



Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office

1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433 USA
Tel: (202) 473-0508 - Fax: (202) 522-3240 / (202) 522-3245

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of GEF National Self-Assessments of Capacity-Building Needs (NCSAs)

May 9, 2011

Background on GEF and Capacity Development

1. The GEF has supported capacity development since its inception at all levels, within regular GEF programs and projects, through specific activities targeted specifically at capacity development and enabling activities. The driving factors for the GEF support to capacity development could include the facts that all conventions working with the GEF have decisions requesting the GEF to support capacity development¹ and the recognition that improving capacities are critical to meeting development objectives. The GEF has adopted two major policy documents discussed with the GEF Council regarding capacity development which have guided the GEF work on this area: the Capacity Development Initiative (GEF/C.13/9 and GEF/C.17/6/Rev.1, April 2001) and the Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building (GEF/C.22.8, April 2003). The topic of capacity development is also included in all GEF replenishment negotiations, including in the last one (2010, GEF5) in which the GEF is requested that capacity development through regular projects and programs are the central part of GEF's approach to capacity development. In addition, the GEF has also agreed that cross-cutting capacity development will be addressed through stand alone projects (GEF5 capacity development strategy). In the context of the GEF, capacity development is those sets of capabilities needed to strengthen and sustain functional environmental management systems at the global level, recognizing that these systems must build upon national governance and management systems. Furthermore, capacity development is required to improve individual, institutional and/or enabling environment performance to promote progress toward global environmental gains.

2. In May 1999, the GEF Council approved the Capacity Development Initiative (CDI) as a strategic partnership between the GEF Secretariat and UNDP, for the preparation of a comprehensive approach for developing the capacities needed at the country level to meet the challenges of global environmental action. The Initiative provided the necessary consultative and substantive foundation for developing elements of a strategic collaboration and a specific framework for GEF action to respond to

¹ Guidances from the COPs of UNFCCC and CBD have requested the GEF to provide funding for country-driven capacity development activities, in particular LDCs and SIDSs. Both the CCD and the Stockholm POPs highlighted the need to emphasize capacity development to assist countries in meeting their commitments under their respective conventions.

the growing attention from the Conventions to capacity development. The assessment recommended that the GEF subscribed to the following operational principles to achieve effective capacity development:

- Ensure national ownership and leadership
- Ensure multi-stakeholder consultations and decision-making
- Base capacity building efforts in self-needs assessment
- Adopt a holistic approach to capacity building
- Integrate capacity building in wider sustainable development efforts
- Promote partnerships
- Accommodate the dynamic nature of capacity building
- Adopt a learning-by-doing approach
- Combine programmatic and project-based approaches
- Combine process as well as product-based approaches
- Promote regional approaches

3. In 2003, Council approved the Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building (GEF/C.22.8, April 2003), which guided the GEF actions on capacity development through GEF3 and GEF4 phases. This approach focused attention on cross-cutting capacity through four pathways:

1. National Capacity Self-Assessments
2. Strengthening capacity building components of GEF projects
3. Targeted capacity building projects both within and across focal areas
4. Country capacity development programs in LDCs and SIDSs

4. The Evaluation Office has conducted several assessments of capacity development particularly as components of different evaluations. In 2007 the Office conducted an evaluation on capacity development using two methods: country case studies of the Philippines and Vietnam and review of projects terminal evaluations received by the Office during FY2007. The country case studies examined the nature and results of national, regional and global interventions and related these to capacity development targets at the policy, institutional and individual levels in each country.² The review of 41 terminal evaluations reports assessed the extent to which capacity development activities in GEF projects were relevant, effective and efficient and looked at the results and sustainability of the results of these activities based on evidence provided in the reports. Nevertheless, there has not been an overall evaluation of the capacity development support provided by the GEF.

5. In 2010, the GEF Secretariat and The World Bank (as GEF Trustee) prepared a “Summary of Negotiations – Fifth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund”, which was submitted to the GEF Council in May 2010. The programming document requested that the NCSAs implemented under GEF-4 be evaluated in order to prepare a new strategy for discussion by the GEF Council in 2011. This new

² These case studies are published on the GEF Evaluation Office Web site (www.gefeo.org).

strategy is to be prepared in consultation with the Agencies and will be based on the results and recommendations of the evaluation.

National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSAs), Global Support Program and Second Phases

6. The GEF Council approved in May 2001 funding for technical support to countries to initiate a self-assessment of their capacity needs to address global environmental issues and prepare a national capacity action plan. This decision was taken as one of the approaches the GEF proposed to implement the recommendations from the GEF Capacity Development Initiative. The purpose of the NCSA was to enable countries to:

- Review the global environmental issues that require its priority attention, particularly, but not exclusively, with regard to issues covered by the Rio conventions.
- Determine what capacity development is needed to strengthen management of these issues; and
- Prepare a national plan of capacity development actions.

7. The decision requested that financial assistance was provided to countries that wish to undertake a National Self-Assessments of Capacity-Building Needs (NCSA). Proposals up to \$200,000 were to be processed under expedited procedures and those above under regular GEF project cycle. The purpose of these assessments was to support a country-driven consultative process of analysis and planning that would determine national priorities and needs for capacity development to protect the global environment and implement the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC conventions.

8. The primary objective of the NCSAs was to identify country level priorities and needs for capacity development to address global environmental issues (with a focus on biological diversity, climate change, and land degradation³). In order to delve into an assessment of the capacities to meet and sustain global environmental objectives, NCSAs were to explore the synergies among focal areas, as well as the linkages with wider concerns of environmental management and sustainable development. NCSAs were not intended to be definitive or final, recognizing the dynamic nature of capacity development and they were not considered as a precondition for GEF assistance through regular projects and enabling activities nor a necessary first step before launching capacity development activities in a particular sector. The Final Report and Action Plan of the NCSA is the main output of the NCSA, but as described above, it was expected that the GEF grant would support the process of consultation and preparation of the report. Both the process and final report were considered a useful and relevant framework for domestic action and external assistance for capacity development. A key principle of NCSAs was that they were supposed to be entirely country-driven, undertaken by national institutions and experts and respond to national situations and priorities.

³ GEF resources were allocated separately for addressing initial capacity development needs in the areas of Persistent Organic Polluting Substances and biosafety, but with the expectation where linkages and synergies with these sectors are desirable or obvious, NCSAs should cover them in keeping with country perceptions and priorities.

9. The following elements were considered critical to effectively carry out NCSAs and could be considered as the drivers behind NCSAs which would ensure a sustainable, longer-term and holistic capacity development which would enable countries to tackle environmental priority setting within the guidance of the conventions and their own sustainable development frameworks:

- National ownership and leadership. The process of preparing as well as the implementation of any plan of action coming from NCSAs should ensure national ownership and leadership. It was assumed that this could be accomplished by using national or regional experts and existing coordinating structures and mechanisms; ensuring multi-stakeholder participation, consultation and decision making; and building on ongoing/existing work relevant to NCSAs, such as GEF supported enabling activities and national reports to conventions.
- Decisions from three Conventions. NCSAs should take into account provisions and decisions from the three Conventions, as they relate to capacity development.
- Holistic approach. NCSAs should adopt a holistic approach to capacity development that addresses capacity needs at the systemic, institutional and individual levels while integrating such capacity building into wider sustainable development efforts.
- Long-term approach. NCSAs should also adopt a long-term approach to capacity development within the broader context of sustainable development

10. According to a recent study conducted by UNDP and UNEP⁴ on NCSAs, the GEF has provided about \$28.7 million for 153 NCSAs since 2002 (out of 165 eligible countries), when the first NCSA was approved. GEF did not require co-financing, with most countries contributing in-kind support. Seven NCSA projects were cancelled due to non-delivery of NCSA products., with the remaining 146 projects implemented or under implementation. UNDP implemented 76% of these NCSA projects, 23% by UNEP and one by the World Bank. As of the end of 2010, from the 119 countries that have completed their NCSAs, 23 have received a **second phase support** from the GEF to implement priorities identified in their NCSAs, valued at about \$12 million from the GEF (on average the GEF provides \$500,000 per project, CDs or CB-2 projects, as they are known).

11. In addition to the national NCSAs, the GEF also approved in 2004 the **Global Support Programme for the NCSA (GSP)** as a support mechanism for the NCSAs and capacity development under the GEF. The GSP was a 3-year facility of the GEF partner agencies, UNDP and UNEP, designed to provide technical assistance to countries engaged in the GEF, to monitor the progress of individual NCSAs and review the process followed and results produced; and to draw and disseminate lessons for both the participating countries and partners agencies. The program was funded by \$1.9 million from GEF and \$1 million from other sources. The services provided by GSP to NCSA teams included:

- Development and dissemination of assessment tools, guidance and resource materials for the NCSAs

⁴ UNDP, UNEP, GEF (2010), "National Capacity Self-Assessments: Results and Lessons Learned for Global Environmental Sustainability," Global Support Programme, Bureau for Development Policy, United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.

- Training on assessment approaches and tools through a series of NCSA workshops
- Information and knowledge management through outreach, website, database and electronic list-servers
- Review and analysis of NCSA outputs, particularly NCSA action plans and final reports.

12. The GSP closed recently (end of December 2010) and a final evaluation is available.⁵

Scope of the evaluation

13. The scope of the evaluation will include an assessment of all approved NCSAs, the GSP and the second phase projects. The evaluation will take into account the level of implementation of each of these projects and existing assessments, reviews and evaluations conducted on any of these modalities and build on them. In the case of NCSAs, a key resource to be considered will be the NCSA Results and Lessons (UNDP, UNEP, GEF, 2010) assessment and in the case of the GSP, the evaluation team will review the recently completed evaluation of this project and build on its findings and recommendations. In particular, the evaluation will conduct a full assessment (basically asking all areas of focus presented below) of those NCSAs that have been completed, a partial assessment (mainly relevance and efficiency) for those NCSAs under implementation and a limited assessment (questions regarding relevance) for the second phase projects.

14. It should be clarified that in this evaluation the term NCSA is used in a broad sense, including the grant, the implementation of the project, the Final Report and Action Plan and also the process that led to the preparation of these reports. This assumes that the NCSA was a process-oriented intervention, set up to create a consultative process to undertake an in-depth assessment of the capacity challenges to meet Rio Convention objectives. Therefore, the term NCSA is just used for short and convenience but it encompasses all of the above.

Areas of Focus and key questions

15. The evaluation proposes to have four areas of focus: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and results (and their sustainability). Each of these areas will be developed through a series of key questions and sub-questions presented in the table below and in more detailed in Annex 1 containing the evaluation matrix for this evaluation. This framework for the evaluation is based on the theory and key principles behind the development of NCSAs and expected purpose, objectives and results of these modalities, as presented earlier. The following table provides the framework for the evaluation.

⁵ Baastel, November 2010. Final Evaluation of the Global Support Programme to the National Capacity Self-Assessments Final Evaluation Reports.

Criteria for effective implementation of NCSAs				
Area of Focus	National ownership and leadership	Decisions from Conventions	Holistic approach	Long-term approach
Relevance of NCSAs to the GEF mandate, the multinational and regional environmental agreements and conventions working with the GEF and the national sustainable development and environmental priorities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have NCSAs been relevant to recipient countries needs and priorities, within the context of national sustainable development agendas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the relevance of NCSAs to the implementation of multinational and regional environmental agreements and conventions working with the GEF? To what extent have NCSAs been relevant to the GEF mandate? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do NCSAs adequately take into account sustainable development objectives of recipient countries and their related needs and priorities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do NCSAs support the strategic priorities of the GEF; including the strategy to enhance environmental management capacity in countries?
Efficiency in the processes to implement NCSAs and prepare Final Reports and Action Plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the support to NCSAs channeled in an efficient way? How efficient were stakeholders' involvement and partnership arrangements for designing and implementing NCSAs and preparing final reports and Action Plans? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were NCSAs built on on-going and existing work, such as GEF and other projects, enabling activities, national communications and other activities supporting capacity development? 	
Effectiveness: What are the main achievements of the NCSAs, individually and at aggregate levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were capacity needs and action plans endorsed /approved nationally and how? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was conventions guidance taken into account and is it implemented? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the synergies between NCSAs and GEF supported activities? What have been the achievements of NCSAs at the aggregate level, based on individual achievements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What types of CCCD (CB2) projects were developed following NCSAs?
Results: What are the long-term results of NCSAs at country (each individual grant) and global levels (aggregated)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What degree is there of local ownership of NCSAs; their capacity needs and the required actions? Do NCSAs have a catalytic role in recipient countries? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have NCSAs contributed to develop the capacity of countries to meet MEA responsibilities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were NCSAs recommendations integrated into the wider national sustainable development and environmental agendas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will NCSA achievements be sustainable over the long-term? Were there any synergies between NCSAs and the planning of GEF activities; including

Criteria for effective implementation of NCSAs				
Area of Focus	National ownership and leadership	Decisions from Conventions	Holistic approach	Long-term approach
				the National Prioritization Formulation Exercise (NPFE)?

Evaluation design, methods and timeframe

16. The evaluation will take place between mid-February until early November when its main findings and recommendations will be presented to the GEF Council at its November 2011 meeting as part of the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report to GEF Council. The full evaluation report will be available through the GEF Evaluation Office Web site. The evaluation will be conducted by an evaluation team comprised of GEF Evaluation Office staff, a senior consultant and research assistants.

Evaluation Design

17. The first set of tasks include the hiring of consultants to form the evaluation team, conduct a consultation with key stakeholders on key issues that should be included in the evaluation, finalize the terms of reference for the evaluation, prepare up to date databases of projects and develop protocols for project and document reviews and interviews.

- Selection and hiring of consultants (consultant’s contract should start on or about March 15). A request of interest was created for a senior consultants and research assistants, in mid January followed by interviews, selection and contracting. Each consultancy will have separate terms of reference.
- Preparation of terms of reference for the evaluation and its approval by the Director of GEFO by mid-April. These terms of reference have been prepared after consultations with key stakeholders, particularly GEFO, GEFSEC, UNDP and UNEP representatives that have been engaged with the NCSA program as well as with broader capacity development issues. Several GEF Focal Points were also consulted in the finalization of the terms of reference, through consultations during the GEF supported Expanded Constituency Workshops conducted for countries in central Africa, Caribbean and Eastern Europe. In addition to the terms of reference, an up to date database of all NCSA and second-phase projects will be prepared including basic project information, such as project cycle dates, financial information, implementing and executing agencies and key expected outcomes.
- Development of protocols for conducting interviews with key stakeholders, NCSAs reviews and capacity development activities in GEF portfolio (March-April). These protocols will provide the framework to conduct reviews and interviews in a standardized format.

Evaluation Context

18. The evaluation will begin by establishing the context of the NCSAs in the GEF through three tasks: a review of capacity development in GEF supported projects and programs; a review of other types of

capacity development conducted at the national level not supported by GEF funding, in particular those described in enabling activities and other reporting to the Conventions; and a meta evaluation of GEF Evaluation Office documents as well as relevant documents from evaluation offices of the GEF Agencies regarding capacity development and in particular lessons, findings, conclusions and recommendations about NCSAs.

- Review of capacity development activities across GEF projects and programs approved in GEF3 and GEF4, since the approval of the first NCSA (March – May). A project review protocol will be developed to conduct a review of capacity development activities supported through regular GEF projects and programs. This will provide a context in which NCSAs were prepared and implemented as well as it will help to respond to the questions of relevance and synergies of NCSAs with other GEF supported activities. In addition, this review will produce an inventory of types and amount of funding provided by the GEF for capacity development in the last two GEF phases. Since this will be a review of inputs (at project and program approval) no attempt will be made at assessing the results or effectiveness of these supported activities.
- Review of capacity development activities as well as assessments of needs, at the country level, with relationship with the global environmental conventions and supported by sources other than the GEF (March – May). This overview of other activities supporting capacity development will be conducted at the global and regional levels to place the GEF in context. Activities will be identified using the Rio conventions and other relevant institutions websites. In addition, each of the country visits (see below) will include a brief overview of capacity development activities at the national level, using for example NCSAs and other enabling activities that identify these other activities, since they usually would have an inventory of capacity development activities in the country.
- Meta evaluation of GEF Evaluations as well as other evaluations from GEF Agencies to extract evaluative evidence regarding capacity development (March – April). As mentioned above, the GEF Evaluation Office has not conducted a system wide evaluation of capacity development but several evaluations have included components dealing with this subject. The study conducted in 2007 included two components: a review of capacity development lessons and achievements from a series of completed projects and two country case studies: the Philippines and Vietnam. This study will be incorporated in the meta-evaluation. Furthermore, evaluative evidence coming from evaluations conducted by the evaluation offices of GEF Agencies will be also considered. In particular, the recently completed independent evaluation of the GSP will be incorporated into this meta-evaluation and will be analyzed separately and synthesized in the final report. Furthermore, the UNDP Evaluation Office has agreed to incorporate some of the key questions in their Annual Development Results Evaluations (ADR, evaluations of UNDP support at the country level) that will be conducted during 2011 (15 country level evaluations are expected to take place).

Data Collection

19. Data will be collected using a mixture of tools. Early on in the evaluation, the evaluation team will conduct interviews with key stakeholders, in particular representatives from GEFSEC, GEF Agencies and

GEF Focal Points. In addition to interviews, an online survey will be conducted to reach other stakeholders in the GEF partnership, such as conventions focal points, NGOs and other representatives of GEF Agencies. All NCSAs reports will be assessed using a protocol prepared especially for the evaluation which will contain sections on the four focus areas of the evaluation and using the NCSA Results and Lessons report as a key supporting document to build on. To respond in particular to the issues of effectiveness, relevance and results all second phase projects will also be reviewed using a different protocol. Data collection at the country level will be done through three methods: the meta evaluation from GEF Evaluation Office documents will produce country level data; teleconferences with GEF Focal Points and NCSA teams and visits to a selection of countries to conduct in-depth assessments. Countries will be selected, both for teleconferences and country visits, to represent different situations and stages in implementation. For example, countries that would have preference would include: those with completed NCSAs; those with a second phase under implementation; and those that chose not to do an NCSA.

- Interviews of key stakeholders (March – September). Interviews will be conducted throughout the entire evaluation period. Interviews of people with more extensive participation in the development and implementation of NCSAs will be given priority. In particular, priority will be given to representatives of GEFSEC, UNDP and UNEP that were involved in the development of the 2003 GEF Capacity Development Strategy as well as in the preparation and implementation of NCSAs.
- Online survey of stakeholders regarding relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and results of NCSAs (May – June). A short online survey will be developed, implemented and analyzed reaching out to key stakeholders. The survey will be available in English, French, Spanish, Russian, Chinese and Arabic. The results, if response rates are sufficiently high, will provide another data source for triangulating the analysis. Analysis will be conducted according to categories of respondents.
- Review of NCSAs (April – May). Building on the NCSA Synthesis Report and the work conducted for this report, all approved NCSAs will be reviewed (desk review) using the protocol developed earlier to collect information on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and results. The status of the NCSA (completed, under implementation or start-up) will determine the focus of the review. Interviews and visits to selected countries (see below) will complement this review.
- Review of Second Phase CD projects (April – May). Each of the approved second phase CD projects will be reviewed (desk review) using the project review protocol developed earlier. The two key areas of focus of this review will be the relevance of these projects to the NCSAs recommendations and action plans and the efficiency of their processing. When appropriate the review of these projects will also provide data to the analysis of the sustainability of the NCSAs results.
- The evaluation will propose three ways to collect information at the country level:
 - a. The meta-evaluation proposed above will generate data at the country level.

- b. Develop a protocol to review capacity development activities in GEF funded projects under GEF-3 and GEF-4
- c. Teleconference with GEF Focal Points and NCSAs teams (May – July). The evaluation will select a few countries and will conduct a teleconference with country representatives that have been involved with the preparation and implementation of NCSAs. An interview protocol will be prepared for this teleconference and shared with the interviewees.
- d. Visits to a group of countries to collect data from all key areas of the evaluation including verification of expected outcomes and results (May – July). Terms of reference will be developed to conduct the visits and prepare country reports upon return. The visit will include extensive meetings and interviews with different types of stakeholders that are familiar with the NCSAs and those that were expected to receive benefits from them. In addition, a few GEF projects that had a particular emphasis on capacity development will be selected for a visit, depending on available time. It is expected that country visits will last about 2 days, depending on the extent of GEF support to capacity development activities. The evaluation will benefit from inputs at the country level coming from the GEF Country Portfolio Evaluations (at least 3 or 4 are expected to be completed by July or August) and the UNDP Assessment of Development Reports by the UNDP Evaluation Office.

20. Countries for teleconferences and visits will be selected according to a set of criteria to be developed, including: synergies with other visits conducted by GEFEO staff; status of NCSA (completed, on-going, just started); countries that have not had CPEs or other extensive GEFEO visits in the last 5 years; diversity in GEF agencies; diversity in types of countries (LDCs, SIDs, etc.); regional diversity.

Analysis

21. Once all data is collected it will be analyzed after the proper quality control is conducted. Trends, lessons and main findings and conclusions will be extracted to prepare a draft report to be discussed at a consultation workshop with key stakeholders.

- Analysis of data (July – September). Data collected using the different methods described above will be assessed for quality, corrected when necessary and then analyzed.
- Draft Report (September 7). The draft report will contain sections that present the five key areas of focus of the evaluation as well as a description of the actual methodology applied and any limitations or challenges encountered as well as how they were solved.
- Consultation workshop to discuss draft report (September 15). A consultation workshop will take place with key stakeholders to discuss the key findings and conclusions as well as possible recommendations for GEF Council consideration. This is following standard practice of the GEF Evaluation Office. Participants will receive the draft report about one week prior to the workshop.

They will be encouraged to send comments prior to the workshop. Comments and discussions from the workshop will be incorporated, as appropriate and relevant in the drafting of the final report.

Report and presentation to Council

22. The final report will be synthesized and the main findings and recommendations will be included in the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report to be presented to GEF Council at its November session (to take place during the week of November 7, 2011). Since the Annual Thematic Report should be uploaded in the GEF Council Web Site by October 10, the final NCSA evaluation report should be completed by mid-September, 2011. The full report will be available through the GEF Evaluation Office Web site.

Evaluation Tasks and Timetable

months in 2011 (calendar)

Task	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>Evaluation Design</u>												
- Consultants selection and contracting												
- Consultation with key stakeholders												
- Terms of Reference approved												
- Database												
- Protocols development												
<u>Evaluation Context</u>												
- Review of CD in GEF projects												
- Review of CD from other sources												
- Meta evaluation of existing evaluations												
<u>Data Collection</u>												
- Interviews												
- Online survey												
- Review of NCSAs												
- Review of second phase CD												
- Teleconference with NCSA teams												
- Country visits												
<u>Analysis</u>												
- Data analysis												
- Draft Report												
- Consultation workshop												
<u>Report and presentation to Council</u>												
- Final Document												
- Presentation to Council												

Time Table and inputs (in days) from team (GEFEO staff, Senior consultant and 2 research assistants)

Task	Month (calendar year 2011)												Total input
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
<u>Evaluation Design</u>													
Consultants selection and contracting	2	2											4
Consultation with key stakeholders	1	0	4										5
Approach paper approved			7										7
Database			3.5	2									5.5

Task	Month (calendar year 2011)												Total input
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Protocols development			3	5									8
<u>Evaluation Context</u>													
Review of CD in GEF projects					7	7	9						23
Review of CD from other sources				9.5	9								18.5
Meta evaluation of existing evaluations				5.5	5								10.5
<u>Data Collection</u>													
Interviews				2.5	7	6	4	4	4				27.5
Online survey				2.5	3	6							11.5
Review of NCSAs				7	8	10.5	10						35.5
Review of second phase CD				4	3	5.5	5						17.5
Teleconference with NCSA teams					2	8	11						21
Country visits					3	0	30	32					65
<u>Analysis</u>													
Data analysis							0	27	27				54
Draft Report									21				21
Consultation workshop									10				10
<u>Report and presentation to Council</u>													
Final Document										24			24
Presentation to Council											15		15
Total	3	2	17.5	38	47	43	69	63	62	24	15	0	383.5

Inputs by task from each team member (Fy11 and FY12)

Task	GEFEO	Senior	Research Consultant 1	Research Consultant 2	Total
<u>Evaluation Design</u>					
Consultants selection and contracting	4	0	0	0	4
Consultation with key stakeholders	2	1	2	0	5
Approach paper approved	2	2	3	0	7
Database	1.5	0	4	0	5.5
Protocols development	2	3	1	2	8
<u>Evaluation Context</u>					
Review of CD in GEF projects	4	4	0	15	23
Review of CD from other sources	3	1.5	14	0	18.5
Meta evaluation of existing evaluations	3	1.5	6	0	10.5
<u>Data Collection</u>					
Interviews	9	7.5	7	4	27.5
Online survey	3	2.5	6	0	11.5
Review of NCSAs	3.5	2	17	13	35.5
Review of second phase CD	3.5	2	12	0	17.5
Teleconference with NCSA teams	5	7	9	0	21

Task	GEFEO	Senior	Research Consultant 1	Research Consultant 2	Total
Country visits	16	21	21	7	65
<u>Analysis</u>					
Data analysis	10	20	20	4	54
Draft Report	5	7	7	2	21
Consultation workshop	2	3	3	2	10
<u>Report and presentation to Council</u>					
Final Document	2	10	15	2	29
Presentation to Council	2	1	10	2	15
Total	82.5	96	157	53	388.5

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix will serve as a general guide for the evaluation. It provides directions for the evaluation; particularly the collect of relevant data. It will be used as a basis for developing data collection instruments such as interview guide and document review guide. It will also provide a basis for structuring the evaluation report as a whole.

Evaluated Component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Evaluation criteria: Relevance of NCSAs to the GEF mandate, the multinational and regional environmental agreements and conventions working with the GEF and the recipient countries' sustainable development and environmental agendas?				
<i>What is the relevance of NCSAs to the implementation of multinational and regional environmental agreements and conventions working with the GEF?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How were the NCSA process and its reports related to the national implementation of conventions? ▪ Were conventions guidance taken into account when implementing NCSAs and producing their reports? ▪ Were lessons and experiences from the implementation of NCSAs fed into convention processes related to capacity development? ▪ What is the relevance of the NCSAs with other capacity development activities supporting the implementation of the conventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of coherence between NCSAs objectives and those of the MEAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conventions documents ▪ GEF and Conventions web sites ▪ NCSA reports and actions plans ▪ OPS4 ▪ Key Informants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents analyses ▪ Web sites review ▪ Interviews ▪ Survey
<i>To what extent have NCSAs been relevant to the GEF mandate?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How do NCSAs support the strategic priorities of the GEF; including the strategy to enhance environmental management capacity in countries? ▪ What were the links between NCSAs and GEF projects and programs and other capacity development activities supported by the GEF? ▪ Were there any synergies between NCSAs and the planning of GEF activities; including the National Prioritization Formulation Exercise (NPFE)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of coherence between NCSAs objectives/priorities and of the GEF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NCSA reports and actions plans ▪ GEF Strategic Priorities ▪ OPS4 ▪ Key Informants ▪ GEF web sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents analyses ▪ Web sites reviews ▪ Interviews ▪ Survey
<i>To what extent have NCSAs been relevant to recipient countries needs and priorities within the context of national sustainable development agendas?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do NCSAs adequately take into account sustainable development objectives of recipient countries and their related needs and priorities? ▪ Have NCSAs remained relevant in terms of scope and process? Any examples? ▪ What were the links between NCSAs and governance structures and mechanisms dealing with environmental management, capacity development and national sustainable development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree to which NCSAs support national environmental objectives and priorities ▪ Environmental status in recipient countries ▪ Examples of linkages between NCSAs and national environmental management frameworks ▪ Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of NCSAs design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities? ▪ Level of involvement of Government officials and other partners into NCSAs ▪ Coherence between needs expressed by national 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Related Country strategies, policies and programmes ▪ NCSA reports and actions plans ▪ OPS4 ▪ Needs assessment studies ▪ GEF FPs, other key government officials and other partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents analyses ▪ Web site reviews ▪ Interviews ▪ Survey

Evaluated Component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
		stakeholders and GEF policies and strategies		
Evaluation criteria: Effectiveness – What are the main achievements of NCSAs at country and global levels?				
<i>How were the NCSAs effective in achieving their expected outcomes?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What have been the achievements of NCSAs at the aggregate level, based on individual achievements? ▪ How do NCSAs relate to NCSA principles? ▪ Were capacity needs and action plans endorsed /approved nationally? ▪ What types of CCCD (CB2) projects were developed following NCSAs? ▪ Was conventions guidance taken into account and is it implemented? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Systematically assessment of priority needs; ▪ Preparation of national capacity development plans, which should contain objectives and actions required to improve the ability of individuals, institutions and systems to make and implement decisions, and to perform functions in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner ▪ Approved national environmental priorities ▪ Degree of national acceptance / endorsement of NCSA reports; including action plans; examples ▪ Examples of NCSA contributions to strengthen functions necessary to meet MEA responsibilities ▪ Examples of synergies between NCSAs and other GEF supported activities ▪ Quality of NCSA reports ▪ Examples of significant capacity gains ▪ Type of follow up activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NCSA reports and actions plans ▪ GEF Focal Points ▪ Key stakeholders ▪ Related national strategies and programmes ▪ NCSA management teams ▪ Key Informants from GEF and Implementing Agencies ▪ NCSA management committees Meetings Minutes ▪ CCCD project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents analysis ▪ Meetings ▪ Interviews ▪ Survey ▪ Country visits
Evaluation criteria: Efficiency in the processes to implement NCSAs and prepare Final Reports and Action Plans?				
<i>Was the support to the NCSAs channeled in an efficient way?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Did NCSAs use the guidance received from the GSP, including the NCSA Resource Kit? ▪ Were NCSAs built on on-going and existing work, such as GEF and other projects, enabling activities, national communications and other activities supporting capacity development? ▪ Was there a direct and strong link between expected results of NCSAs and their design (in terms of Project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)? ▪ How long did it take to prepare and implement NCSAs? ▪ Did NCSAs take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? Any limitations? ▪ Did NCSA implementation and preparation face implementing challenges? ▪ Was adaptive management used? How well were risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guidance included in the resource kit ▪ Inception reports – including work plans - and any changes made to them were used as management tools during implementation ▪ Availability and quality of progress and financial reports ▪ Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided ▪ Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures ▪ Planned vs. actual funds leveraged ▪ Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost ▪ Proportion of total expertise utilized taken from recipient countries ▪ Level of project progress review done by the NCSA management committees ▪ Occurrence of change in design/ implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NCSA Resource Kit ▪ NCSA reports and actions plans; including inception reports and PIRs ▪ NCSA management teams ▪ Key Informants ▪ NCSA management committees Meetings Minutes ▪ GEF Focal Points ▪ NCSA (self) evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews ▪ Survey ▪ Meetings with NCSA management teams

Evaluated Component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and assumptions being managed? ▪ Were there an institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanisms to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations were shared among stakeholders? ▪ Did NCSAs mainstream gender considerations into their implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> approach (ie restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency ▪ Existence, quality and use of M&E, feedback and dissemination mechanism to share findings, lessons learned and action plans ▪ Gender disaggregated data in project documents 		
<p><i>How efficient were stakeholders' involvement and partnership arrangements for designing, implementing NCSAs and preparing final reports and action plans?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How country-driven were NCSA processes? Who conducted NCSAs? ▪ Were all relevant and appropriate country stakeholders involved? What were their roles and responsibilities? ▪ What were the challenges in implementing national project steering committees? Any other collaborative arrangements established/used? ▪ Which collaboration methods were successful or not and why? ▪ What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements among stakeholders, GEF Focal Points and GEF Executing Agencies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in the implementation of NCSAs ▪ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners ▪ Examples of supported partnerships ▪ Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained ▪ Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NCSA reports and actions plans ▪ NCSA management teams ▪ Key Informants ▪ GEF Focal Points ▪ Key informants ▪ NCSA (self) evaluation reports ▪ NCSA management committees Meetings Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews ▪ Meetings ▪ Survey
<p>Evaluation criteria: Results - What are the long-term results of NCSAs at country (each individual grant) and global levels (aggregated)?</p>				
<p><i>What are the long-term results of NCSAs?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have NCSAs had a catalytic role in recipient countries? ▪ At what level were results of NCSAs achieved: individual, institutional and/or systemic? ▪ Have NCSAs contributed to develop the capacity of countries to meet MEA responsibilities? ▪ How did participants and their organizations assimilate results of efforts made during the implementation of NCSAs? ▪ What degree is there of local ownership of NCSAs; their capacity needs and the required actions? ▪ Were there any synergies between NCSAs and the planning of GEF activities; including the National Prioritization Formulation Exercise (NPF)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Examples of NCSA achievements ▪ Examples of synergies in projects and programmes amongst the GEF focal areas and convention issues that can be traced back to NCSAs ▪ Examples of integration of global environmental issues into national strategies that are related to NCSAs ▪ Examples of commitments or actions on biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation or persistent organic pollutants (POPs) that are related to NCSAs ▪ Examples of NCSAs with catalytic roles ▪ Changes related to the mainstreaming of GEF activities in national planning frameworks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Change in strategies/programmes/practices related to global environmental agenda ○ Change in capacity for knowledge acquisition and sharing ○ Change in capacity for awareness raising; stakeholder involvement and government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NCSA final reports and actions plans ▪ GEF Focal Points ▪ Key stakeholders ▪ NCSA (self) evaluation reports ▪ NCSA management teams ▪ Key Informants ▪ NCSA management committees Meetings Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents analysis ▪ Meetings ▪ Interviews ▪ Survey

Evaluated Component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
		awareness; change in stakeholder behavior ○ Change in capacity in policy making and planning for mainstreaming GEF activities in national planning frameworks ○ Change in capacity in mobilizing resources		
<i>Will NCSAs' achievements be sustainable over the long-term?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How were NCSAs recommendations integrated into the wider national sustainable development and environmental agendas? ▪ Were sustainability aspects integrated into the design and implementation of NCSAs? ▪ Did NCSAs adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues? ▪ What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of NCSAs? ▪ What is the sustainability of collaborative mechanisms established or strengthened through the NCSA process? ▪ Were any NCSAs replicated and/or scaled up in countries supported and also in other countries? ▪ What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts? What can be done about it? ▪ Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the NCSAs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence/Quality of sustainability strategy and steps taken to address sustainability ▪ Type of NCSA follow up activities ▪ Level and source of future financial support to be provided to follow up activities to NCSAs in recipient countries ▪ Evidence of political commitments through speeches, strategies, programmes and resource allocation to priorities established by the NCSA action plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NCSA final reports and actions plans ▪ GEF Focal Points ▪ Key stakeholders ▪ NCSA (self) evaluation reports ▪ NCSA management teams ▪ Key Informants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews ▪ Meetings ▪ Survey ▪ Document analysis