

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2387	
GEF Agency project ID		3089 (Component 3)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		National Communications Programme for Climate Change	
Country/Countries		Global	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Capacity building, Enabling Activity	
Executing agencies involved		UNDP, UNEP	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		--	
Private sector involvement		--	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		16 April 2004	
Effectiveness date / project start		22 July 2004	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		31 December 2010	
Actual date of project completion		December 2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	NA
	Co-financing	0	NA
GEF Project Grant		58.649	3.83
Co-financing	IA own	0.64	NA
	Government	0	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	NA
	Private sector	0	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	NA
Total GEF funding		58.649	3.83
Total Co-financing		0.64	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		59.28	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 2013	
Author of TE		Elsa da Costa	
TER completion date		November 26, 2015	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	NR	NR	S

Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	NR	NR	ML
M&E Design	NR	NR	NR	S
M&E Implementation	NR	NR	NR	S
Quality of Implementation	NR	NR	NR	S
Quality of Execution	NR	NR	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

While the project objectives are primarily development objectives, they are instrumental to the achievement of the GEF's various environmental objectives related to climate change, namely:

- Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation
- Promoting the Adoption of Renewable Energy by Removing Barriers and Reducing Implementation Costs
- Reducing the Long-Term Costs of Low Greenhouse Gas Emitting Energy Technologies
- Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The main development objective of this project is to enhance country capacity to formulate and integrate climate change policy into national development policy. More specifically, the NCSP (National Communications Support Programme)'s goal is to *“provide an integrated package of support activities to promote the integration of climate change policy into national development policies”* (Project Document). In order to achieve this goal, the NSCP has three key objectives:

- Objective 1.* To facilitate implementation of enabling activities related to the preparation of National Communications;
- Objective 2.* To prepare and disseminate technical and policy-relevant materials, including methodologies and tools; and
- Objective 3.* To enhance knowledge management, best practices, communications and outreach.

(TE, p.2).

The project was designed to significantly enhance the capacity of participating non-Annex 1 Parties to prepare their national communications for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The activities of the project aimed to improve the quality,

comprehensiveness, and timeliness of national communications from non-Annex 1 Parties to the Convention in accordance with guidance provided by the Conference of Parties (TE, p.2).

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

There were no changes to the objectives of this project during implementation.

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 TE does not rate the relevance of this project. This TER rates the relevance of this project as Satisfactory.

The project is consistent with the objectives of the GEF-3's focal area on Climate Change. The project provides technical and policy support to more than 140 non-Annex I Parties in the preparation of their National Communications on Climate Change. Its goal is to provide an integrated package of support activities to promote the integration of climate change policy into national development policies. It 'supports and complements the efforts of the CGE and Secretariat and fulfills a specific role in essential technical backstopping and guidance around the NCs' (TE, p.ii).

The project is also consistent with national priorities. A strong majority of stakeholders surveyed expressed their agreement that the NCSP is relevant to national communications and that the project successfully supported NC country teams (TE, p.ii). As country needs are extremely specific, it should be considered a success for so many countries to have used technical guidance, products and tools made available as part of the NCSP. This demonstrates well that the NCSP met an important need in non-Annex 1 countries.

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

The TE assesses this project as having been highly effective. In the PIR (2010), the reporting UNDP Technical Advisor rates the progress of this project against its development objectives as satisfactory. This TER also rates effectiveness as satisfactory; while the first two objectives were exceeded or met, the third objective had some shortcomings. We discuss below the extent to which the various project objectives were achieved.

Objective 1. To facilitate implementation of enabling activities related to the preparation of National Communications

The TER considers that the NCSP has exceeded its objective to facilitate effective technical support for the preparation of NCs. Indeed, the TE provides ample example of countries using materials and support from the NCSP, as well as NCSP initiatives that go beyond planned project objectives.

According to the TE, ‘the technical backstopping has been the most valuable services provided to NAI countries, as it provides hands-on tailored technical support to countries requests’ (TE, p.13). Technical backstopping was flexibly delivered based on needs, mostly in response to specific technical questions, as well as to review draft versions of the NCs. Over the course of the project, the NCSP responded to over one hundred technical requests. In 2009, when several countries encountered difficulties finalizing their NCs, the NCSP launched a Targeted Backstopping Initiative. According to the TE (p.16), the responsiveness of the NCSP to individual country needs largely contributed to facilitating the implementation of the NC activities. According to surveys and interviews, this type of support was highly effective and appreciated by the participating countries.

The TE provides no evidence on the proportion of supported countries with NC project proposals approved by IAs, which was one of the two proposed effectiveness indicators for Objective 1.

Objective 2. To prepare and disseminate technical and policy-relevant materials, including methodologies and tools

The TER considers that the NCSP has met its objective to create and disseminate products and services useful for policy and technical needs. The TE provides convincing evidence that countries used and were satisfied with the various materials produced. In addition, there is evidence that NCSP materials and support was instrumental in improving/informing policies.

Over the project duration, the NCSP produced a number of guidance documents which were uploaded to the NCSP website. According to the TE (p.15), these documents have been widely used, in particular the GHG inventory methodology. In addition, and among others, the NCSP has produced a document on *The National Communication as a Tool for Integrating Climate Change into National Development*, and a guidance document on ‘how to increase the profile of NC reports in order to foster better understanding of the role the National Communication can play in linking climate change with national development priorities’ (TE p.17).

According to the TE (p.16), guidance documents effectively improved national communications on climate change, and ‘the improvement in the quality of the NC has been the key factor in NCSP’s contribution to the integration of climate change policy at the national level’.

The TE provides no evidence that countries used tools, methods, and approaches proposed by the NCSP to formulate technical solutions, which was one of the three proposed effectiveness indicators for Objective 2.

Objective 3. To enhance knowledge management, best practices, communications and outreach.

The TER considers that the NCSP has moderately met its objective to create an outreach and knowledge management strategy that would heighten understanding of technical and policy issues on climate change. In the following paragraphs, the TE describes the effectiveness of various NCSP knowledge management and outreach strategies.

The NCSP had planned to set up five Knowledge Networks (KNs). However, after the first two Networks were set up, they were largely unutilized and the remaining three have therefore not been set up. KNs have not been as effective as planned (TE p.18). The NCSP also organized numerous workshops, which countries have found highly beneficial (TE p.19). For example, technical workshops ‘contributed to increasing the technical capacity of NC teams’, and have been a key opportunity for the NCSP to assist countries in the integration of the NC as a tool for climate change policy in national plans. According to the TE, workshops were one of the most effective activities provided by the NCSP. The NCSP also developed a website and newsletter, both of which were produced by the NCSP team. Those tools, which were considered useful by countries, could have been better designed to engage their key audiences.

The TE provides no evidence that documented best practices were utilized, which was one of the two proposed effectiveness indicators for Objective 3.

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

The TE rates the efficiency of this project as satisfactory, which is consistent with the assessment of this review.

The GEF contribution was released as a lump sum to the NCSP and internally managed over the course of the programme (TE p.25). Financial management appears to have run smoothly, and the NCSP has efficiently managed its resources and was even able to continue providing support for two years longer than the initial expected project duration. In addition, countries expressed high levels of satisfaction with NCSP staff, praising their ability to respond to requests efficiently and in a timely fashion. The NCSP’s timeliness could have been better as, by the start of the project, several countries were already in advanced stages of preparing their second national communications.

In terms of complementarity with existing systems and organizations, the NCSP fared well. It worked well with strategic partners, and built on material, workshops and guidance tools produced by other bodies. However, the NCSP could have done more to engage regional level support (TE, p. 26).

The TE does not provide budgetary information, and there is therefore no evidence on expenditures per NCSP objective against expressed needs, which was one of the two proposed effectiveness indicators for Objective 3.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	---------------------------

The TE does not rate the sustainability of this project. This TER assesses a rating of Moderately Likely, finding some shortcomings in the planned capacity-building activities of the project, but acknowledging that the GEF has continued and will continue to provide support and funding to non-Annex 1 countries with their national communications. This TER proposes the following ratings:

Financial Risks - Likely ^[13]_[SEP]

This project is a long term GEF commitment to supporting non-annex 1 countries with their national communications. Funding for the preparation of national communications is therefore secure for the near future. In addition, and as is shown below in the Co-Financing section of this TER, there is evidence that the international community is interested in providing financial support towards NCs, which makes future financial support for similar activities likely

Socio-political Risks

There is insufficient evidence in the TE to rate socio-political risks

Environmental Risks

Not applicable

Institutional Risks – Moderately Likely

Some level of sustainability has been achieved by building national capacity; country stakeholders who have attended workshops or collaborated with technical experts will have gained experience and expertise that will prove valuable in the preparation of future NCs on climate change. According to the TE (p.27), the NCSP did build ‘capacity for integrating climate change into national development policies at the individual level, and, in many cases, at the institutional and inter-ministerial levels’. However, more could have been done to ensure that capacity built is expanded beyond NC team individuals who attend trainings and workshops. Overall, not enough was done to ensure technical know-how would be in place after project completion.

According to the PES, the most important way in which sustainability was going to be ensured as part of the project was by creating knowledge networks and decentralizing the model to regional partners. This would 'enhance national capacity and encourage sustainability over the longer-term' (Project Executive Summary p.6). Unfortunately, those two objectives were largely unmet as part of the project. Thematic knowledge networks, which were supposed to 'facilitate information sharing via email and internet' (Project Executive Summary p.6), stayed largely under-developed and unused, and regional partners have not been meaningfully involved in the project. According to the TE (p. 27), there still lacks 'good models to engage regional partners and expertise'.

Given this project is a long term GEF commitment to supporting non-annex 1 countries with their national communications, and that this weakness can be addressed in future phases of the project, this TER considers the issues described above do not pose an important sustainability risk, and therefore rate this component as 'moderately likely'.

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?

According to the TE, the amount of co-financing turned out to be a little less than expected (no figure provided), although additional co-financing was found along the way, notably support from the Swiss government to translate the UNDP Adaptation Policy Framework (APF), and support from the US EPA for the participation of the NCSP training course on the LEAP model (TE p.26).

No details are given to explain the reason why co-financing was less than expected, and it appears that the lower amount of co-financing did not impact project outcomes or sustainability.

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?

There are no reported delays in project start or implementation.

The project was extended from the planned date of December 2010 to December 2012. The extension was due to unspent funds earmarked for the NCSP program, which enabled it to continue providing funding until past its planned end date (TE p. 26). As a result, more support was provided to participating countries, thereby further contributing to the objectives of the project.

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:

As this is a global project, country ownership needs to be assessed in terms of intent and support provided by the participating countries as a collective. This – given the number of participating countries – is difficult to ascertain. Nevertheless, the TE provides an example of a country, Namibia, where the national Climate Change Committee took ownership over the NC process. In order to do so, Namibia ‘took full advantage of the NCSP’s workshops and technical review, especially for the GHG inventory, which, because of its institutional preparations, helped build the capacities of a large number of national stakeholders’ (TE p. 13). Several other countries have jumped on the opportunity to get access to technical support and improved their communication capacity as a result.

On the other hand, the report mentions “relatively low levels of country awareness about what the program has to offer” (TE p.iv), in particular regarding some aspects of the Outreach and Knowledge Management Activities (TE p. iii). This demonstrates low country ownership over key aspects of the project.

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: Satisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE did not assign a specific rating to the project’s M&E Design. This TER assesses a rating of **Satisfactory** to M&E Design at entry due to the quality of the M&E plan set up at project start.

The Project Document defined a clear M&E plan. According to the TE (pp.23-24), “The project document presented a results-based log frame matrix for the NCSP, which outlined the programme goal, objectives, outputs and activities. In addition, the document outlined a table of deliverables to be produced during the lifetime of the programme, which included six reports to the GEF Secretariat, two independent evaluations, and the monitoring of NCSP outputs”. A budget was also set aside for the two planned evaluations, and M&E responsibilities were included in staff TOR from the start.

The TE notes several shortcomings with the logframe. First, while the logframe specified the main goal, objectives, outputs and activities for each the three NCSP objectives, it did not establish outcomes or baseline conditions, making reviewing the progress of the NCSP quite challenging (TE p.24). The project

document only listed output-based indicators (e.g. number of newsletters or workshops), but no indicator for project outcomes or objectives.

This TER disagrees with the TE’s criticism of the M&E design. Given that this project’s objectives were largely to support countries in producing communication outputs, this TER supports this project’s M&E approach, which was to focus on tracking outputs and activities, and not to focus on outcomes.

Overall, despite the TE’s skepticism over the chosen M&E plan, this TER finds the M&E plan to have been detailed and appropriate for this project.

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

The TE did not assign a specific rating to the project’s M&E Implementation. This TER assesses a rating of Satisfactory to M&E Implementation as the M&E plan has overall been well executed despite weaknesses in reporting, and evaluation findings were used for program improvement.

Monitoring for this project appears to have been sporadic. According to the TE (p.24), “The quality and the frequency of the reporting declined over the course of the program. Two substantial reports were prepared for the 4th and 5th meetings of the Advisory Committee. Only one joint Annual Performance Report and Project Implementation Review Report have been prepared (by UNDP, for the period July, 2007 to June, 2008).

A mid-term evaluation was presented in February 2009, and a final evaluation in XX. Despite challenges getting the necessary data to report on project indicators, the NCSP did then manage to conduct a survey with participant countries twice a year. In addition, results from the MTE do appear to have been taken seriously. Indeed, the TE mentions several instances when course correction occurred following a recommendation in the MTE.

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: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for project implementation. This TER assesses project implementation to have been satisfactory, recognizing the overall successful implementation of the various project components, but noting some weaknesses regarding regional cooperation and advisory mechanisms.

The general NCSP project was well-designed, and benefited from being the continuation of a previous first phase of the NCSP. The umbrella approach chosen for this project has been successful in ensuring financial and technical assistance has been delivered in a timely manner (TE p.35). Activities, budgets and expectations appeared to have been very well specified, with the exception of the following two project components.

First, although it was the NCSP’s intention to engage regional institutions, it has not succeeded. The NCSP could not provide them with funds, and the regional institutions slowly became disengaged from the project. However, throughout the project, the NCSP continued its efforts to develop partnerships with regional organizations.

Second, the NCSP was to establish an Advisory Committee as well as a Project Implementation Committee. The TE (p. 22) found that “the Project Implementation Committee was never established and the Advisory Committee only met twice in the duration of the programme.” The failure of the Advisory Committee was largely due to staffing issues, but the TE (p.22) reveals that “there is a clear need in the future for a more solid steering committee for advice, monitoring and support”.

Because those weaknesses do not appear to have negatively affected project objectives, and given the overall good management throughout the project, this TER assesses project implementation as satisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for project execution. This TER assesses project execution to have been satisfactory, recognizing the effectiveness and efficiency with which program staff has provided support to countries as part of this project, but noting some shortcomings related to M&E activities.

The NCSP was designed to build upon the first phase of the NCSP, moving from a one-size fits all approach to more tailored support services (TE p.21). NCSP staff successfully managed this transition, frequently consulting stakeholders to find out about their needs in relation to NCs and taking initiatives to improve the relevance and usefulness of the NCSP to participating countries. The NCSP was very effective in responding to demands and ensuring that the NCSP would become a valuable tool for all interested countries.

The execution of M&E activities had shortcomings. For instance, performance reports were not prepared every year, and monitoring activities generally appear to have been neglected during parts of the project.

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.

Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable

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

The TE reports that, as a result of the project, countries now use NCSP technical guidance materials, have better access to NC technical and policy information, and that NCSP tools/methods are used to integrate climate change into policies (TE p.ii). "The programme's technical backstopping, workshops, and guidance materials have been highly valued by partner countries in the development of their NCs. NCSP support has helped build individual capacity for NAI NC teams and their respective ministries, and in some cases has encouraged and informed inter-ministerial or inter-institutional collaboration" (TE p.iv).

"In responses to "How has the process of developing a NC been relevant to support the following aspects of national efforts to address climate change?" the top three answers were related to institutional coordination and capacity building:

- i. Deepened relations between involved institutions (77%, 47/61)
- ii. Enhanced capacity building (73.8%, 45/61)
- iii. Established new links between institutions (70.5%, 43/61)¹

(TE p.30)

According to the logic chain of the NCSP program, this increase in capacity and enhanced relations between institutions should have contributed to a better integration of climate change policy into national development policies, and ultimately to better climate change outcomes.

b) Governance

The project created a website designed as a repository of resources on NCs. NC country teams now have access to the resources on the website, and more resources (guidance notes, technical documents, etc.) have been developed by the NCSP. (TE pp. 18-20)

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 were found as part of this project.

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.

Not Applicable

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 mentions the following lessons and good practices: (TE p. 35,)

- The NCSP should continue to focus on supporting countries to develop high-quality NCs for the purposes of follow-on policy processes, decision-making, and funding.

¹ *Ibid.*

- The IAs must strike a balance between being proactive and responsive, with a delivery approach that answers requests in relation to technical needs without exceeding their mandate.
- Interactive services and fora are most useful to and appreciated by partner countries for learning and information exchange. Linking NCSP activities to promote country engagement has proven successful.
- Using the relationship with the CGE as a starting point, the NCSP can continue to seek out specific synergies among other programmes and projects supporting EAs, as well as non-GEF capacity building measures. These relationships can lead to an expansion of platforms to launch materials, reduce administrative or knowledge management burdens, and expand the visibility of the programme.
- The Umbrella approach to providing countries with assistance for their NCs has been a good modality for delivering financial and technical assistance in a timely manner.
- The objective and the scope of the project design has been too ambitious with regards to the potential of the NC process, as well as with the resources made available to the NCSP.
- Regional participation has been challenging given the nature of the NC process, which is demand driven, and therefore the NCSP is not able to provide a defined workload and in turn provide funds for these institutions to allocate resources.
- The workshops remain a valuable part of the services provided by the NCSP, mainly because countries are keen to participate and exchange their own experiences.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE makes the following recommendations: (TE pp. 33-34)

- The NCSP should consider how to improve its delivery mechanisms to support the process of ensuring NCs develop beyond a reporting requirement and toward a technically sound framework document that is linked to national policies, informs policy-making and helps enable mainstreaming climate change at the national level.
- To the extent possible, the NCSP should encourage streamlined reporting processes, coherence between reporting requirements, and lessen administrative burdens for partner countries.
- As the NAI countries take on their SNC and TNC, their capacity needs become more specific to their national context. As such, there is a growing need for an even more tailored approach in the third phase of the NCSP. The requested from countries are increasingly varied and technical, as such, to respond to these needs, a tailored approach may be more effective to respond to country needs. Furthermore, the technical guidance would need to be updated and revised to provide targeted guidance, such as downscaling of certain models to reflect national circumstances.

- The NCSP could focus on building individual technical capacities at the national and regional levels in order to increase a network of expertise that is more responsive to national context and capacities, and that can contribute to the credibility of the NC, all the while continuing its inclusion of a mainstreaming component within its activities.
- Outreach is a key component to the delivery of NCSP support, the workshops remain a key activity to engage experts and provide an opportunity to share and network. These workshops should indeed continue during the next phase of the NCSP.
- Having online outreach is imperative to provide low-cost tools to engage participant countries. The NCSP should review the available online tools. Furthermore, the NCSP could make their website more user-friendly for countries, as well as review the potential use of social networking tools.
- As the capacity level for countries to undertake their NCs get increasingly varied, the importance of engaging the regional level support that can provide such technical and policy assistance will be key in the following support programme. Regional cooperation and institutions should be included at the design stage of the next support programme to get a clear sense of the resources available to the NCSP and to countries.
- The design of the next support programme should outline goals and outcomes that are within the scope of the NCSP in regards to the budget and resources available. In order for the NCSP to get a clear sense of its contribution and the attainment of its goal, it is imperative that a baseline be established, that the log frame includes indicators for the outcomes, as well as the outputs.
- As the reporting requirements under the convention are become more numerous and more frequent, and while capacities are being built at different paces and levels, the consideration of a permanent support programme that can assist with reporting requirements could be reviewed.
- The efficiency of the NCSP has also been compromised by the lack of regional engagement and support. As such, the NCSP team has had to shift its focus to providing targeted tailored assistance. To improve the efficiency of the NCSP in providing high quality and timely assistance, there will need to be an increase in human resources, as well as regional support.
- In order to ensure capacity built is expanded beyond NC team individuals who attend trainings and workshops, the NCSP should invest effort toward:
 - Cultivating formal and information relationships with regional/local institutions, and facilitating the development of partnerships between countries and these regional centres;
 - Developing and facilitate workshops for a larger group of attendees per country/NC team but with more regional and/or topic focus (e.g. two countries that have very specific similar needs or solutions);
 - Identifying and testing higher quality and faster quality ways to exchange experiences, lessons learned and best practices (replacing the function of the defunct knowledge networks and lack

of online), such as webinars featuring exchanges on country experiences and/or talks by the online roster of experts; and

- Assisting countries in navigating the proliferation of guidance on new and existing topics – LULUCF, MRV, CDM, etc. REDD – and how to integrate these topics into the NCs to make them more relevant for policy processes and decision-making.

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 does assess all relevant outcomes, impacts and the achievement project objectives, insofar as information was available. However, the TER finds the indicators in the review matrix (Annex 1) are not clearly discussed in the report, and could have been more specifically discussed in the "Evaluation Findings" section of the report.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, well structured and well written. The evidence presented is convincing but not always complete, and no ratings are provided.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE discusses sustainability, but solely focuses on the sustainability of outcomes arising from capacity building. There is no discussion of other aspects of sustainability	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The sections on 'recommendations' and 'lessons learned' are well developed, comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented in the report. Recommendations appear thoughtful and feasible	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE only includes total planned costs, not actual costs. The TE mentions that not all co-financing was disbursed but provides no figures to support this.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE has information on M&E Design, M&E implementation and uses of M&E information. However, this TER does not agree with the TE's assessment of the M&E plan.	MS
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).

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER, other than PIRs, TE, and PD.