and young, and it is complemented with transitory staff (seconded staff and volunteers). Data collected indicates that there is a relatively high staff turnover, which is justified by the suboptimal living conditions in São Tomé e Príncipe. Key informants often mentioned the low quality of medical access and lack of country infrastructure as the main reasons for staff turnover. It was reported office culture is adequate and leading to successful implementation of tasks.

Regular staff meetings with focus on reporting execution of projects were considered relevant to provide the opportunity for strategic discussion, sharing of lessons-learned, and cross-fertilization of the experiences across outcomes. However, this evaluation has found an opportunity for improved comprehensive strategic communication and learning among the staff from the different outcomes. As already shown in this report, the different programmatic outcomes share core processes (e.g., infrastructure building, acquisition, and implementation of software), thus there is ground for further knowledge sharing. For example, in the health sector, the UNDP already encountered difficulties in assisting São Tomé e Príncipe in the transition from a paper-based into a digital-based form of data collection with the DHIS2. Upon difficulties the UNDP already tested mitigation measures. Other projects that equally seek to establish information systems and contribute for digitalization of services may run into similar difficulties.

To favor a culture of building institutional knowledge, and sharing of know-how, information, and lessons learned, the UNDP could potentially devote resources into maintaining a well curated and updated institutional archive. In a small office where staff members often participate in several projects, it is important to establish a responsible for curating an UNDP project library.

According to key informants, staff turnover has not led to evident losses in implementation. However, it was reported that staff turnover sometimes leads to strategic realignment of project implementation, which sometimes creates frictions with partners. Moreover, new staff often require time to have a comprehensive knowledge of the processes and procedures of the UNDP, which sometimes lead to incomplete or inaccurate information provided to partners. This problem affects seconded and volunteer staff the most. In order to mitigate the negative effects of staff turnover, the UNDP could consider a strong staff induction package, with a guidance toolbox for all those who begin functions at UNDP. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors the quick integration of new staff into the practices, methods, language, processes, and procedures of the UNDP.

The need for effective staff induction processes seems to be particularly relevant as it was reported that UNDP procedures, including procurement procedures, are often complex, and hard to navigate through. In fact, multiple staff and former staff reported lack of knowledge on management tools such as the ATLAS. In this regard, it was reported that to ease adaptation – particularly by seconded staff and volunteers – key guidelines should be made available in Portuguese.

Resources mobilization was a key area of CPD success between 2017 and 2022. Reportedly, the process of resource mobilization and programme/project design could be further improved with the establishment of a backstopping mechanism to support project design. It was reported that experts in specific technical areas (e.g., justice) are also responsible for designing programmes/projects proposals. However, despite being experts in their respective fields, sometimes consultants lack specific technical knowledge in the redaction and design of

development cooperation projects. The insufficiencies at design phase could lead to the inadequate definition of goals, indicators, M&E instruments, etc. In fact, several project evaluation reports mentioned the insufficiency of at design phase, including at results framework level⁸⁶.

The CPD envisioned efforts to increase the M&E capacity of the UNDP. It was reported to this evaluation that steps were made to install a M&E office. However, staff turnover prevented the office from being implemented. Strengthening M&E efforts – which are currently focused on programme managers - is crucial for the consistent improvement of the UNDP activities, early detection of implementation divergencies, as well as for consistent reporting of UNDP achievements to partners and donors. M&E of projects in São Tomé e Príncipe may face difficulties at quantitative level due to lack of data collection and monitoring culture in the country. As already extensively discusses across this report, data is crucial for M&E, as well as for decision making. Therefore, higher efforts should be made to instill a data collection culture across managing and implementing partners of UNDP projects. Considering the relatively small size of the UNDP office, it should be considered the establishment of an M&E unit or a joint M&E office with other UN agencies in São Tomé e Príncipe.

3.9.3. PARTNERSHIPS AND SYNERGIES

This evaluation has found evidence the UNDP developed its actions in São Tomé and Príncipe in partnership with national partners - both governmental and CSO -, and other international organizations. Partnerships were positive in terms of resources mobilization, as well as sharing of knowledge and resources. As a non-specialized UN agency, the UNDP often bridged partners and fostered the establishment of synergies and networks, which has contributed to implementation. Furthermore, the UNDP contributed to strengthen the capacities of national partners, which reportedly added value to partnerships.

The non-specialized nature of the UNDP was sometimes mentioned as a potential hindrance in terms of recognition. However, the findings in this evaluation seem to suggest the comprehensive scope of the UNDP has been instrumental in the process of establishing bridges and partnerships between partners. Furthermore, the bird-eye perspective of a generalist organization seems to have been useful in the identification of core needs and implementation of innovative activities within the context of São Tomé and Príncipe, such as the youth entrepreneurship activities, and the need for climate adaptation in the agricultural sector⁸⁷.

As previously explained, this evaluation has found evidenced of synergies with other organizations across outcomes. For instance, under outcome 1 the UNDP's work towards strengthening the national health system was made in partnership with the MoH, close interaction with the CNE, as well as partnerships with UN agencies, international organizations (IOs), and CSO. In implementation WHO was a frequent UNDP partner in matters of health, including, in the implementation of the DHIS2, and in the development of actions to control malaria. Likewise, the UNDP was part of the multi-partner programme '*Fostering Social Protection in São Tomé and*

⁸⁶ See, for example, Fernandes, Agostinho: "Final Evaluation of the Project's Performance and Results: Project to Support the Justice Sector Reform 2017-2021", 2021. Iueva, Lili, Antonio Correia and Marion Denantes: "Project terminal Evaluation: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Cantagalo and Lobata (CMPLCL)", 2019. Larrabure, Juan, Victor Bonfim: "Final Evaluation Report Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change", 2019.

⁸⁷ Iueva, Lili, Antonio Correia, and Marion Denantes: "Project terminal Evaluaiton: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Catnagalo and Lobata (CMPLCL)", 2019.

Príncipe alongside the ILO and WHO, as well as national partners such as the MLSFPQ. In malaria related activities the UNDP partners with the Red Cross, as well as with the ASPF.

Likewise, under outcome 2 the list of national partners is extensive, including, for instance, the National Assembly, the Ministry of Finance, the Supreme Audit Institution (*Tribunal de Contas*), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, Judicial Courts, the Supervisory Court, Prison services, and the Public Prosecution Office. Furthermore, this evaluation found evidence of consistent partnership with CSOs.

3.9.4. UNDP-PARTNER'S WORKFLOW

According to key informants, the workflow between the UNDP and its partners is overall positive. Partners from state/government bodies, as well as from CSOs conveyed to this evaluation satisfaction with the partnerships with the UNDP, which is perceived as a trusted partner that adds value to its partners.

The factors mostly evoked to explain the overall positive assessment of UNDP-Partner's workflow include (i) a spirit of systematic and open dialogue, (ii) UNDP flexibility in adapting activities in perceived changing contexts and beneficiary needs, (iii) overall good relation at operational level, (iv) efficient communication lines, (v) good interpersonal relations between UNDP staff and partner's staff, (vi) UNDP's efficiency in mobilizing resources (funds and HR), (vii) UNDP's capacity of linking with key stakeholders and fostering partnerships, (viii) UNDP's accurate reading of the national context and institutional constrains, and (ix) UNDP's access to high-level decision makers.

Key informants from partner institutions noted some key practices, and processes that can be improved. Across outcomes, three themes emerged as suboptimal aspects of the partnership. Those relate to the complexity of UNDP procedures, external staff / public servants' relation, and financial management of projects/programmes. As this evaluation now discusses the aspects mentioned may be overcome with enhanced mechanisms for mutual awareness, as the root causes of tensions appear to be linked with misperceptions and/or lack of awareness.

Perceived excessive bureaucracy, and complexity of UNDP procedures is often referred as a source of friction. Partners consider UNDP procedures to be extremely complex, even in comparison to other organizations such as the EU, and other UN agencies (e.g., UNICEF). Reportedly, dialogue with UNDP staff often assists in overcoming bureaucratic challenges, yet it was reported that sometimes even UNDP staff might not be entirely aware of these procedures. This evaluation was informed that the UNDP has in place sessions to explain key processes to new partners at the beginning of implementation. However, state/government and CSOs partners experience high staff turnover rates, which may explain a perceived less successful experience of initial sessions. Therefore, the UNDP should consider improving guidance for UNDP implementing partners, including actionable manuals in Portuguese and in English, and clear schedules for the delivery of documentations (e.g., narrative, or financial reports).

Effective, clear, and comprehensive induction processes favor a good communication with implementing partners, and a thorough transmission of operating instructions, particularly on payment procedures/access funding and the implementation of activities/projects' monitoring and reporting (including financial reporting).

An interesting process often mentioned by partners that causes implementation difficulties and delays is the relatively standard procedural demand of presenting three pro-forma invoices

whenever there is a planned expense. According to key informants, the small size of the São Tomé e Príncipe economy and lack of competing businesses, aligned with the slow-motion culture of the country, often renders obtaining the pro-forma invoices difficult. The difficulty is often majored when the same supplier is chosen more than once, as it results in other suppliers not being willing to send pro-forma invoices. Because of the economic context, it could be useful to attempt business diversification at supplier level, even when less cost-effective. Diversity of suppliers could assist in dynamizing the local economy, which could have positive externalities in terms of business environment, and local economy support.

Adding procedures, key informants was often mentioned **friction in the rapport between externally hired staff and public servants**. This evaluation already mentioned that sometimes UNDP hired staff is not fully integrated into institution's dynamics, which reduces both ownership and the establishment of institutional knowledge. However, HR frictions equally relate with the tendential higher salary offered by the UNDP and other IOs to national contracts. It has been reported that UNDP-placed staff often earn higher salaries when compared to public servants, including those with a higher hierarchical level. The salary gap has reportedly created grievances and frustrations among public servants, which has been linked with lower levels of project ownership. The issue of remuneration is not exclusive to the UNDP. Indeed, the same dynamics of pay gaps can be found in projects/programmes implemented by other IOs. There is no obvious solution to the frictions raised by pay gaps. Yet feedback provided by public servants to this evaluation indicate grievances that may cause unnecessary frictions with partner's staff and reduce the levels of public servants' engagement required to effective implementation and national ownership.

Lastly, there is the issue of **budget autonomy by partners**. It was reported by both state/governmental and CSOs a consistent ambition of having an enhanced participation in the financial management of projects/programmes. In the health sector, the UNDP successfully transitioned the management of the Global Fund project into the MoH. The transition was well celebrated and deemed to have strengthened the MoH. Considering that several partners explicitly ambition higher levels of responsibility, it could be relevant for the UNDP to focus on strengthening partner's capacities, and slowly transfer some financial management powers. Such institutional strengthening could assist the UNDP in finding partners for NIM projects, which would increase the levels of national ownership, and slowly reduce the levels of dependence on UNDP assistance. Indeed, ensuring national ownership, leadership and accountability were key

3.10. SUSTAINABILITY

Some key achievements of the country programme are highly likely to be sustainable. A clear area of sustainability is the adoption of legal and regulatory frameworks in multiple areas, including the family law, code of criminal procedure, the parity law, the laws on resources use (forestry, water), energy regulation among many others. Laws and procedures solidify change, and the adoption of new principles and practices.

Capacity-building and strengthening of state/government partners as well as CSOs is another area that offer signs of sustainability. It contributes to improvements in governmental response, as well as to CSOs participation in decision-making, and monitoring across governmental areas. The capacity-building of staff also indicates the sustainability of results, as new practices and methods are slowly penetrating the São Tomé e Príncipe public administration, and CSOs staff consider to be better prepared to push their agendas. In this regard, the successful transition of the

management of the Global Fund project into MoH illustrates how capacity-building may lead to higher institutional autonomy.

Some institutions that were strengthened during the CPD have reportedly become part of the governmental organic, such as the Incubadora Central, and the CONPREC that, according to key informants, will become the National Risk Management Platform, which showcases national ownership on these areas.

An area which may offer a high level of sustainability relates to the improvement of the digital infrastructure of the country. The Data Center established in the INIC has the potential of aggregating data from multiple ministries, which may enable sharing of costs. Moreover, the data acquired through digital system may assist in increases in performance, which may be conducive to higher levels of effectiveness and improved decision-making.

The positive signs are, however, contingent to the availability of resources. As the context of this evaluation described, São Tomé e Príncipe is highly dependent on foreign aid, and foreign debt. In this sense, the UNDP's acute *modus operandi* of seeking partnerships and in establishing synergies and networks is useful in the continuous effort of resource mobilization. Likewise, the investment in the private sector, and in the emergence of an economically sustainable internal market is the seed for a more dynamic economic landscape, which in the long-term may assist São Tomé e Príncipe in achieving higher levels of growth and reduce poverty.

3.11. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY

The CDP addressed key human rights including, for example, equal rights of men and women, adequate standard of living for health and well-being, and the right to work.

Vulnerable groups and gender equality were addressed at strategic design level and implementation. However, as **Table 6, Table 7**, The table of result provides an interesting indication of the results achieved. Other key implementation areas of work for UNDP include early warning systems, and support to negotiations in trade agreements. An area where results have not yet been achieved relates to blue economy investments (a CPD established priority) whose implementation is reportedly delayed at country level. This evaluation now briefly discusses key results under outcome 3.

Table 8 indicate, the gender reporting was inconsistent which indicates the need for further strengthening of M&E tools.

During implementation period the UNDP addressed key vulnerable population. For instance, **female sex workers, MSM, and prisoners** were addressed within the Malaria, HIV/AIDS, and TB, activities. The UNDP inscribed in its design, specific actions to address these groups, and allocated specific funds to target these groups, including in matters of identification, and access to treatment. A key intervention was the funding of the first IBBS, which increased the existent knowledge on these groups, and their visibility. According to key informants, the IBBS contributed to uncover the behaviors of the targeted groups, which were largely unknown, particularly regarding MSM. A key informant reported São Tomé and Príncipe had no information on MSM prior to the IBBS; only that there were MSM. Focusing on female sex workers, MSM, and prisoners highlighted important barriers, including the identification of the population, which is often hidden, reportedly harassed by security forces, and victims of social disapproval. Because of the social stigma, access to these groups was difficult, and there are no strong CSO partners.

Additionally, a key informant reported that a training was organized to assist health professionals to better communicate and address youth.

To improve the inclusion of female sex workers, MSM, and prisoners, it seems to be required to further efforts in bringing these groups into the sphere of organized institutions, be it governmental or CSO. CSOs would require strengthening, as according to key informants, their role remains incipient. General public awareness campaigns, as well as targeted capacity-building to security forces to reduce stigma and harassment seem to be appropriate courses of actions. Reduced stigma and a sense of lower vulnerability could increase the confidence levels of the vulnerable groups in seeking out both governmental and CSO support.

The CPD proposed to target **PwD** which, according to the CPD, represented 3.5 *percent* of the labor force⁸⁸. This evaluation has found limited evidence that PwD were particularly targeted. Nonetheless, the UNDP Team informed the evaluation team that in the context of the Social Registry there were included disability criteria in the variables to select vulnerable families - to be disaggregated by type of disability (e.g., physical, visual), as well as the level of disability. Establishing such criteria may be a contributing factor to facilitate PwD access to basic services, in the sense there was no national database with information on PwD. To improve the inclusion of PwD, future action may consider launching specific activities to address PwD.

On **gender and youth**, the UNDP youth entrepreneurship activities were gender inclusive, and the project Muala+ was purposely directed towards female entrepreneurs. Gender equality was relevant within the CPD. As previously discussed, the UNDP contributed to actual changes in norms and behaviors, which is well exemplified, for instance, by the approval of a GRB in 2010, as well as by the approval of the parity law.

⁸⁸ UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This evaluation has found evidence the CPD outcomes were well aligned with identifiable needs and priorities, with the PND 2017-2021, and with sectoral plans and priorities, as well as with the (SDG's) 1, 8, 10 and 16. All key informants consulted agreed the outcomes proposed in the CPD, as well as the several Projects/Programmes that followed were relevant.

The relevance of the CDP, as well as its alignment with national priorities and needs is explained by two complementary factors. (i) the long history of UNDP implementation in São Tomé and Príncipe enabled the UNDP to formulate an accurate reading of the national context, priorities, and needs, and (ii) there was a consistent effort in auscultating national partners. Further strengthening consultation with national partners, particularly Civil society Organizations (CSOs) would further strengthen the UNDP's strategic planning capacity. Overall, the UNDP is perceived as a relevant, trustworthy, and valuable partner.

This evaluation has found that the CPD implementation has made a significant contribution to the planned objectives. In outcome 1, the UNDP was effective in improving infectious diseases (Malaria, HIV/AIDS, TB) response - including detection, monitoring, access to treatment, and knowledge on key population -, to the improvement of infrastructure, equipment, technical assistance to improve response, and the development of digital systems to improve data collection, monitoring, and decision making, notably the District Health Information System 2 (DHIS2) and its linkages with other data systems. Furthermore, the CPD accomplished the transfer of the management of the Global Fund project to the hands of the Ministry of Health. Under outcome 2, there was a consistent strengthening of state/government institutions (e.g., National Assembly, Ministry of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions) and CSOs in terms of public finance oversight and gender responsiveness budget, and women participation in decision-making bodies, which led to three key achievements including the adoption of a gender responsive national budget in 2021, the approval of public accounts of 2010 to 2017, and the recent approval of the Parity Law in 2022. On human rights, the UNDP supported the ratification of 7 African Union treaties to improve compliance with human rights in São Tomé and Príncipe. On justice modernization, the UNDP took significant steps in strengthening the justice system including infrastructure (e.g., tribunals), capacity-building of staff, and update of laws and legal codes (e.g., *Código de Processo Penal*). The UNDP further contributed to launching the national Data Center; a structural digital infrastructure that strongly contributes to the national digital sovereignty. Under outcome 3, the UNDP contributed to the resilience and dynamism of the economic landscape of São Tomé and Príncipe by supporting (youth) entrepreneurship, the development of the agriculture value-chain, and by supporting local communities in finding climate change resilient livelihood alternatives. The UNDP supported the national early warning and disaster preparedness system with capacity-building, equipment, and technical capacity to improve disaster response planning. Moreover, the UNDP contributed to the energy transition of São Tomé and Príncipe with extensive support for the adaptation of legal and plan frameworks (e.g., *Lei-Quadro de Recursos Hídricos*), as well as capacity-building of national partner's structures (e.g., buildings, training). Additionally, the UNDP supported the construction of the first solar plant in the country. At macro environmental level,

the UNDP provided technical assistance to 2021 the update of the National Determined Contributions.

The mobilization of resources by the UNDP for the programmed cycle was impressive. From a total indicative budget for the three outcomes of 14,200,000 US\$ in 2016, the UNDP mobilized funds that enabled a delivery of 38,076,973 US\$ by the time of this evaluation. The workflow between the UNDP and its partners is overall positive, and the UNDP is regarded as a trusted partner that adds value to its partners.

Some key achievements of the country programme are highly likely to be sustainable. A clear area of sustainability is the adoption of legal and regulatory frameworks in multiple areas, including the family law, code of criminal procedure, the parity law, the laws on resources use (forestry, water), energy regulation, among many others. Laws and procedures solidify change, and the adoption of new principles and practices. Capacity-building and strengthening of state/government partners as well as CSOs is another area that offers signs of sustainability. Some institutions that were strengthened during the CPD have reportedly become part of the governmental organic (e.g., Incubadora Central) and likely to continue. An area which may offer a high level of sustainability relates to the improvement of the digital infrastructure of the country. The Data Center established in the INIC has the potential of aggregating data from multiple ministries, which may enable sharing of costs. The positive signs are, however, contingent to the availability of resources from national counterparts. São Tomé e Príncipe is highly dependent on foreign aid, and in that sense, the UNDP's acute *modus operandi* of seeking partnerships and in establishing synergies and networks is relevant in the continuous effort of funding mobilization. Likewise, the investment in the private sector, and in the emergence of an economically sustainable internal market is the seed for a more dynamic economic landscape, which in the long-term may assist São Tomé e Príncipe in achieving higher levels of growth and reducing poverty.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

This chapter focuses on the lessons learned from the implementation of the CPD, based on the evidence gathered in the evaluation process, and aims to build on the experience gained from it to identify clues for improving relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability for the expansion of the Project or for future projects in different contexts.

Lesson Learned (LL)

LL1. A solid design phase with in-depth consultations with key stakeholders from governmental, CSO, IOs, and other UN agencies is key to ensure clear, feasible, and realistic projects/programmes strategy. A clear project design also enhances coordination/inter-connection between the Programme outcomes/projects, which will increase effectiveness and efficiency.

LL2. Solid data on key socio-economic and environmental indicators is essential for accurate and well-suited programme design planning, decision-making, and monitoring of programme outcomes. Particularly when the Agenda 2030 approaches its culmination, accurate and credible data availability is indispensable to enhance knowledge, and track results and effective change.

LL3. Leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies and mobilizing additional funding contributes to cost-effectiveness. The UNDP was successful in leveraging partnerships with other UN agencies, as well as with other partners, and in securing additional funding, which has contributed to Programme cost-effectiveness.

LL4. Ensuring the existence of clear monitoring and evaluation mechanisms from the inception phase of the programme – such as an assigned team/unit to record progress on outcomes outputs and activities as well as a centralized programme library which is shared with all team members -, enables sharing of crucial information on relevant initiatives between the teams of different outcomes, enabling them to understand the progress made in other outcomes and what synergies can/should be explored. It can also further inform management decisions.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations presented are supported by evidence, conclusions and lessons learned. They are intended to the UNDP. The evaluation team collected suggestions for recommendations through consultations with stakeholders. Throughout the report this evaluation has provided multiple recommendations on multiple aspects of the CPD implementation. In this sector, the evaluation collated only high priority recommendations.

Recommendation

Strategic Recommendations

SR1. Continue undertaking efforts for in-depth consultations and discussions at the design phase of the CDP and other thematic projects and initiatives, with both governmental and CSO representatives to ensure that the programme has a clear, feasible and realistic strategy, well suited to the national context in all its dimensions.

SR2. Consider enhancing the coordination between different Programme outcomes/projects, with the establishment of an M&E unit with the clear role to centralize the information/knowledge (including indicator tracking) produced across the multiple projects/programmes, maintain the UNDP's archive/library, promote strategic level opportunities, and promote cross-fertilization of lessons learned across outcomes, as well as sharing of best practices and knowledge within UNDP.

SR3. Consider enhancing efforts in data collection initiatives of key socio-economic and environmental trackers in order to enable the systematic monitorization of the context of São Tomé and Príncipe. Strengthening of the National Statistics Institute, as well as providing capacity-building of key governmental staff on data collection and statistical analysis may contribute to improve monitoring capacity, as well as country situational awareness.

SR4. Consider intensifying efforts in the systematic involvement of the private sector in the multiple projects/programmes, from inception to implementation. Taking advantage of private sector perspectives and foster private sector engagement in UNDP activities may assist in revitalizing the economic landscape of São Tomé and Príncipe, and in improving the sustainability of UNDP actions.

SR5. Continue strengthening South-South and triangular cooperation activities in order to enhance interaction between technical staff from different countries, including training, exchanges and sharing of experiences, especially in a face-to-face format.

Operational Recommendations

OR1. Consider developing an induction guidance toolbox for new UNDP staff members, including consultants and volunteers. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors the quick integration of new staff into the practices, methods, language, processes, and procedures of the UNDP. Such integration is crucial in small offices with high staff turnover.

OR2. Consider improving guidance for UNDP implementing partners. An effective, clear, and comprehensive induction process favors a good communication with implementing partners, and a thorough transmission of operating instructions, particularly on payment procedures/access funding and activities/projects' monitoring and reporting (including financial reporting).

OR3. Consider developing or activating a backstopping mechanism (on-sight or remote) to support consultants on the technical specifications of project/programmed/proposal writing (including theories of change, intervention logic, results frameworks, indicators).

Particularly in a small office, highly reliant on volunteers and external consultants that are experts on particular areas/sectors but that sometimes lack experience on the development of project/programme proposals, a backstopping mechanism could assist in improving the quality of projects/programmes design, as well as in mobilizing additional resources.

OR4. Consider developing a Communication and Visibility Strategy. An effective visibility strategy promotes greater understanding and ownership of the project among stakeholders, and allows the UNDP's successes to be projected, as well as the beneficiary and donor countries. It also promotes the replicability of good practices developed by entities outside the scope of the programme.

OR5. Considering developing projects/programmes targeting PwD.

ANNEXES

1. LIST OF QUALITATIVE INTERACTIONS
2. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
3. BIBLIOGRAPHY
4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. LIST OF QUALITATIVE INTERACTIONS

1.1. SEMISTRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

ENTITY	NAME	FUNCTION
National Assembly	Aykisse Lombá	Director of Parliamentary Support Services and Documentation
National Assembly	José Luís de Jesus	IT Director
National Assembly	Samora Ferreira	Secretary-General
BIRDLIFE International	Julie Courret	Head of projects office in São Tomé and Príncipe
CEPIBA	Carlos Tavares	President of the Board of Direction
CONPREC	Carlos Mendes	Coordinator
DGRNE	Belizardo Neto	Management Assistant
DGRNE	Carlos João	Administrative Support
DGRNE	Chicher Pires	Directorate of Water
DGRNE	Dudete Lima	Technical Staff - Water
DGRNE	Gabriel Maquengo	Directorate of Energy
DGRNE	José Bastos Sacramento.	Director
DGRNE	Lídia Barros	Technical Staff - Water
Institute of Meteorology	Aristones Mendes	Coordinator
MPFEA-GARFIP	Ana Maria Silveira	MPFEA Pro PALOP-TL ISC (II) Focal point, and Director of GARFIP
Ministry of Commerce	Jorge Bonfim	Director of Trade
Ministry of Justice	Eloisa Cabinda	Office Director
Ministry of Youth	Aleksander Ferreira	Director of Entrepreneurship (Incubadora Central)
Ministry of Health	Andreza Batista de Sousa	DVE Coordinator
Ministry of Health	Bonifácio Sousa	HIV/TB Coordinator - PNLS
Ministry of Health	Carlos Bandeira	CNE Director
Ministry of Health	Elisângela Bonfim	HIV/TB Medical staff - PNLS
Ministry of Health	Eneyda Monteverde	SIS Coordinator

National Youth Council	Abdu Sousa	Secretary
National Youth Council	Amilton Mendes Bonfim	Secretary for Public Relations
National Youth Council	Vanilson Silva	Audit Committee
OIKOS	Rogério Rosa	Coordinator
OIKOS	Tomás Pardo	Technical Staff
Platform for Human Rights and Gender Equity	Célia Posser	President
Santomean Association of Jurist Women	Gorete Lopes	Association Member
UNDP	Aderito Santana	ARR/Programme
UNDP	Alec Mkwamba	Health
UNDP	Alissandra Ramos	Governance
UNDP	Carlos Falla	Health
UNDP	Damiano Borgogno	Int Chief Technical Specialist
UNDP	David Aguilar	Project Manager
UNDP	Dinka Amorim	Associate Project Manager
UNDP	José Alexandre Silva	IPSA Case Management and Court Administration Specialist
UNDP	Katarzyna Wawiernia	Resident Representative
UNDP	Maite Mendizabal	Portfolio Manager - CESA
UNDP	Marco Matias	Digitalization - IT Specialist
UNDP	Nelma Rita	Governance
UNDP	Olaf Juergensen	Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP	Rita Aguiar Santos	Programme Analyst CESA
UNDP	Vaciley Andrade	Project Manager CESA
UNDP	Zhaoying Ye	Research and Data Fellow
UNICEF	Alejandra Moncada	Partnership Specialist

1.2. STRUCTURED QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

	# OF FINAL BENEFICIARIES		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Empreende Jovem	5	-	5
Muala+	-	3	3
		Total	8

2. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

2.1. INTERVIEW RULES AND PROCEDURES: DONOR, PROGRAMME TEAM & STAKEHOLDERS

This document lays out key standard rules and procedures that all facilitators (i.e., the person conducting interviews) must abide to when conducting interviews.

1. Duration of the interview: 60-90 min.

2. Objective of interviews by type

Interviews are supported by a script which determines the thematic axes of the dialogue. Interviews seek to increase the understanding about the Programme under evaluation and gather vital or complementary information to the evaluation process.

On semi-structured interviews, questions are tendentially open-ended to allow for a great flexibility in the conduction of the interview. This approach seeks to maximize the inputs provided by participants, for it allows room for participants to structure their reply according to his/her train of thought.

Differently **structured interviews** reduce flexibility in terms of question's leeway. Some questions may be open-ended, yet others clearly direct participants to specific aspects of interest to the evaluation. Structured interviews allow for a greater comparability of the inputs provided by different participants.

3. Posture during interviews

In **both semi-structured and structured interviews**, the reaction of interviewees should be clearly induced from the questions on the script. The questions are purposely designed to address the objectives of the evaluation.

During the interview, the facilitator may, whenever deemed necessary, request complementary data, information, examples, opinions and judgments to maximize the input's provided by key informants. This step is particularly relevant when interviewing shy or nervous participants. The request for further information should be made using follow-up questions and rephrasing techniques.

4. Procedures & Rules

- (i) Prior to the interviews, facilitators should acquaint themselves with the interview rules & script, with the nature of the interviewee role in the Programme and with the Programme itself.
- (ii) The objectives of the evaluation should be presented at the beginning of the meeting.
- (iii) Participants must decide whether to participate in the evaluation and may decide to withdraw at any time. It should be clear from the onset that participants can abandon the interview at any point.

- (iv) All participants must be treated with the uttermost respect, civility, and courtesy.
- (v) Interviews are a place of dialogue, and seek understanding and clarity of the position, perceptions, and opinions of the participants.
- (vi) All information collected during the interview can be used to inform subsequent interviews, **yet** the information cannot be linked to participants outside the transcripts of the interviews. To tease out additional information and/or validate information, the facilitator may mention the opinions, arguments, or declarations of previous participants **without ever** mentioning the identity of those who produced said opinions, arguments, or declarations.
- (vii) The facilitator should abstain from providing personal impressions about the Programme.
- (viii) All data collected should be recorded on the interview protocol sheet. The protocol sheets will be part of the documentation. It should include all comments considered relevant for a better interpretation of the participants' interventions (e.g., if participants expressed confidence, were nervous).
 - a. Before archiving the interview, the facilitator should review the content to make sure the recordings are intelligible, and accurate.
 - b. Special care should be taken to avoid subjective and abusive interpretations of the interviewee's words. When in doubt the facilitator should summarize to the participant how the reply was interpreted and ask if the interpretation was correct.
 - c. All sentences that by their potential uniqueness or by revealing a very personal approach of the participant should, whenever possible, be reproduced in the terms used by the participant.

2.2. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. INTERVIEWEE / INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Name		Entity	
Sex		Place	
Function		Date	
Typology of interview	1) UNDP 2) Government/Beneficiaries 3) UN Agencies 4) Donors/ Development Partners 5) Civil Society Organizations		

2. DISCUSSION INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the objective(s) of the interview:

- Welcoming the interviewee, small talk to make the interviewee at ease.
- Mention the objectives of the evaluation of the Programme.
- Note the duration of the discussion (60-90 min).

Ask if there is need for further clarification

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

QUESTION	UNDP	Government/ Beneficiaries	UN Agencies	Donors/ Development Partners	CSOs
1. To what extent was the country programme relevant to the national development goals of São Tomé and Príncipe, and to implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development in the three main areas of the Programme: health, democratic governance, sustainable development, and resilience to climate change?	x				
2. To what extent were UNDP initiatives relevant to the national development goals of São Tomé and Príncipe, and to implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development? (NOTE: mention specific programmes/projects for each stakeholder)		x	x	x	x
3. To what extent were the planned activities clear, feasible and adequate to address the priorities and needs of the targeted beneficiaries in the three main areas of intervention: Health, democratic governance, sustainable development, and resilience to climate change?	x				
4. To what extent were the planned activities clear, feasible and adequate to address the priorities and needs of the targeted beneficiaries of the UNDP supported initiatives implemented with your organization?		x	x	x	x
5. Do you consider the UNDP is a strong advocate for improving health, democratic governance, and sustainable development and resilience to climate change in São Tomé and Príncipe? Can you provide an example in one or the three areas in which the UNDP manifested its advocacy efforts?		x	x	x	x
6. To what extent has the UNDP partnership model with international and national partners been effective in mobilizing resources (human, material) and knowledge to address the development challenges in São Tomé and Príncipe?	x	x	x	x	x
7. To what extent did the UNDP Programmes include south-south and triangular cooperation features? Can you provide an example that show south-south and triangular cooperation in practice?	x	x			

8. To what extent did the Programme manage to adapt to the demands of Covid-19 in São Tomé and Príncipe? Can you provide examples?	x	x	x	x	x
9. What results were achieved by the programme in each of the three main areas of intervention Health, democratic governance, sustainable development, and resilience to climate change? Were the proposed targets achieved?	x				
10. What results were achieved by the UNDP supported initiatives in partnership with your organization (NOTE: mention specific programmes/projects for each stakeholder) ?		x	x	x	x
11. What were the main factors contributing to those achievements?	x	x	x	x	x
12. What were the biggest challenges the CPD Programme faced? How were they mitigated/addressed?	x				
13. What were the biggest challenges the UNDP supported initiatives faced? How were they mitigated/addressed?		x	x	x	x
14. To what extent did small-size initiatives funded by UNDP were successful, and contributed to the overall objectives of the UNDP in São Tomé and Príncipe? Should the model be maintained in the future or adapted?	x				
15. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives in the country strengthen the capacity of the São Tomé and Príncipe government, and the São Tomé and Príncipe institutions? Can you provide concrete examples?	x	x	x	x	x
16. In the future, which thematic areas should the UNDP pursue in São Tomé and Príncipe, and with what intent?	x	x	x	x	x
17. To what extent were the Programme resources (human, technical, financial) sufficient and adequate? What shortcomings identified and how were they solved?	x				
18. To what extent were the allocated resources (human, technical, financial) sufficient and adequate to the initiatives implemented with UNDP's support? What shortcomings identified and how were they solved?		x			
19. What benefits and shortcomings were identified regarding Programme management (including M&E)?	x				
20. Were partnerships and synergies with other projects been leveraged? If yes, how?	x	x	x	x	x
21. Which benefits and shortcomings do you identify on the work relations between the UNDP and national implementing partners?	x	x	x	x	x

22. If applicable, were programme funds delivered in a timely manner to partners?	x	x			X
23. Did the UNDP provide adequate political, technical, or other support? To what extent?		x			
24. What will be the impact of the UNDP programme(s) in terms of strengthening institutional capacities?	x	x	x	x	x
25. What has changed in the way your institution works because of the UNDP supported initiatives? Will those changes be maintained?		x			x
26. Do you consider your institution has sufficient resources (human, technical and financial) to maintain the change introduced by the UNDP's Programme? If not, are there plans to increase resources?		x			x
27. What barriers have been seen to the inclusion of vulnerable groups (e.g., youth, women) in UNDP's work and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?	x	x	x	x	X
28. How did the programme(s) integrate human rights and gender issues, from design to implementation and reporting?	x	x	x	x	x
29. What lessons have you learned so far in implementing this programme?	x				
30. What lessons have you learned so far in implementing the UNDP supported initiatives?		x			x
31. What recommendations do you have for the next country programme?	x	x	x	x	x
32. Are there any additional matters you would like to discuss?	x	x	x	x	x

OUTCOME 3 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

The following questions complement the general questions previously outlined.

QUESTION	UNDP	Government/ Beneficiaries	UN Agencies	Donors/ Development Partners	CSOs
33. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives contribute to sustainable blue economy development (e.g., development of local businesses, increase climate resilience of communities), and reduction of fisherfolk poverty?	x	x	x	x	x

34. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives contribute to increase the resilience of agriculture production against climate change? Which mitigation or adaptation measures were implemented?	x	x	x	x	x
35. To what extent did the UNDP initiatives contribute to the adoption of renewable energy sources? To what extent will renewable energy sources contribute to mitigate the current energy deficit of São Tomé and Príncipe, particularly in rural areas?	x	x	x	x	x

2.3. STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. INTERVIEWEE / INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Name		Business	
Sex		Place	
Date		Activity	1) Empreende Jovem 2) Muala+

2. DISCUSSION INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the objective(s) of the interview:

- Welcoming the interviewee, small talk to make the interviewee at ease.
- Mention the objectives of the evaluation of the Programme.
- Note the duration of the discussion (10-15 min).

Ask if there is need for further clarification

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

QUESTION	Empreende Jovem	Muala +
1. Como é que teve conhecimento do programa?	x	x
2. O que o/a levou a participar no programa?	x	x
2. Durante a formação quais foram os conteúdos mais importantes que apreendeu?	x	x
3. O programa promoveu ligação com entidades bancárias/financeiras?	x	x
4. O financiamento foi entregue em tempo devido?	x	
5. O equipamento foi entregue em tempo devido?		x
6. O processo para aceder ao financiamento / adquirir equipamento foi simples?	x	x
7. O seu negócio continua em atividade?	x	x
8. Quantas pessoas estão a trabalhar no seu negócio?	x	x
9. Depois da formação e recebimento do financiamento/equipamento teve contacto com a Incubadora Central?	X	x
10. Recomendaria este programa a outras pessoas?	x	x
11. Tem alguma recomendação para melhorar o programa nas próximas edições?	x	x

3. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2019
- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2020.
- “Results Oriented Annual Report – São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2021.
- Carvalho, Patrícia and João Silveira: “Final Evaluation of the Program for the Consolidation of Economic Governance and Public Finances Management Systems in the Official Portuguese Speaking African Countries and East Timor (Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II)”, IMPACTE – Consultants for Dev, 2021.
- Climate Watch: “GHG Emissions. Washington”, 2020.
- EM-DAT (The International Disaster Database): “Custom Request: disaster classification (all natural), location (Sao Tomé and Principe), range (1900-2022)”, n.d. (consulted 03/08/2022).
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): “Aquastat, Agriculture, Value Added (% GDP)”, <https://www.fao.org/aquastat/statistics/query/index.html?lang=en>, 2022.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): “Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Value Added (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)”, May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): “Country Investment Statistics Profile, Sao Tome and Principe, Gross Fixed Capital Formation (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)”, May 13, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CISP>, 2022.
- Fernandes, Agostinho: “Final Evaluation of the Project’s Performance and Results: Project to Support the Justice Sector Reform 2017-2021”, 2021.
- IBP (International Budget Partnership): “Open Budget Survey 2017 São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2018.
- IBP (International Budget Partnership): “Open Budget Survey 2021 São Tomé and Príncipe”, 2022.
- IEA (International Energy Agency), IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), UNSD (the United Nations Statistics Division), the World Bank, and WHO (World Health Organization): “Tracking SDG 7, The Energy Progress Report”, n.d., (consulted 05/08/2022).
- IEO (Independent Evaluation Office): “Assessment of Development Results, Evaluation of UNDP Contribution São Tomé & Príncipe”, United Nations Development Programme, 2016.
- ILO (International Labour Organization): “SDG indicator 1.3.1 – Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/system (%) – Annual”, SDG_0131_SEX_SOC_RT_A, June 2022, <https://ilostat.ilo.org/data/#> (consulted 06/08/2022).
- ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2017-2019”, 2017.
- ILO (International Labour Organization): “World Social Protection Report 2020-2022”, 2021.
- INPG (Instituto Nacional para Promoção da Igualdade e Equidade de Género), and PNLS (Programa Nacional de Luta contra SIDA): “Relatório do Estudo Biocomportamental HIV/SIDA nas Populações Chave (TS, HSH e Prisioneiros) em STP”, 2019.
- IPU (Inter-Parliamentary Union): “Historical dataset on the percentage of women in parliament between 1945-2018”, 2019.
- IPU (Inter-Parliamentary Union): “Monthly ranking of women in national parliaments”, 2022.
- ITU (International Telecommunication Union): “World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Database”, n.d. (consulted 03/08/2022).
- Lueva, Lili, Antonio Correia and Marion Denantes: “Project terminal Evaluation: enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the São Tomé and Príncipes Districts of Caué, Mé-Zóchim Lembá, Cantagalo and Lobata (CMPLCL)”, 2019.
- Joint SDG Fund: “Joint Programme 2020 Annual Progress Report”. 2021.

Kaufman, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi: "The worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues", Policy Research Working Paper 5430, The World Bank, 2010.

Larrabure, Juan, Victor Bonfim: "Final Evaluation Report Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change", 2019.

MPFEA (Ministério do Planeamento, Finanças e Economia Azul): "Estratégia de Reforma da Gestão das Finanças Públicas: ERGFP 2020-2030", 2020.

Observador: "São Tomé and Príncipe inaugura Primeira Central de Energia Fotovoltaica", 25 August, 2022.

República Democrática de São Tomé and Príncipe: "Note Verbale", October 2020.

Roma-Reardon, Josianne: "Global Fund Grant São Tomé and Príncipe-Z-UNDP Final Evaluation Report", 2021.

São Tomé and Príncipe: "Decreto n.º 21/2020", Diário da República N.º 46, 31 de Julho. 2020.

São Tomé and Príncipe: "Estratégia de Reforma da Gestão das Finanças Públicas", 2020.

São Tomé and Príncipe: "III Estratégia Nacional para a Igualdade e Equidade De Género em São Tomé and Príncipe 2019-2026", 2019.

São Tomé and Príncipe: "Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento 2017-2021", 2017.

São Tomé and Príncipe: "Programa de Promoção do Trabalho Digno 2018-2021 de São Tomé and Príncipe", 2018.

São Tomé and Príncipe: "São Tomé and Príncipe national Determined Contributions (NDC-STP) Update", 2021.

The World Bank: "What is the Blue Economy?", June 2017 (consulted 07/07/2022).

UN São Tomé and Príncipe (United Nations): "São Tomé & Príncipe Evaluation of the UNDAF 2017-2022 Final Report", January 2022.

UNDP (United National Development Programme), "Human Development Report 2015", 2015.

UNDP (United National Development Programme), "Human Development Report 2020", 2021.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Country Programme document for São Tomé and Príncipe (2017-2021)", September 2016.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "CPD 17-22 Financial Execution REVI", August 2022.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Energy Project: Project 4602 São Tomé and Príncipe Midterm Review", June 2019.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Strategic Plan 2018-2021", 17 October 2017.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Strategic Plan 2022-2025", 2021.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Strengthening Health Human Resources in São Tomé and Príncipe: report period 1 April to 31 May 2022", 2022.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "Terms of Reference UNDP Sao Tomé and Príncipe Country Programme Evaluation", December 2021.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme): "UNDP Evaluation Guidelines", June 2021.

UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group): "Norms and Standards for Evaluation", 2016.

WGI (Worldwide Governance Indicators): "Interactive Data Access", 2021 (consulted 07/08/2022).

WHO (World Health Organization): "Biobehavioural Survey Guidelines for Populations at Risk for HIV", 2017.

WHO (World Health Organization): "Global Health Workforce Statistics Database: Medical doctors (per 10.000)", 2022.

WHO (World Health Organization): "Global Health Workforce Statistics Database: Nursing and Midwifery Personnel (per 10.000)", 2022, (consulted 03/08/2022).

WHO (World Health Organization): "Proportion of children under five who sleep under an insecticide-treated net. Year 2019", n.d., (consulted 10/08/2022).

WHO (World Health Organization): "The Global Health Observatory: Estimated Malaria Incidence (per 1000 Population at Risk)", May 2022, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators> (consulted 03/08/2022).

WHO (World Health Organization): "The Global Health Observatory: Incidence of Tuberculosis (per 100 000 Population per Year)", October 2021, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators> (consulted 03/08/2022).

WHO (World Health Organization): "UHC Service Coverage Index (SDG 3.8.1)", UHC_INDEX_REPORTED, November 2021, <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/uhc-index-of-service-coverage>, (consulted 03/08/2022).

WHO (World Health Organization): "UHC Service Coverage Sub-Index on Infectious Diseases", November 2021, (consulted 03/08/2022).

World Bank: "Entrepreneurship Database", n.d., (consulted 03/08/2022).

World Bank: "GDP (current US\$) – Sao Tome and Principe", NY.GDP.MKTP.CD, 2022.

World Bank: "Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49) – Sao Tome and Principe", SH.DYN.AIDS.ZS (UNAIDS), (consulted 10/08/2022).

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE



Terms of Reference

UNDP Sao Tome and Principe Country Programme Evaluation

December 2021

Contents

1.	Assignment Information	2
1.	Introduction	2
2.	UNDP's current programme	2
3.	Evaluation purpose	4
4.	Evaluation scope and objectives	4
5.	Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions	5
	Relevance	5
	Effectiveness	5
	Efficiency	5
	Sustainability	6
	Human rights	6
	Gender Equality	6
6.	Methodology and approaches	6
7.	Evaluation products (deliverables)	7
8.	Evaluation team composition and required competencies	8
9.	Evaluation ethics	10
10.	Evaluation arrangements	10
11.	Time frame for the evaluation process	12
12.	Application submission process and criteria for selection	15
13.	TOR annexes	16
	Annex A: Country programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2021)	17
	Annex B: Guiding questions for the governance thematic evaluation.	18
	Annex C: Key stakeholders and partners	20
	Annex D: Documents to be reviewed and consulted.	20
	Annex E: Evaluation matrix	20
	Annex F: Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.	21
	Annex G: Inception report template	21
	Annex H: Required format for the evaluation report.	21
	Annex I: Evaluation Recommendations.	21
	Annex J: Evaluation Quality Assessment	21
	Annex K: Code of conduct.	21

Assignment Information

Title	The evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme for the Sao Tome and Principe (STP)
Purpose	This term of reference (TOR) is designed to guide the evaluation of the 2017-2022 Country Programme Document (CPD) of UNDP STP and a Thematic Evaluation of UNDP's engagement on the Economic Growth Sector
Location/Country	Sao Tome and Principe
Region	Africa
Application categories	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. An individual international consultant (Team leader) to undertake the evaluation of the CPD2. An individual international consultant to cover the theme of governance3. An individual national consultant (Team member) to partner with the international consultants to undertake the CDP evaluation
Duration	Start date: January 2022 Complete date: March 2022

1. Introduction

São Tomé and Príncipe is a politically stable democracy and Small Island Developing State (SIDS), situated in the Gulf of Guinea, off the western equatorial coast of Central Africa. It comprises an archipelago of two main islands, São Tomé and Príncipe, situated about 140 km apart.

It's population of 215,000, has grown, on average, by 2.17% per annum over the last decade, and is highly urbanised with 72.8% of the population living in towns and cities, and 40% living in the district of Água Grande in the urban sprawl of the capital city on the island of São Tomé. By contrast, the Autonomous Region of Príncipe hosts a population of just less than 9,000.

Just over half of STP's population is female (50.5%) and more than one third of households are headed by women. Moreover, STP has a youthful population with 70% aged between 0 and 29 and 61% under the age of 24 (INE, 2012) which, if carefully managed, could create the potential for a demographic dividend.

Notable progress has been achieved in terms of human development in recent years, especially with regard to health and education indicators. STP's score in UNDP's Human Development Index (HDI) rose from 0.542 to 0.609 between 2010 and 2018 (UNDP, 2019), placing the country above average for Sub-Saharan Africa (0.537), but below the average for countries in the average human development group (0.645). These improvements are largely attributable to an increase in average life expectancy from 67.4 years in 2010 to 70.2 years in 2018, improvement in GNI per capita from \$2,567 in 2010 to \$3,024 in 2018, and an increase in the expected and average years of schooling from 10.6 to 12.7 and from 4.9 to 6.4 respectively over the period 2010 to 2018 (UNDP, 2019). These positive developments gains have led the country to be enlisted for LDC graduation status by 2024.

Yet **STP still confronts a number of challenges to achieving the SDGs** and an economic growth that has not been sufficiently inclusive. Lack of decent employment opportunities, particularly for women and young people, and rising inequality are two of the country's greatest challenges. When adjusted for inequality, STP's HDI drops by 16.7% (UNDP, 2019) and the country's GINI coefficient has risen from 32.1 in 2000 to 56.3 in 2017, indicating an alarming widening in the inequality gap (World Development Indicators, 2020). Poverty rates have

remained stubbornly high reducing marginally from 68.4% to 66.7% between 2010 and 2017. The 2017 Household Survey recorded the incidence of extreme poverty at 47% (INE, 2020). Some 46% of households comprising couples with children are poor, and 23% of households composed of extended families. Female-headed households are poorer than their male equivalents with a poverty rate of 61.6% compared to 55.8%. (INE, 2020). Urban areas and southern districts, such as Caué and Lembá, have higher levels of poverty incidence.

Severe food insecurity is a concern with around 10% of families reporting in 2017 that at least one family member had had to skip a full day of meals due to lack of money. And it appears this problem, due to seasonality, is not limited to the poor: 7.5% of non-poor families also reported a similar situation. Not having enough money for food seems to be a recurring problem with 42% of families reporting experiences of food shortages for a few months of the year, and 26% declaring that they are affected by this problem for almost the entire year.

Social protection programmes aimed at the poorest and most vulnerable groups are inadequately resourced and often unable to make timely and regular cash transfers to beneficiaries. In 2016, less than 0.65% of GDP was budgeted for social protection and social assistance programmes, significantly below the regional average of 1.2% (World Bank, 2018). Expanding these programmes to reach all poor households in STP would require expenditure of approximately US\$7.2 million, or 2% of GDP. In addition to the lack of funding, sector policies are poorly coordinated and lack a common set of tools to serve those most at risk of being left behind.

STP's economic challenges are typical of a SIDS and affect its ability to deal with shocks and achieve balanced budgets. The limited labour pool prevents the efficient production of goods and services at a scale needed to meet local and export market demand. Its insularity and limited transport connectivity increase imports and export costs, and the limited availability of land, and a small and largely unskilled workforce, prevent the country from diversifying its economy, making it more vulnerable to trade shocks. The economy is principally driven by agriculture, tourism, and foreign direct investment, and especially by government expenditures and investments. Socio-economic development is fragile and 97% of public investment budget is (on average) financed through debt and external aid. The economy is also overly dependent on trade and services (accounting for 70% of GDP), with tourism alone accounting for 65% of total exports. Paradoxically, and despite its potential, agriculture contributes barely 10% to GDP, principally through the production and export of cocoa which on average accounts for 90% of agricultural export earnings. However, although agriculture's contribution to GDP is small, the sector is of strategic importance in socioeconomic terms given that it accounts for more than 70% of rural employment.

In order **to control inflation, STP pegged its national currency (the Dobra) to the Euro in 2009 which has significantly contributed to price stability.** Inflation declined to 3.96% in 2015 but has increased since spiking at 9% in 2018 due to a supply shock connected to locally produced food. In order to safeguard the exchange rate regime, the authorities have implemented prudent monetary and fiscal policies to keep international reserves at the necessary level.

2. UNDP's current programme

The current country programme contributes to achievement of the SDGs, most specifically Goals 1, 8, 10 and 16. The national authorities have decided to implement all the SDGs, giving priority to Goals 1, 5, 8, 10 and 16. The three main outcome areas are aimed at: i) health, ii) governance, and iii) sustainable development and climate change.

In **health**, specifically COVID Response, Malaria, and HIV/AIDS, through the Global Fund, UNDP is supporting improvements in the provision of health services for sex professionals, who are especially vulnerable to HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. This will include a focus on reducing the prevalence of HIV and tuberculosis and eliminating malaria. UNDP's interventions will concentrate on strengthening the health system in three main areas: health information; drugs and medical products procurement; and community systems. UNDP supported the

Government in coordinating partners, decentralizing response management and aiding community involvement by vulnerable men and women. This support will be the key element of UNDP's strategy to transition the Global Fund programme to national management. Disparities and inequalities at all levels will be tackled through participation by vulnerable groups, and by increasing their access to social protection and basic social services. Unforeseen in the CPD, as part of the COVID Response plan UNDP played a central technical and analytical role in helping STP cope with the pandemic.

In **democratic governance** the emphasis has been on ensuring equitable access to justice and increasing citizen participation in decision-making bodies. This was done with an eye to increasing the effectiveness of central, regional and local public administration services and management institutions, which will benefit from more citizen participation, particularly by youth and women. To further this objective, UNDP worked at strengthening capacities at the Ministry of Justice, Parliament, the National Electoral Commission, the courts and the Police Crime Investigation unit.

Sustainable development and resilience to climate change: Interventions focussing on developing policy instruments for natural resource management and disaster preparedness together with plans to address disaster risk and climate change impact. UNDP is supporting small farmers, small agricultural traders (women, young girls and boys) and fisherfolk harmed by climate change as well as victims of injustice. The innovative 'blue economy' initiative will encourage public and private investment in disaster risk prevention and reduction. It will involve structural and non-structural measures to enhance the economic, social, health and cultural resilience of people and communities. This approach will help tackle social inequalities, in particular the prevalence of poverty in areas hurt by climate change.

UNDP is supporting the Government in developing renewable energies to mitigate the energy deficit in rural areas, build resilience to climate change and apply the blue economy to reduce the poverty of fisherfolk. Support is being provided to the private sector in promoting renewable energy to increase economic growth and provide job opportunities for vulnerable groups, particularly youth and women.

Evaluation purpose

This evaluation will assess the UNDP's contribution and performance in supporting the national development and priorities under the approved CPD. A special focus should be placed on Outcome area three (**Sustainable development and resilience to climate change**) thematic area. The evaluation will serve an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in STP with an impartial assessment of the results of UNDP support. The evaluation will capture evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the current programme, which will be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for new the preparation of new CPD (2023-2026).

3. Evaluation scope and objectives

The CPD evaluation will focus on the formal UNDP country programme approved by the Executive Board (2017-2022⁸⁹). The scope of the CPD evaluation includes the entirety of UNDP's activities at the outcome and output levels covering from 2017 to date. The evaluation covers interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources, donor funds and government funds. Initiatives from regional and global programmes will be included in the CPD evaluation. The evaluation will also examine UNDP's contribution toward cross-cutting issues, e.g. human rights, gender, leaving no one behind, and capacity development. The evaluation should be forward-looking by drawing lessons from the current CPD and propose recommendations for the next CPD.

4. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

The evaluation will answer three broad questions as follows:

- What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?

⁸⁹ The CO was granted a 1-year extension until December 2022 due COVID challenges.

- To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives at the output level, and what contribution has it made at the outcome level and towards the UN Partnership Framework?
- What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

In addition to the above questions, the evaluation is expected to produce answers surrounding the of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the country programme. Below are guiding questions. This evaluation will also include a special thematic evaluation of the Sustainable development and resilience to climate change theme & UNDP's engagement in the same. Guiding questions for the thematic evaluation are listed in the Annex C.

Relevance

- To what extent has the current UNDP programme supported the government of STP in achieving the national development goals and implementing the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development?
- To what extent has the UNDP programme responded to the priorities and the needs of target beneficiaries as defined in the programme document?
- Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving Health, Governance, and sustainable development and resilience to climate change in STP?
- Have the efforts made by UNDP and national partners to mobilize resources and knowledge been in line with the current development landscape?
- To what extent did the UNDP programme promote SSC/Triangular cooperation?
- Has UNDP been able to effectively adapt the programme to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in STP?

Effectiveness

- By reviewing the programme results and resources framework, is the UNDP programme on track to achieve intended results at the outcome and output levels? What are the key achievements and what factors contributed to the achievements or non-achievement of those results?
- By examining the small-size initiatives funded by UNDP regular sources, how have these projects fulfilled their objectives? What are the factors (positive and negative) that contribute to their success or shortcomings? Are there recommendations or lessons that can be drawn from this approach?
- To what extent has UNDP programme contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening? How could UNDP enhance this element in the next UNDP programme?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up going forward?

Efficiency

- To what extent has there been an economical use of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)? What are the main administrative constraints/strengths?
- Is the results-based management system operating effectively and is monitoring data informing management decision making?
- To what extent has UNDP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in STP?
- How well does the workflow between UNDP and national implementing partners perform?
- To what extent have programme funds have been delivered in a timely manner?

- When UNDP provides implementation support services as per MOU with an implementing partner, how well has UNDP performed?

Sustainability

- What outcomes and outputs have the most likelihood of sustainability and being adopted by partners and why?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have national partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?

Human rights

- What barriers have been seen to the inclusion of vulnerable groups in UNDP's work and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?

Gender Equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the programme strategic design, implementation and reporting? Are there key achievements?
- In what way could UNDP enhance gender equality in the next country programme?

An important note: Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on achievement of the 2017-2022 CPD, as well as recommend key development priorities which shall inform the focus the new CPD. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer wider lessons for UNDP support in STP.

5. Methodology and approaches

The CPD evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The evaluation will be carried out by an independent evaluation team. The evaluation team should adopt an integrated approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis tools to generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits where/when possible. It is expected that the evaluation methodology will comprise of the following elements:

- Review documents (Desk Review);
- Interviews with key stakeholders including government line ministries, development partners, civil society and other relevant partners through a participatory and transparent process;
- Consultations with beneficiaries through interviews and/ or focus group discussions;
- Survey and/ or questionnaires where appropriate;
- Triangulation of information collected from different sources/methods to enhance the validity of the findings.

The evaluation is expected to use a variety of data sources, primary, secondary, qualitative, quantitative, etc. to be extracted through surveys, storytelling, focus group discussions, face to face interviews, participatory methods, desk reviews, etc. conducted with a variety of partners. A transparent and participatory multi-stakeholder approach should be followed for data collection from government partners, community members, private sector, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, etc.

Evidence will be provided for every claim generated by the evaluation and data will be triangulated to ensure validity. An evaluation matrix or other methods can be used to map the data and triangulate the available evidence.

In line with the UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, gender disaggregation of data is a key element of all UNDP's interventions and data collected for the evaluation will be disaggregated by gender, to the extent possible, and assessed against the programme outputs/outcomes.

Special note:

Given the COVID 19 pandemic and the resultant restrictions may require many of the in-person missions / consultations and data gathering / activities to be carried out remotely using electronic conferencing means. Alternatively, some or all in person interviews may be undertaken by the national consultant in consultation with the evaluation team leader.

6. Evaluation products (deliverables)

These products could include:

- **Evaluation inception report (up to 10 pages).** The inception report, containing the proposed theory of change, and evaluation methodology should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed (this element can be shared with UNDP well in advance). The inception report should be endorsed by UNDP in consultation with the relevant government partners before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluator. **(see the inception report template in Annex H).**
- **Kick-off meeting.** Evaluators will give an overall presentation about the evaluation, including the evaluator team's approach, work plans and other necessary elements during the kick-off meeting. Evaluators can seek further clarification and expectations of UNDP and the Government partner in the kick-off meeting.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, the evaluation team is required to present a preliminary debriefing of findings to UNDP, key Government partners and other development partners.
- **Draft evaluation report (max 60 pages including executive summary).** UNDP and other designated government representative and key stakeholders in the evaluation, including the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluators in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluators to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report (see final evaluation template in the Annex I).**
- **A report on the sustainable development and resilience to climate change thematic evaluation (max 15 pages) by the assigned consultant;** this paper will be presented as an appendix of the final report. The assigned consultant should integrate the important aspects of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the final evaluation report.
- **Evaluation brief (2 pages maximum) and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.
- **Evaluation Recommendations (see the management response in the Annex J)**
- **Presentations to stakeholders (this maybe done remotely)**

7. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of three independent consultants comprising of:

- An Evaluation Team Leader (International);

- An Evaluation Member (international) focusing specifically on UNDP's sustainable development and resilience to climate change portfolio; and
- A National Consultant who will provide knowledge of national context and support the full evaluation process as well as serve as an interpreter from Portuguese to English to and vice-versa when needed.

(a) Evaluation Team Leader (international), 39 working days

S/he has overall responsibility for conducting the CPD evaluation and providing guidance and leadership to the national consultant. In consultation with the team member, s/he will be responsible for developing a methodology for the assignment that reflects best practices and encourages the use of a participatory and consultative approach as well as delivering the required deliverables to meet the objective of the assignment. S/he will lead the preparation and revision of the draft and final reports, ensuring the assignments have been completed in the agreed timeframe.

S/he has responsibilities as follows:

- Leading the documentation review and framing of evaluation questions;
- Leading the design of monitoring and evaluation questions and field verification tools;
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between evaluation team members;
- Leading the evaluation team in planning, execution and reporting;
- Incorporating the use of best practice with respect to evaluation methodologies;
- Incorporating results from the governance thematic evaluation into the report;
- Responsible for and leading the drafting of inception report, finalization/quality control of the evaluation report including timely submission and adjustment;
- Leading the kick-off meeting and debriefing meeting on behalf of the evaluation team with UNDP and stakeholders;

Required Qualifications:

- Minimum Master's degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning or any other social sciences related to economic management and pro-poor development;
- 7 to 10 years relevant experience in undertaking evaluation in the development sector
- Strong knowledge of UNDP and its working approaches including partnership approaches with Government, civil society and community groups;
- Proven experience in conducting outputs/outcomes/impact/CPD/UNDAF evaluations;
- Experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice;
- Strong inter-personal skills, teamwork, analytical skills and organizational skills;
- Excellent presentation and drafting skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software;
- Fluency in Portuguese and English, both spoken and written;
- Previous experience working in STP or similar settings in the region is an advantage;
- Knowledge of the sensitivities of the context of STP is an asset.

(b) International Evaluation Consultant, Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change Area, 25 working days (Advertised and Recruited Separately)

S/he has overall responsibility for contributing to the CPD evaluation especially reviewing UNDP's engagement in the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change outcome area. In consultation with the team leader, s/he will be responsible for developing a methodology for the assignment that reflects best practices and encourages the use of a participatory and consultative approach as well as delivering the required deliverables to meet the objective of the assignment. S/he will substantively contribute to the preparation and revision of the draft and final reports, ensuring the assignments have been completed in the agreed timeframe. S/he will prepare a final report focusing on the findings, lessons learned and recommendations for UNDP's future portfolio in this area. The key elements and highlights of

Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change will be integrated into the final country overall programme evaluation report.

S/he has responsibilities as follows:

- Contributing to the documentation review and framing of evaluation questions;
- Contributing to the design of monitoring and evaluation questions and field verification tools;
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between evaluation team members;
- Conducting the evaluation of the governance portfolio while contributing to the overall planning, execution and reporting;
- Incorporating the use of best practice with respect to evaluation methodologies;
- Contributing to the drafting of inception report, finalization/quality control of the evaluation report including timely submission and adjustment;
- Contributing to and participating in the kick-off meeting and debriefing meeting on behalf of the evaluation team with UNDP and stakeholders;

Required Qualifications:

- Minimum Master's degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning or any other social sciences related to economic management and pro-poor development;
- 7 to 10 years relevant experience in undertaking evaluation in the development sector
- Extensive professional experience in the area of governance and sustainable development, including gender equality and social policies;
- Strong knowledge of UNDP and its working approaches including partnership approaches with Government, civil society and community groups;
- Proven experience in conducting outputs/outcomes/impact/CPD/UNDAF/thematic evaluations;
- Experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice;
- Strong inter-personal skills, teamwork, analytical skills and organizational skills;
- Excellent presentation and drafting skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software;
- Fluency in Portuguese and English, both spoken and written;
- Previous experience working in STP or similar settings in the region is an advantage;
- Knowledge of the sensitivities of the context of STP is an asset.

(c) National Evaluation Consultant, 39 working days) (Advertised and Recruited Separately)

S/he will support the Team Leader by providing knowledge of the development context in STP. S/he is well aware of STP cultural context and working with different government institutions; and when needed support as an interpreter between Portuguese and English. S/he collects all relevant documents and reports needed for the review. S/he will support the team leader in coordinating with UNDP, government partners and other stakeholders. S/he will play a crucial role in organizing meetings, workshops, interviews, consultations during the field missions. S/he will draft some parts of the report as assigned by the team leader. The consultant will advise the Team Leader on relevant aspects of the local context where the projects have operated.

Under the supervision of Evaluation Team Leader, s/he has responsibilities as follows:

- Support the documentation review and framing of evaluation questions;
- Support the coordination with UNDP, government partners, stakeholders and other parties;
- Undertake field visits and collect feedback from beneficiaries, project stakeholders etc.;
- Support the Evaluation Team Leader and international consultant in planning, execution, analyzing and reporting;
- Incorporate the use of best practice with respect to evaluation methodologies;
- Support the drafting of inception report, finalization/quality control of the evaluation report;

- Participate and support the kick-off meeting and debriefing meeting with UNDP and stakeholders;
- Facilitate and support the field data collection in country;
- Translate the evaluation brief in STP language;
- Perform translation from English to STP and vice versa for the evaluation team when required.

Required Qualifications:

- Master's degree or equivalent in Development, Economics, Public Policy, Communications, English, Social Sciences, Humanities or any other relevant field;
- 7 to 10 years-experience in undertaking evaluation in the development sector;
- Experience with evaluation methodologies; programme development and project implementation;
- Have a strong understanding of the development context in STP and preferably understanding of the strategic Poverty and inclusive growth, environment and governance issues within the STP context;
- Experience in oral and written translations;
- Fluent in Portuguese and English (written and spoken).

8. Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' which are available here: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultants must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

9. Evaluation arrangements

The below table outlines key roles and responsibilities for the evaluation process. UNDP and evaluation stakeholders will appoint an Evaluation Manager, who will assume the day-to-day responsibility for managing the evaluation and serve as a central person connecting other key parties.

The evaluators will report to the Resident Representative (RR) who will be technically supported by the Regional M&E Advisor. The final approval of the report will be made by the RR. The final payment will be made upon the satisfactory completion and approval of the report.

Role	Responsibilities
Commissioner of the Evaluation: UNDP Resident Representative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lead and ensure the development of comprehensive, representative, strategic and costed evaluation; ▪ Determine scope of evaluation in consultation with key partners; ▪ Provide clear advice to the Evaluation Manager on how the findings will be used; ▪ Respond to the evaluation by preparing a management response and use the findings as appropriate; ▪ Safeguard the independence of the exercise; ▪ Approve TOR, inception report and final report. ▪ Allocate adequate funding and human resources. ▪ Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders.
Evaluation Manager: M&E Focal Point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lead the development of the evaluation TOR in consultation with stakeholders; ▪ Manage the selection and recruitment of the Evaluation Team;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manage the contractual arrangements, the budget and the personnel involved in the evaluation; ▪ Provide executive and coordination support; ▪ Provide the Evaluation Team with administrative support and required data; ▪ Liaise with and respond to the commissioners; ▪ Connect the Evaluation Team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation; ▪ Review the inception report and final report.
PROGRAMME/ PROJECT MANAGER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide inputs/advice to the evaluation on the detail and scope of the terms of reference for the evaluation and how the findings will be used; ▪ Ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations; ▪ Provide the evaluation manager with all required data and documentation and contacts/stakeholders list, etc.; ▪ Support the arrangement of interview, meetings and field missions; ▪ Provide comments and clarification on the terms of reference, inception report and draft evaluation reports; ▪ In consultation with Government, respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP; ▪ Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders including the project boards; ▪ Responsible for the implementation of key actions on evaluation recommendations in partnership with Implementing partners.
Regional Evaluation Focal Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support the evaluation process and ensure compliance with corporate standards; ▪ Provide technical support to country office including advice on the development of terms of reference; recruitment of evaluators and maintaining evaluator rosters; implementation of evaluations; and finalization of evaluations, management responses and key actions ▪ Ensure management response tracking and support M&E capacity development and knowledge-sharing; ▪ Dispute resolution when issues arise in implementation of evaluations. ▪ Contributes to the quality assurance process of the evaluation.
Key Evaluation Partner- MPI (DIC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of key evaluation deliverables, including terms of reference, the inception report and successive versions of the draft evaluation report; ▪ Provide inputs/advice how the findings will be used; ▪ Assist in collecting required data; ▪ Review draft evaluation report for accuracy and factual errors (if any); ▪ Responsible for the implementation of key actions on evaluation recommendations and integrate the evaluation lessons learned in the future Country Programme Document and projects where appropriate.
Evaluation team (led by Team leader)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the terms of reference as appropriate; ▪ Ensure the quality (including editorial) of the report and its findings and recommendations; ▪ Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix, in line with the terms of reference, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines; ▪ Draft reports and brief the evaluation manager, programme/project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations; ▪ Finalize the evaluation, taking into consideration comments and questions on the evaluation report. Evaluators' feedback should be recorded in the audit trail; ▪ Support UNDP efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination if required.

10. Time frame for the evaluation process

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively as follows:

Timeframe for the CDP evaluation process		
Activity	Responsible party	tentative timeframe
Selection of the evaluation team	UNDP	January 2022
Provide necessary information to Evaluation team	UNDP	Late January 2022
Conduct desk review	Evaluation team	January-Mid February 2022
Submit the inception report to UNDP	Evaluation team	February 2022
Approve the inception report	UNDP	February 2022
Hold a kick-off meeting with UNDP, Government and development partners	Evaluation team	February 2022
Collect data/conduct field missions	Evaluation team	Early March 2022
Organize a stakeholder workshop to brief on the preliminary observations (Participants include UNDP, UN agencies, Government and development partners)	Evaluation team & UNDP	March 2022
Analyse data and prepare a report	Evaluation team	End-March 2022
Submit the first draft	Evaluation team	April 2022
Review the first draft	UNDP	April 2022
Submit the second draft	Evaluation team	Late April 2022
Review the second draft	UNDP, RBAP & MPI	Late April 2022
Submit the final draft	Lead evaluator	May 2022
Accept the final report and submit the management response	UNDP	May 2022
Edit and format the report	Evaluation team	May 2022
Issue the final report and evaluation brief	Lead evaluator	May 2022
Disseminate the final report and evaluation brief / stakeholders workshop	UNDP	May 2022

Suggested working day allocation and schedule for evaluation

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATE D # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and inception report				
<i>Meet/discuss with UNDP</i>	0.5 day	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	UNDP or remote	Evaluation team & UNDP
<i>Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team</i>	-	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation manager
<i>Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology, the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed and prepare the inception report</i>	10 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Home- based	Evaluation Team
<i>Submission of the inception report, 15 pages maximum (see the template in the annex section)</i>	-	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation team
<i>Comments and on approval of inception report</i>	7 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	UNDP
<i>Revise the inception report</i>	2 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Home- based	Evaluation team
<i>Submit the final inception report</i>	-	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation team
<i>Approve the inception report</i>	3 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	UNDP
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
<i>Update on the detailed work plan including field mission and agree upon with UNDP</i>	0.5 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation team
<i>Kick-off meeting with UNDP, Government and development partners.</i>	0.5 day	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]		
<i>Conduct data collection including field visits, in-depth interviews, focus group and etc.</i>	14 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	In country (subject to COVID pandemic restrictions)	
<i>Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders</i>	0.5 day	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	In country (subject to COVID	Evaluation team

				pandemic restrictions)	
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing					
<i>Preparation of draft evaluation report (see the template in the annex section)</i>	7 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Home- based	Evaluation team	
<i>Draft report submission</i>	-	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation team	
<i>UNDP comments to the draft report</i>	14 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	UNDP	Evaluation manager	
<i>Update report taking into account UNDP comments</i>	2 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation team	
<i>Submit the updated draft to UNDP for sharing to other stakeholders</i>	-	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation team	
<i>Consolidated stakeholder comments to the draft report</i>	2 days	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	UNDP	Evaluation manager	
<i>Submit the final report to UNDP</i>	-	[indicate a proposed date DD/MM/YYYY]	Via email	Evaluation team	
Estimated total days for the evaluation	--				
Total working day of evaluation team	39				

11. **Application submission process and criteria for selection**

Evaluation team will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed approach, including following:

- 10%. Qualification and experience
- 15%. Technical approach as illustrated in the description of the proposed methodology.
- 10%. Timeline reflecting proposed activities, which emphasis the ability to meet the proposed deadlines
- 20%. Evidence of experience of the consultant in conducting evaluations as detailed in the CV
- 15%. Reference from Past performance. To enable this reference check is carried out, applicants are required to provide a list of all related consultancies/ evaluations conducted during the past three years with associated contact details of references.
- 30% Financial proposal

12. **TOR annexes**

- A. Country programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2021)
- B. Guiding questions for Governance thematic evaluation

Key stakeholders and partners

- C. Document to be reviewed
- D. Evaluation matrix
- E. Schedule of tasks, milestone and deliverables
- F. Inception report template
- G. Require format for the evaluation report
- H. Evaluation recommendations
- I. Evaluation quality assessment
- J. Code of conduct

Annex B: Country programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2022)

Country Programme Outcome and Outputs	Indicative resources (2017-2022) US\$
<p>Outcome 1. Output 1.1: The key and vulnerable groups, particularly children and women, use quality health services, within a legal framework and within strengthened national systems</p> <p><u>1.1 Indicators:</u> Proportion of children under five who sleep under an LLIN during the night Percentage of female sex workers infected by HIV Number of TB cases notified within the key and high-risk population</p> <p>1.1</p>	<p>\$ 3,120,000</p>
<p>Outcome 2</p> <p>Output 2.1: The capacities of the national institutions at the central, regional and local levels are strengthened in terms of control, transparency and mutual accountability. 2.1 Insert indicators Number of Institutions (Parliament, Courts, Electoral Commission and Ministries) strengthened - control, transparency and accountability Proportion of women to men in decision making body</p> <p>Output 2.2: <i>Capacity of justice and human rights institutions enabled and/or expanded to provide quality services and uphold the rule of law and redress</i></p> <p><u>2.2 Indicators:</u> Number of alternative conflict resolution and legal information mechanisms created at local level Number of disputes settled through alternative mechanism Number of updated alternative justice mechanisms (laws and annual regulations)</p> <p>Output 2.3: The public and private institutions are able to collect, compile and analyze relevant data for mainstreaming the SDGs into national plans, policies and strategies and coordination of aid for better implementation of the 2030 STP Transformation Agendas.</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> Number of plans, policies and strategies integrating SDGS Number of public institutions strengthened for Aid Coordination Number of training in data gathering and analysis for National Statistics Institute</p>	<p>2,256,000.</p>
<p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Output 3.1 National, local and regional systems and institutions (Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction) enabled to achieve structural transformation of productive capacities that are sustainable and employment - and livelihoods - intensive</p> <p>3.1 Insert indicators Number of policies, systems and/or institutional measures in place at central, local and regional levels to generate and strengthen employment and livelihoods Number of green jobs created Number of community benefiting from livelihood initiatives</p> <p>•</p>	<p>Regular: 250,000</p> <p>Other: 6,667,000</p>

Other (global, regional, management projects)	
Total	\$

Source: UNDP STP Country Programme Document 2017-2021*22

Annex C: Guiding questions for the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change thematic evaluation.

Relevance

1. Was UNDP responsive to the evolution overtime of development challenges and the priorities in national strategies, especially significant shifts in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change and related areas?
2. Are UNDP activities aligned with national strategies, policies, and other development initiatives in the country in particular in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change and related areas?
3. How has UNDP engaged and partnered with women and youth in delivering their Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change programme?

Effectiveness

1. What has been the effectiveness of UNDP Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change portfolio in supporting the governance sector in STP?
2. Have the approaches taken by UNDP in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change been aligned with the governments approach or strategy?
3. What has been the impact of UNDP's support in Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change activities at the national and subnational levels?
4. What comparative advantage does UNDP hold in the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change area? Is this recognized by the Government of STP and donors?
5. Did UNDP's programme facilitate the implementation of the national development strategies and policies related to advance Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change (e.g. linking UNDP initiatives to government policies or coordination of development actors)?
6. What have been the opportunities for support? Has UNDP STP taken advantage of these opportunities and any comparative advantage to strengthen Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change across government and society?
7. What have been the main challenges faced in the UNDP's support to Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change sector?

Efficiency

1. Has the Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change programme been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates? What challenges have been faced?
2. Has UNDP and its partners taken prompt action to solve implementation and other managerial issues?
3. Has UNDP and the government used human & financial resources efficiently?
4. Did UNDP have an adequate mechanism to respond to significant changes in the country situation, in particular in crisis and emergencies?
5. Has UNDP used its network to bring about opportunities for South-South exchanges and triangular cooperation, and facilitate external expertise for government?
6. Has UNDP helped to mobilise other development partners (e.g. civil society, private sector, academia, etc.)?
7. How has UNDP integrated its Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change work with other country office programme (such as governance and health)? Has UNDP been able to develop integration or cooperation amongst its outcome areas and leverage Sustainable Development and Resilience to Climate Change work into other areas?
8. Do the government and development partners see UNDP as a value for money partner? Are happy with costs incurred and charged? What issues were faced in the development of this modality of support?

Sustainability

1. Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks and did they include an exit strategy?

2. How did UNDP design to scale-up coverage and effects of its interventions? Or ensure adoption at a larger scale by the Government of the STP.
3. Has institutional, individual and/or national capacity been developed so that UNDP may realistically plan progressive disengagement?
4. How has UNDP responded to threats to sustainability during implementation

Annex D: Key stakeholders and partners

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

- Implementing Partner – Ministry of Planning
- Responsible Partners – Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Planning & Investment – Ministry of Commerce
- Project beneficiaries including government at national, and provincial (there may be a field mission at district level)
- Donors and non-donor partners (approx. 3-4)
- Civil Society Organization, NGOs, Academic Institutions and Private Sector (approx. 3-4)
- Project Manager (PM)
- National Consultants (1)
- UNDP staff (3)
- Hydrology Department Directorate General of Natural Resources and Energy (DGNRE), Conseil National Prévention de Risques et Catastrophes (CONPREC), Directorate of Agriculture and Rural Development (DADR), Institute National of Meteorology (INM), Technical Training Center for Agriculture and Livestock (CATAP), General Directorate of Environment (DGA), International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) concurring for the achievement of Outcome 3
- Ministry of Justice; Police Crime Investigation (PIC), the Courts, National Assembly; National Programme for Fighting against Malaria (PNLP)
- National Programme for Fighting Against AIDS (PNLS), Centre National des Endémies (CNE), Centre National d'Education á la Santé (CNES), Institut National de Promotion du Genre (INPG)Fond National de Médicaments (FNM) concurring for the achievement of Outcome 2
- **Additional Partners / Partnerships:**
- World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, Global Environment Fund (GEF), European Union (EU), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), World Bank, African Development Bank, Portugal, Canada, França
- **South-South Partnerships** - Brazil, Timor-Leste, Brazil, China, Nigeria, Angola, Equatorial Guinea

Annex E: Documents to be reviewed and consulted.

Evaluation team are required to review various documents related to STP and UNDP programme including but not limited to following documents:

- UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021)
<http://strategicplan.undp.org/>
- STP-United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF 2017-2021)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (2017-2021)
- Project Documents and Project Brief
- UNDP Evaluation guidelines
<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>
- UNEG norms and standard
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>
- Human Development Reports
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/STP>
- Other UNDP Evaluation Reports
<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>
- Gender Inequality Index

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii>

Annex F: Evaluation matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

Table 11. Sample evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub questions	Data sources	Data-collection methods/tools	Indicators/success standard	Methods for data analysis

Annex G: Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.

Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.

Annex H: Inception report template

Follow the link: [Inception report content outline](#)

Annex I: Required format for the evaluation report.

The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports. Follow the link: [Evaluation report template and quality standards](#)

Annex J: Evaluation Recommendations.

Follow the link: [Evaluation Management Response Template](#)

Annex K: Evaluation Quality Assessment

Evaluations commissioned by UNDP country offices are subject to a quality assessment, including this evaluation. Final evaluation reports will be uploaded to the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC site) after the evaluations complete. IEO will later undertake the quality assessment and assign a rating. IEO will notify the assessment results to country offices and makes the results publicized in the ERC site. UNDP STP aims to ensure evaluation quality. To do so, the consultant should put in place the quality control of deliverables. Also, consultants should familiarize themselves with rating criteria and assessment questions outlined in the Section six of [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](#)

Annex L: Code of conduct.

UNDP requests each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report. Follow this link: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>