

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2045	
GEF Agency project ID		2986	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP, UNEP, World Bank	
Project name		GEF National Consultative Dialogue Initiative	
Country/Countries		Global	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Multifocal	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 1-4, 6-10	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		September 2003	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 2003	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2007	
Actual date of project completion		December 2010	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		5.7749	5.77 (expected)
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.249 (in-kind)	0.25 (expected)
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		5.7749	5.77 (expected)
Total Co-financing		0.249	
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.0239	6.02 (expected by project completion)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		August 2009	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Jean-Joseph Bellamy	
TER completion date		January 2015	
TER prepared by		Aditi Poddar	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation*	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	N/R	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	Not Applicable	N/R	U/A
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Implementation	S	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	U/A
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MS

*The Terminal Evaluation (TE) does not give its own independent ratings for different aspects of the project. It provides a description of the particular aspect and the ratings given by the respondents in the evaluation surveys carried out.

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of this project, as stated in the Project Document (PD, pg. 14), are to build knowledge and an understanding of global environmental issues at the national level, and of how the GEF can assist countries to respond to those issues. It seeks to: (i) promote in-depth understanding of the GEF's strategic directions, policies and procedures; (ii) strengthen country coordination and ownership in GEF operations and sharing lessons learned from project implementation; and (iii) achieve greater mainstreaming of GEF activities into national planning frameworks and coordination and synergies amongst the GEF focal areas and international convention issues at the national level (TE pg. 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD (pg. 6), the project will have the following Development Objectives:

- (a) To promote in-depth understanding of the GEF's strategic priorities, business plan, policies and procedures, including the range of operational tools that have been developed for accessing GEF assistance, and to share lessons learned from GEF project implementation reviews.
- (b) To conduct a dialogue with national stakeholders on national strategies, processes and implementation challenges related to global environmental issues.
- (c) To seek country inputs into the design of national level consultations to be conducted during years two to four of the project.
- (d) To continue strengthening country coordination and engagement in GEF activities by promoting national level coordination among multiple stakeholders and synergies amongst the GEF focal areas and convention issues.

- (e) To support the efforts of countries and the Implementing Agencies to mainstream GEF activities into national planning frameworks, such as national sustainable development strategies and poverty reduction strategies.

The GEF National Dialogue Initiative has two main components. Component 1, which was expected to be one-year long, was to focus on sub-regional consultations with national GEF focal points and other key stakeholders. These consultations were to inform all GEF participating countries of the recommendations and decisions of the GEF Council and Assembly. They also provided an opportunity to obtain inputs from the participants into the design of Component 2 of the National Dialogue Initiative, which was to focus on national level consultations, as well as on the GEF Country Support Programme for Focal Points.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

No, there were no changes to the Global Environment Objectives or the Development Objectives.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The national dialogues are relevant for the environmental objectives of the participating countries. The TE finds that national environmental objectives were one area of focus in the dialogues. They also attempted to align GEF activities with national sustainable development and/or environmental policies. The evaluation surveys conducted found that over 85% of respondents from participating countries indicated that the dialogues were either ‘Highly Relevant’ or ‘Relevant’, and that respondents acknowledged their positive role in improving national coordination mechanisms. Some even found that these dialogues improved cooperation between representatives from the ministries of environment and stakeholders.

The initiative is also aligned with one of the fundamental principles of the GEF Instrument, which highlights the GEF’s commitment “to facilitating continued effective participation, as appropriate, of major groups and local communities and to promoting opportunities for mobilizing outside resources in

support of GEF activities”. It is consistent with the recommendations of the Second and Third Overall Performance Study of the GEF and the independent evaluation of the Country Dialogue Workshops program (TE pg. 1). The Overall Performance Studies recommend that the GEF should continue efforts to support capacity development and empowerment of operational focal points. They also recommend that the GEF cultivate a stronger country program focus, and track sustainability and catalytic effects. As the national dialogues involved discussions of national environmental issues and prioritization, GEF strategies and how they can fit with national sustainable development agendas, and how national coordination mechanisms could be improved, they did contribute to the development of stronger country programs. The TE surveys also found that about 90% of respondents believed that the initiative was either ‘Highly Relevant’ or ‘Relevant’ to the global environmental agenda and GEF objectives.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for program effectiveness, but provides percentage of the evaluation survey responses for various points on the ratings scale for each of the program objectives. For instance, it reports that 24% of the respondents rate the effectiveness of outcome 1 of the program as ‘Highly Satisfactory’ whereas 61% rate it as ‘Satisfactory’ (TE pg. 15). The program successfully completed the target number of dialogues, which were also successful in improving the participants’ understanding of GEF strategies and procedures, and their relationship to national priorities. The few weaknesses that the program suffered from were poor follow-up after the dialogues, lack of use of case studies to focus discussions and the short duration of these dialogues.

The TE reports that the program was meeting its expected outcomes at the time of its writing. However, it is difficult to compare the actual achievement of most of the outcomes to their expected levels. The PD did not specify any targets other than those for the number of consultations. However it seems that additional targets were decided on at some point during project implementation. Thus PIR 2008 and 2010 provide an expanded list of targets. At the same time, some of the targets developed over project implementation are vague and non-specific.

Two of the indicators for objective 1, the number of consultations and national dialogues can be compared easily. The PD (pgs. 7-8) specifies that up to 11 sub-regional consultations and up to 45 multi-stakeholder national dialogues will be delivered. The PIR 2010 shows the target level to be 8 sub-regional consultations, thus it seems that this target was decreased during program implementation. The PIR 2010 also reports that 46 national dialogues with an average of 75 participants per event had been delivered by June 2010. To gauge the participants’ actual understanding of GEF strategies and procedures, the PIR reports that evaluation documents such as national reports on the dialogues and evaluation questionnaires indicate that the participants have gained an understanding of GEF strategies and procedures. As mentioned above, the TE states 85% of the respondents rate the effectiveness of outcome 1 of the program as ‘Satisfactory’ or higher.

For objective 2 (conduct a dialogue with national stakeholders on national strategies, processes and implementation challenges related to global environmental issues), 82% of the respondents indicated their rating to be ‘Satisfactory’ or higher. The PIR 2010 mentions that evaluation documents indicate

that participants have gained an understanding of the relationship between GEF strategies and national priorities.

The TE does not provide respondents' rating for objective 3 (seek country inputs into the design of national level consultations to be conducted during years two to four of the project). The PIR 2010 reports that the success of this outcome is reflected in the fact that country contributions to the needs assessment informed the design of the 2007 Sub-Regional Workshops and the online Knowledge Facility for GEF Focal Points.

76% of respondents rated objective 4 (continue strengthening country coordination and engagement in GEF activities by promoting national level coordination among multiple stakeholders and synergies amongst the GEF focal areas and convention issues) as 'Satisfactory' or higher. The PIR 2010 notes that feedback from GEF Focal Points indicates that they have gained understanding of their enhanced role in coordination. Additionally, a majority of the 46 participating countries recommended coordination commitments and/or activities after their national dialogues. The TE finds that 81% of the respondents believed that the national dialogue had contributed to improving national coordination on GEF and environmental issues. Finally, the PIR reports that many countries had follow-up consultations similar to the country dialogues, but it was difficult to quantify the program's contribution to enabling synergies.

For objective 5 (support the efforts of countries and the Implementing Agencies to mainstream GEF activities into national planning frameworks, such as national sustainable development strategies and poverty reduction strategies), only 73% of the respondents gave the rating 'Satisfactory' or higher. This implies that participants perceived the program to be more effective in building a better understanding about GEF strategies, policies and procedures than in supporting national efforts to mainstream GEF activities into national frameworks. The PIR 2010 and the TE both admit that it is difficult to assess the contribution of the national dialogues in the mainstreaming of GEF activities into national plans. While national reports on the dialogues have recommended specific actions regarding international conventions on biodiversity and the environment, and strengthening the links between GEF activities and the convention activities in the countries, it is unclear whether these actions have actually been taken.

The TE reports that 69% of the respondents rate the overall effectiveness of the dialogues as 'Satisfactory' or higher. Participants found the quality of presenters and presentations, the interaction across sectors, the opportunity to discuss/debate experiences and issues, and the review of national project portfolios to be the strengths of the dialogues. However, the program suffered from some minor weaknesses as well. The follow-up after the dialogues was poor, distributing material in advance of the dialogue might have been better, and important resources such as case studies were not used to focus the discussions. The weakness most cited by participants in these national dialogues was the duration of these dialogues. They found them to be too short which did not leave them with enough time to adequately cover all topics on the agendas, or to interact with other stakeholders.

Overall, the project achieved its targets with some minor weaknesses in the process, and most stakeholders were satisfied with the initiative.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

On the whole, based on the evidence presented in the TE, the initiative was efficient in its use of resources. However, some minor issues affected the efficiency of project implementation. The program aimed to deliver up to 11 sub-regional consultations and up to 45 national dialogues in the span of four years from 2004 to 2007. At the time of the TE's writing in 2009 only 8 sub-regional consultations (it appears that this target might have been revised to 8 consultations from 11) and 42 national dialogues had been conducted, and the initiative was extended up to December 2010. The TE (pg. 27) reports that the sub-regional consultations, which had been planned to be conducted during 2004-2005, were delayed until 2006. The reason for this delay is stated as waiting for a resolution on the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF), which was expected to be taken at the GEF Assembly in August 2006. The Inter-Agency Steering Committee believed that it would be an inefficient use of resources to bring all GEF Focal Points together for discussions prior to this resolution.

The TE (pgs. 20, 21, 26) commends the initiative on its adaptive management approach, the coordination and program management carried out by the various agencies involved and its cost effectiveness. At the time of writing the TE, only 86% of the UNDP-administered budget had been spent, but a total of 50 events had been delivered. Thus, the average cost of organizing each event was only USD 77,000, which is lower than the USD 80,500 estimated in the PD. The surveys conducted by the TE also found that 95% respondents believed that financial resources had been utilized efficiently during the program.

The coordination between the various agencies involved in implementation and execution seems to have been smooth. All roles and responsibilities were clearly laid out in the PD. The Programme Management Team (PMT) was set up by the UNDP in New York to coordinate GEF Focal Points and manage the program. The GEF Secretariat provided strategic oversight and UNDP country offices worked together with national GEF Focal Points to organize national dialogues. UNOPS was the executing agency, which carried out procurements, prepared financial authorizations, and ensured accountability through monitoring. The TE (pg. 20) found that 89% of the stakeholders rated the program management as 'Satisfactory' or higher.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to Assess
---------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for Sustainability of Project Outcomes. It states that sustainability is not relevant for this initiative. The PD identifies some risks to the program during implementation but these were addressed and mitigation strategies were provided in PIR 2008 (TE pg. 18). This TER considers socio-political and institutional risks as potentially important factors, which might affect sustainability but is only able to assess financial sustainability. Thus, it is unable to provide an overall rating for sustainability.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes are further assessed along the following four dimensions:

Financial sustainability (MU) – The PD notes that there is a risk that enhanced country-level coordination capacities might not be maintained in the long term. The PIR 2008 clearly states that the initiative is “not mandated to support follow-up activities in this area and where coordination commitments have been made as a result of the dialogues.” While some countries had requested follow-up guidance and tracking support, the complementary Country Support Programme (CSP) provides only limited funds for Focal Points to host follow-up meetings, reproduce and translate documents, and carry out activities to support the sustaining of coordination capacities.

Socio-political sustainability (U/A) – The TE does not provide information on the socio-political risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.

Institutional sustainability (U/A) - The TE does not address the institutional risks to sustainability of program outcomes.

Environmental sustainability (NA) – This aspect of sustainability is not applicable to this initiative.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Committed co-financing from the country governments constituted only 4% of total project funding. It was committed in the form of in-kind contributions such as coordination time for the dialogues, venues for events and preparation of documents for the dialogues. However, the TE does not provide any details on the actual co-financing realized from the country governments. The PD attributes the rest of the program funds jointly to GEF, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank. The entire amount of USD 5.77 million is considered GEF financing though. It is unclear how crucial co-financing was to the achievement of the objectives of this program.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

As mentioned in the ‘Efficiency’ section, the program was delayed at start-up as sub-regional consultations were delayed by two years. This was done in order to wait for a resolution of the Resource Allocation Framework at the GEF Assembly in 2006. Program completion was extended from 2007 to 2010. However, these delays do not seem to have affected the program’s outcomes much.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership for this program seems to be moderately high. The TE reports that a participatory process was used to develop the agendas for the national dialogues. These agendas are very well aligned with national policies and priorities reflecting high country involvement and ownership. Additionally, some national reports highlighted the internalization of the lessons from these dialogues into national plans. A high number of respondents also indicated in the surveys that they were satisfied with the level of national ownership of the dialogues. Had the participating countries not been as involved, the impact of the dialogues would have been superficial and short-lived. For instance, national priorities would not have been included in the dialogues and thus ministries would have had very low interest in incorporating the decisions and lessons into their future actions.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E design. This TER rates the design as 'Moderately Satisfactory' as the PD specifies details for developing targets and survey instruments but these were not completed at entry.

The PD (pg. 18) lays out the M&E framework for the program, including clear allocation of responsibilities and timelines for reports and studies. This framework is satisfactory to some extent. The quality of the program was to be evaluated through questionnaires designed by the Project Coordination Unit (called the Programme Management Team) during the program. At the conclusion of each consultation, participants were to be requested to complete this evaluation questionnaire. The PD suggests that a follow-up questionnaire might be administered 6-12 months following the initial country dialogue to document enhanced country awareness on GEF strategic priorities, strengthened country coordination and ownership of GEF activities, incorporation of lessons learned in GEF project activities and greater mainstreaming of GEF activities into national planning frameworks. The PD recommends that these evaluations should consider elements such as representativeness in participation, adequacy of topics covered, quality of briefings, engagement of participants, outcomes (including agreed country level coordination), and a summary of follow-up actions. Annex B of the PD provides a logical framework with indicators and sources of verification specified but does not provide targets.

The PMT was to provide periodic compilations and evaluation summaries of consultative meetings and workshops, which were to be used for improving the consultations and enhancing support to participating countries during the course of project implementation. The PD (pg. 17) also provides a dedicated budget for M&E activities.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	--

M&E implementation had some problems. The TE (pg. 28) and PIR 2008 report that 11 indicators were developed to measure the progress of the five development objectives. These indicators can be divided into two categories, which used different sources to obtain data. The first category tracked the number of events and participants, and the diversity of these participants. These were tracked by the Programme Management Team (PMT) through their logs. The second category of indicators contained some subjective indicators, which required examples of certain activities or impacts. These were tracked through minutes of the consultations, national reports submitted after the dialogues and the evaluation questionnaires. While the indicators covered all the aspects of the program that needed to be tracked, the quality of the data received for the second set of indicators is poor. The TE (pg. 41) recommends improving the format of the questionnaires to improve the quality of this data. While the PD does not specify targets, the PIR 2008 and 2010 mention targets for each of the indicators but some of these are fairly vague and non-specific. For instance, to measure outcome 2, “seek country inputs into the design of national level consultations to be conducted”, examples of feedback provided by consultation participants is used as an indicator. The target specified is – “considerable majority of participants should be able to provide feedback at national level consultations.” It is unclear at what stage of the program these targets were specified.

The TE does not mention whether the periodic reviews or these indicators were used to identify problems in implementation. Since some details about the outcomes are available, it can be assumed that the data collected was useful in tracking project progress towards objectives.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The TE does not provide a rating for quality of project implementation. This TER rates project implementation only as Moderately Satisfactory due to the issues with M&E design.

According to the TE, project implementation was without problems. UNDP established the Programme Management Team (PMT), which was responsible for the day-to-day management of the program and for the quality and delivery of the consultations. UNDP with its network of country offices provided access to local knowledge and logistic support to organize the national and sub-regional dialogues. The TE (pg. 20) found that GEF Focal Point respondents appreciated the supported provided by UNDP and 80% of them credited the PMT for being open to feedback and adapting to changes. The project design seems appropriate given GEF and participant countries' priorities, and the fact that it has achieved most of its goals to a satisfactory level. However, the quality of M&E design was less than satisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide any information about the quality of project execution by UNOPS. It does, however, describe in detail the work carried out by the Programme Management Team established by UNDP (the lead implementing agency), which has been assessed in the 'Quality of Project Implementation' section above.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

TE does not provide any assessment of environmental changes that occurred as a result of the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Socio-economic impact does not seem to be relevant for this program.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

One of the program objectives was to deepen the participants’ understanding of GEF’s priorities, strategies, procedures and operational tools. This knowledge would help participant countries align their national plans with GEF priorities and allow them to access GEF resources. In addition, GEF Focal Points learned about their enhanced role in coordination.

b) Governance

The program strengthened national level coordination and engagement in GEF activities which resulted in the recommendations by participants to their governments to develop coordination commitments. Additionally, national reports produced after the dialogues recognized the need to create and take advantage of the synergies between GEF focal areas and international convention activities in the countries. In Honduras, the dialogue was the catalyst for various Focal Points to convene and work together for the first time.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are reported in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The consultative dialogue approach is being used by some countries after their national dialogues. The PIR 2010 reports that some of the participating countries such as FYR Macedonia, Jordan, Thailand, India, Cuba, Honduras, India, Ecuador and Pakistan planned follow-up workshops using the National Dialogue Initiative framework, methodologies and materials. Iran and Cameroon planned a series of focal area specific stakeholder meetings as a follow up to their respective national dialogues.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE lists the following lessons (pgs. 39-40):

1. There is an evident need for a direct dialogue between stakeholders in countries and the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies. All interviewed stakeholders mentioned the benefits of this type of dialogue, including the need to dialogue with senior GEF Secretariat and Agency representatives. Moreover, the high interest in these national dialogues by stakeholders leads to the demand that these dialogues should not be a “one shot deal” but a regular communication/dialogue mechanism between GEF, its implementing partners and GEF recipient countries, timed with major milestones such as the GEF replenishment cycle.
2. The participation of senior GEF Secretariat and Agency representatives in these national dialogues is viewed as critical by stakeholders for dialoguing on GEF matters. It also guarantees the presence of national decision-makers at the appropriately senior level at these dialogues and, as a consequence, raises the profile of these national dialogues and their potential long-term impacts.
3. It is important to keep a clear line of communication between the GEF Operational Focal Point, the UNDP country office and the Programme Management Team (PMT) when planning and preparing a national dialogue.
4. The preparation of a dialogue necessitates a lot of communication and involves all GEF partners (GEF Secretariat and Agencies). The PMT should continue to coordinate and communicate on behalf of the 10 GEF Agencies and support the GEF Operational Focal Point to coordinate the process at the national level and to communicate with UNDP country offices and local GEF Agencies.
5. The provision of materials in local languages, as well as quality simultaneous interpretation during national dialogues, is necessary. It is particularly true when these dialogues are broadening the traditional sphere of stakeholders. The National Dialogue Initiative always translates the material in the local languages and the website should offer information at least in English, French, Spanish and Russian. Stakeholders request for information in their own languages and often this material becomes reference material for many stakeholders.
6. In order to deliver quality national dialogues, there is a need for a flexible approach to customize each national dialogue to the realities of the country in which it is organized, reflecting the context and the capacity of the country. It is particularly true when the emphasis is on linking national and local issues with global environmental issues and integrating GEF

activities into national strategies, policies and programs. This flexibility should be applied to the content and format of these dialogues but also to the GEF team of resource persons.

7. Within the context of implementing in-country GEF activities, greater national coordination is a need perceived by most stakeholders. It is also well studied in the document “GEF National Coordination – Lessons Learned (October 2005)” that includes five case studies. It is also in line with the idea of greater and more varied participation of stakeholders. However, each country has specific conditions and capacity to structure the appropriate coordination mechanism. Therefore, a “cookie-cutter” approach for a standardized coordination mechanism may not be the solution in most cases; each country needs to develop its best coordination mechanism.
8. The National Dialogue Initiative is one more instrument to break down the “silo” approach to global environmental management. It is a fact that national environmental management is often divided into clear “silos” such as climate change, biodiversity, land degradation, etc. National dialogues offer the opportunity for stakeholders to meet together and discuss linkages, synergies and the need for better cross-coordination. From this point of view it is complementary to the National Capacity Self- Assessment (NCSA) conducted in most countries.
9. Implementing this type of consultation necessitates much communication among partners and marshaling a great deal of information for the adequate preparation of these national dialogues. To succeed, the implementing agency needs to have access to a global network of professionals who can provide information and contacts and support the local preparation for such an event. It is a critical success factor for these national dialogues, and the UNDP Country Office system provides this network facility.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are provided in the TE (pgs. 40-43):

1. Emphasize time management of these national dialogues to keep the dialogues on track with the agendas by either preparing less ambitious agendas or longer dialogues, and leave the end of session discussions as planned to ensure stakeholder interaction.
2. In addition to the National Dialogue Initiative material that is always translated in local languages, continue to translate other GEF material in more languages including information accessible through the website.
3. Improve the feedback/evaluation form used at the end of each dialogue by adding a few additional questions: Did the dialogue meet your expectations? Do you think that the objectives were met? What are the three (or only one?) main things that you learned at this dialogue?
4. In addition to the traditional list of participants in these national dialogues, add a column to keep track of participants by gender.
5. Review the guidelines for national reports that are prepared by national organizers by giving a more standardized and detailed table of contents emphasizing the need for summaries of key points discussed per session and a set of recommendations or action plan.
6. Review the management of stakeholders’ expectations after the national dialogues are completed and ensure some follow-up activities.
7. Compile an electronic mailing list of participants in these national dialogues (with their

permission) and use this list as a means to disseminate information about GEF activities.

8. Enhance the website of the National Dialogue Initiative, particularly the access to some pages such as information on national dialogues prior to January 2007 (this earlier period does not appear to have been included). Additionally, a one-page table summarizing and giving access to the documents per country and per dialogue would be valuable and give a global view about the National Dialogue Initiative.
9. Continue the participation/presentation at national dialogues by senior representatives from the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies.
10. The Interagency Steering Committee should continue to meet twice a year as per its terms of reference. Moreover, the review of minutes of these committee meetings indicates a good record of what was discussed; however, it is also recommended that the decisions taken at these meetings be better summarized.
11. Emphasize the need for more balanced multi-stakeholder participation in the set of selection criteria used to assess a request for a national dialogue, and continue to monitor the sector representation at these national dialogues in order to encourage greater participation by other sectors particularly NGOs and the private sector.
12. Merge the Country Support Programme and the National Dialogue Initiative into one GEF corporate program.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provides an assessment of the relevant outcomes but does not discuss the impacts of the program in detail.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent and but does not provide its own ratings.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not assess critical aspects of sustainability.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are derived from all parts of the project and are presented with strong evidence from the project.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include details of actual co-financing used but does provide project costs per activity.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	It provides a good overview of M&E design and implementation and makes recommendations for improving the system.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).