



Ministry of Environment,  
Science and Technology

# Establishing an Effective and Sustainable Structure for Implementing Multilateral Agreements Project



United Nations  
Development Project

## Final Evaluation

### Report

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
<b>UNDP ID</b>	<i>3710</i>
<b>GEF ID</b>	<i>3162</i>
<b>Country Name</b>	<i>Republic of Ghana</i>
<b>Consultant Name</b>	<i>Dr. Joseph Opoku Fening</i>

June, 2012

## **Acknowledgements**

The Final Evaluation Team (FET) gratefully wish to thank the UNDP Ghana, staff of the Project Coordinating Unit of the Ministry of Environment Science and Technology, the staff of the concerned ministries and agencies of the Government of Ghana and district assemblies, for sharing with us their experiences and insights on this project. We greatly appreciate the time these persons gave to us. We also wish to extend special thanks to Mr. Paolo Dalla Stella – Climate Change Programme Officer, UNDP Ghana for his organizational efforts and for coordinating our mission.

J O Fening

(Individual Consultant)

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	1
Abbreviations and acronyms.....	5
Executive Summary .....	7
Brief Description of the Project .....	7
Purpose and Scope of the Final Evaluation.....	8
Project Summary Table.....	11
Overall Project Rating.....	12
Conclusions .....	17
Recommendations .....	17
Lessons learnt.....	18
2.0. Introduction.....	19
2.1. Project background.....	19
2.2. Purpose of the evaluation .....	20
2.3. Audiences for the evaluation.....	21
2.4. Key issues addressed.....	22
2.5. Methodology and Approach.....	23
2.5.1. Initial Consultation and Document Review: .....	23
2.5.2. Information Gathering and Field Investigation: .....	23
2.5.3. Analysis and Reporting: .....	24
2.6 Rating of Project Success.....	24
2.6.1 Interpretation of outcome ratings .....	25
2.7. Limitations and constraints to the FE.....	25
3.0. The Project and its development context.....	27
3.1. Project start and its duration.....	27
3.2. Problems that the project seeks to address .....	27
3.3. Goal, objectives and outcomes of the Project .....	27
3.4. Main stakeholders .....	28
3.5. Results expected.....	29
4.0. Findings and conclusions.....	30
4.1. Project formulation.....	30

4.1.1. Project conceptualization.....	30
4.1.2. Project relevance.....	31
4.1.3. Project preparation.....	31
4.1.4. Project log frame (logic from analysis to goal, indicators) .....	32
4.1.5. Strategies for replication and sustainability.....	32
4.1.6. Inclusion of participatory mechanisms.....	33
4.1.7. Risks and assumptions.....	33
4.2. Project implementation .....	34
4.2.1 Project inception.....	34
4.2.2 Activity Planning and management.....	34
4.2.3. Financial management.....	35
4.2.4. Cost effectiveness .....	35
4.2.5. Co-financing and leveraging .....	35
4.2.6. Co-ordination mechanisms .....	35
4.2.7. Monitoring and evaluation.....	36
4.2.8. Adaptive management .....	36
4.2.9. Risk management .....	36
4.2.10. Institutional arrangements .....	37
4.2.11. Participation.....	37
4.2.12. Reporting, transparency and dissemination.....	37
4.3 Project results .....	38
4.3.1 Performance against the Project Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Objectives. ....	38
4.3.2. Impacts – achievement of Project Goal.....	42
4.3.3 Unanticipated benefits of the Project.....	42
4.3.4. Effectiveness and cost effectiveness.....	43
4.3.5. Sustainability .....	43
4.3.6. Replicability.....	43
5.0 Recommendations.....	44
6.0 Lessons learnt.....	45
7.0 Annexes.....	46

Annex 1. Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project: Establishing an Effective and Sustainable Structure for Implementing Multilateral Agreements ..... 47

Annex 2 – Documents reviewed ..... 60

Annex 3 – List of People interviewed ..... 62

Annex 4. Interview Guide Used ..... 63

Annex 5. Itinerary of activities of the Final Evaluation Mission ..... 76

Annex 6: Evaluation consultant agreement form ..... 77

## Abbreviations and acronyms

APR/PIR	Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Review
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DA	District Assembly
EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FE	Final Evaluation
FET	Final Evaluation Team
FP	(Convention) Focal Points
GECCA	Ghana Environmental Conventions Coordinating Authority
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOG	Government of Ghana
MDA	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEn	Ministry of Energy
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEST	Ministry of Environment Science and Technology

MLGRDE	Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Environment
MFEP	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
MLFM	Ministry of Lands, Forestry and Mines
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
GECCA	Ghana Environmental Conventions Coordinating Authority
NDPC	National Development and Planning Commission
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NPD	National Project Director
OFP	GEF Operational Focal Point
PMO	Project Management Office
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Project Select Committee
PSCC	Project Steering and Coordination Committee
RCU	UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCCD	United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

## **Executive Summary**

### **Brief Description of the Project**

The degradation of Ghana's renewable natural assets is equal to 5.5 % of its annual GDP i.e. US\$ 475 million. Threats to biodiversity, increasing risk to climate change vulnerability and adaptability and land degradation are the major consequences. As part of efforts toward addressing these environmental challenges, Ghana has ratified the three Rio Conventions (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)) and taken active steps to meet its obligations.

A National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA), was conducted to identify the capacity needs to implement the Rio Conventions. Through this process, it was recognized that the three conventions face common challenges and constraints. A priority recommendation of the NCSA was to strengthen coordination in order to more effectively and jointly address the challenges facing them.

The ensuing project “**Establishing an Effective and Sustainable Structure for Implementing Multilateral Agreements**” aimed at improving coordination structures and mechanisms for the implementation of the three Rio Conventions in an effective manner. The proposed project objective is to improve the institutional structures and mechanisms for implementing the Conventions in Ghana.

Under the leadership of the then Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Environment (MLGRDE), initiatives related to the Conventions that had governmental involvement was brought under a single structure called the Ghana Environmental Conventions Coordinating Authority (GECCA), designed to respond to both technical and political requirements under each Convention.

GEF approved a grant sum of USD 475,000 on 11 January 2006, with official start of the project in August 2007 and end date of October 2010. The actual amount spent was USD 470,951.



The overall goal of GECCA is to “develop the institutional framework and capacity to coordinate at the national level efforts being made by various stakeholders into concerted actions to address the environmental and developmental concerns confronting Ghana as well as the global community”. This objective will be realized through the following three outcomes:

- a) A functioning national structure and mechanisms for coordinating activities within and across the Rio Conventions
- b) Coordinated national stakeholders responsible for the Rio Conventions, to perform the following key tasks: mainstreaming; knowledge management; reporting to Conventions; financial investment and mobilization; and increasing participation of stakeholders in Convention implementation
- c) The coordination of implementation of the Conventions at the District level is piloted in five diverse and representative Districts.

The project was carried out by the Ministry of Environment Science and Technology, with input from a host of stakeholders including MDAs, Civil Society, District Assemblies, Traditional Chieftains, Academia, Research, NGOs, Private Sector and Development partners.

### **Purpose and Scope of the Final Evaluation**

This final evaluation was carried out according to UNDP GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies, which have four objectives at project level: (i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; (ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; (iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and (iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. As noted from the terms of reference for this assignment, the overall objective of the final evaluation exercise is to assess project performance in relation to the objectives as stated in the Project Document, assess the outputs and development outcomes of the project, as well as determine the sustainability of benefits accrued. Specifically, the final evaluation addresses the following:

- Assessment of the design of the project, as well as its management and implementation arrangements in relation to project objectives;
- Assessment of the performance, specific outputs and outcomes, and overall impact of the project in relation to its stated target objectives;
- Determining the cost-effectiveness of project implementation in relation to the management and implementation arrangements;
- Determining whether the disbursement of project funds and the implementation of project activities were in line with project objectives;
- Examining whether there were adequate checks and balances regarding the use of project funds and implementation of project activities;
- Determining whether the requirements and procedures for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of project activities were adhered to;
- Determining what sustainability measures were put in place, and their effectiveness, to consolidate on project gains and ensure continuity;
- Identification of the factors responsible for the performance or non-performance of the project in relation to its objectives, and make recommendations for the future; and,
- Determining the aspects and areas that were successfully implemented (or otherwise), identify the contributory factors, and make recommendations for the future, including a project exit strategy.

Besides these generic components of a GEF Final Evaluation, the FE Team focused on whether the Project had managed to implement recommendations and key issues that arose from review meetings and consultation workshops of stakeholders.

The project from all intent and purpose was well implemented and managed. Financial management followed laid down procedures and was of high standard and cost effective. Stakeholder participation was excellent and complimented the functions of the Project management unit. All activities undertaken were duly documented and led to success in that the

outcomes were largely achieved. Although it is difficult to identify the impacts at the district levels at this stage there is every reason to believe with the high level of awareness and understanding of Rio issues by the District Assemblies, the project will have an eventual significant and positive impacts on the developmental process of the districts and Ghana for that matter.

Significant achievements include:

- The project has instituted functional structures and mechanisms for coordinating activities across the Rio conventions set up at the national level and increased networking and collaboration among agencies playing significant roles towards implementation of the conventions.
- Development of a communication strategy for the Rio conventions.
- Development of standardized Monitoring and Evaluation Terms of Reference for conducting interim evaluations is highly commendable, as it will create a model of good practice, which is expected to be replicated in the other districts and regional administrations in both formal and informal channels.
- The capacity of stakeholder institutions was significantly improved through organization of various training workshops on database management and monitoring and evaluation. The impact of this positive change is difficult to assess at this stage. However, the number of the trained public employees and the mainstreaming into schools and colleges is worth noting.
- Creation of a website for effective data and information circulation on the convention by stakeholders on the Rio convention. ([www.gecca.org](http://www.gecca.org)). The website needs to be resourced to function effectively.

Summaries of the overall project and its performance rating is provided in tables below:

## Project Summary Table

<b>Project Title:</b>	Establishing an Effective and Sustainable structure for Implementing Multilateral Environmental agreements			
<b>GEF Project ID:</b>	3162		<i>at endorsement (Thousand US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Thousand US\$)</i>
<b>UNDP Project ID:</b>	3710	GEF financing:	475,000	470,951*
<b>Country:</b>	Republic of Ghana	IA/EA own:	144,000	144,000
<b>Region:</b>	West African Sub-Region	Government:	140,300	140,300
<b>Focal Area:</b>	Multi-focal Area/Others	Other:	0	0
<b>FA Objectives, (OP/SP):</b>	To enhance capacity for global environmental management by leveraging financial and technical resources to address country needs for capacity to better manage global environmental issues.	Total co-financing:	284,300	284,300
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology (MEST)	Total Project Cost:	759,300	755,251
<b>Other Partners involved:</b>		ProDoc Signature (date project began): 13 April 2009		August, 2007
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: October, 2010	Actual: December, 2011

\* This is an estimation since the financial are not closed yet.

## Overall Project Rating

Evaluation criterion	Rating Area	Comments	Rating
Relevance and Country drivenness	Global conventions and GEF objectives	The strong focus of the project on capacity development is highly relevant to the implementation of the RIO Conventions and to the GEF Operational Programme (OP) 15 objective.	Relevant
	Ownership	<p>The project conceptualization came from the Ghana National Capacity Self Assessment, a Country driven, and participatory process that considered the priority needs of Ghana to enable her meet her obligations under the Rio Conventions effectively.</p> <p>The project preparation that followed this was also country driven, led by the Ministry of Environment Science and Technology, responsible for Regional Development Planning, with direct inputs from other key stakeholders. As a result of this the project was highly relevant to the country's planning needs.</p>	Relevant
	Conceptualization and design	The project design, as elaborated in the project document is appropriate. The project's outputs and activities are	Relevant

		properly put into a logical framework that is very easy to follow. In addition, the quarterly reports, annual workplans and the annual project implementation review (PIR) reports were well prepared.	
Efficiency	Implementation Approach	The Project was well implemented against the Project Document. All activities were well planned, Budgeted for, conducted, and managed by competent personnel. Training and capacity building workshops were also well organized. There was active participation of stakeholders and government involvement was adequate at all levels. Consultancy reports, quarterly and annual reports were well written.	Highly Satisfactory
	Management approach	The project has been well managed and the project management team used an adaptive management approach extensively to secure project outcomes while maintaining adherence to the overall project design.	Highly Satisfactory
	Management arrangement	The overall implementation of the project was good with the Project Management Units having staff of high professional quality and a clear, systematic and transparent way of working with open lines of communication with the overall Project	Highly Satisfactory

		Coordinator.	
	Stakeholder Participation/public	Stakeholder participation was highly adequate from project inception through capacity building and training and awareness creation	Satisfactory
	Financial planning	The accounting and financial system used by the project management team is satisfactory. However we noted no co-financing from Government sources identified in the project.	Satisfactory
	UNDP contribution	UNDP provided necessary technical backstopping for the management of the project.	Highly Satisfactory
	Monitoring and evaluation	The Monitoring and Evaluation conducted throughout the project was satisfactory, and directly linked to adaptive management.	Satisfactory
Effectiveness	Capacity building	Overall, the project has contributed to the capacity development of the target groups, particularly farmers in the rural communities.	Highly Satisfactory
	Risk management	The UNDP-GEF Risk Management System was appropriately applied to the project to identify, analyze and respond to project risks. Its design and management took into account risk exposure and mitigating plans.	Satisfactory
	Cost effectiveness	The project has been cost effective	Highly

		within UNDP assessment norms. One way in which the project has been cost effective is the engagement of consultancy support from within the country.	satisfactory
Impact	Outcomes / Achievement of Objectives	The project has been successful in delivering on its outcomes, which will translate to achieving the project objectives.  Achieving the Objectives should directly contribute to achieving the overall project goal – but that yet to be achieved since coordination at the district level is inadequate.	Minimal
Sustainability	Sustainability strategy	The Project has brought about a number of significant outputs that should ensure its sustainability. These include the establishment of GECCA, capacity building, awareness creation, stakeholder training mainstreaming and piloting coordination mechanisms at the district level and national information and data exchange mechanisms. The project also supported the development of a set of training materials that will live beyond the project. It was observed however that the project had no clear exit strategy.	Likely
	Replication approach	The project was seen by MEST as developing and piloting at selected districts which would then be rolled out	Likely



		<p>across the entire country. Further development of methodologies and criteria for mainstreaming should take place in spatial planning at municipal and district levels. Although in-country replication will be effective regional level replication could have been enhanced by closer links with other UNDP supported projects in the region that are also addressing similar issues.</p>	
Overall Project Rating		<p>Although, there was a delay in project start-up this was not of unusual scale and work plans and budgets were appropriately modified to deal with the delay. The three Project Outcomes have been largely achieved. And almost all the key outputs, planned in the Project document were achieved. It is not clear whether linkages were developed with other government initiatives and other development projects focusing on environmental issues. Effective linkages and partnerships with other government and donor initiatives allows for more efficient resource sharing and cost-effectiveness while promoting harmonization of initiatives.</p>	Highly satisfactory

## **Conclusions**

The project has performed creditably well within the two years span. The sustainability and replicability potential of the project is also satisfactory. To ensure long term impact there is the need for immediate support to enhance its enabling environment in terms of policy mainstreaming and government continuous commitment to sustain the achievements of the project's objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

## **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the project management team put more focus on long-term sustainability and institutionalization of project achievements. Long-term impact and long-term sustainability are closely related and are ultimately the main drivers for the success of a project. All achievements should be well institutionalized within the national system.

To allow for a more accurate assessment of the success of the project the PMU should conduct a follow up evaluation of the training and capacity building specifically looking at:

- The extent to which the project has impacted on the activities of target stakeholders.
- What lessons have been learnt?
- What they find particularly useful and what not?
- Which practices have changed as a result of the project implementation?

This evaluation should be carried out immediately so that the results could be incorporated into the project Final Report.

It is also recommended that an exit strategy should be developed by the project to ensure sustainability.

The GECCA should as a matter of urgency take steps to solicit funds for the continuous operation of the PCU.

## **Lessons learnt**

Up scaling of participation at the district level was recommended by several of the people interviewed as most appropriate as the local level is considered the action spot where capacity development and practices changes are most needed. Projects, such as this which aim to improve national coordination structure and mechanisms for development planning and spatial planning should put in place other financial mechanisms that will lend support to the implementation of the development strategies and plans in order to sustain activities. Such an action should not be left to the tail end of project implementation.

## 2.0. Introduction

### 2.1. Project background

The degradation of Ghana's renewable natural assets is equal to 5.5 % of its annual GDP i.e. US\$475 million. Threats to biodiversity, increasing risk to climate change vulnerability and adaptability and land degradation are the major consequences. As part of efforts toward addressing these environmental challenges, Ghana has ratified the three Rio Conventions (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)) and taken active steps to meet its obligations.

A National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA), was conducted to identify the capacity needs to implement the Rio Conventions. Through this process, it was recognized that the three conventions face common challenges and constraints. A priority recommendation of the NCSA was the need to develop national capacity for mainstreaming global environmental objectives into the regional development process, through the integration of these objectives in the formulation and implementation of regional development policies and plans at national, regional, district and municipal levels. In addition, a need for better coordination among the key ministries at the national and district levels has been stated as key to the implementation of the conventions.

The ensuing project “**Establishing an Effective and Sustainable Structure for Implementing Multilateral Agreements**” aimed at improving coordination structures and mechanisms for the implementation of the three Rio Conventions in an effective manner. The proposed project objective is to improve the institutional structures and mechanisms for implementing the Conventions in Ghana.

Three main interconnected areas of support have been identified in this regard:

- i) Support to merge all existing management structures at national level into one structure.
- ii) Support to operationalize these mechanisms to become operational by building their capacity and supporting them to perform specific functions.

- iii) Support the mechanisms to provide support to five pilot districts to build national level capacity to support the districts.

By so doing it is expected that there will be a more coherent, streamlined and effective allocation of resources to meet the Rio obligations which will eventually attract additional investors to support Ghana as it meets its Rio Convention obligations.

The overall project budget is USD 759,300 of which USD 619,000 is a direct financing provided by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Government of Ghana is providing USD 140,300 in co-financing.

## **2.2. Purpose of the evaluation**

This final evaluation was carried out according to UNDP GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies, which have four objectives at project level: (i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; (ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; (iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and (iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. As noted from the terms of reference for this assignment, the overall objective of the final evaluation exercise is to assess project performance in relation to the objectives as stated in the Project Document, assess the outputs and development outcomes of the project, as well as determine the sustainability of benefits accrued. Specifically, the final evaluation addresses the following:

- Assessment of the design of the project, as well as its management and implementation arrangements in relation to project objectives;
- Assessment of the performance, specific outputs and outcomes, and overall impact of the project in relation to its stated target objectives;
- Determining the cost-effectiveness of project implementation in relation to the management and implementation arrangements;

- Determining whether the disbursement of project funds and the implementation of project activities were in line with project objectives;
- Examining whether there were adequate checks and balances regarding the use of project funds and implementation of project activities;
- Determining whether the requirements and procedures for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of project activities were adhered to;
- Determining what sustainability measures were put in place, and their effectiveness, to consolidate on project gains and ensure continuity;
- Identification of the factors responsible for the performance or non-performance of the project in relation to its objectives, and make recommendations for the future; and,
- Determining the aspects and areas that were successfully implemented (or otherwise), identify the contributory factors, and make recommendations for the future, including a project exit strategy.

Besides these generic components of a GEF Final Evaluation, the FE Team focused on whether the Project had managed to implement recommendations and key issues that arose from review meetings and consultation workshops of stakeholders.

### **2.3. Audiences for the evaluation**

This Final Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Ghana Country Office (CO) as the Implementation Agency for the Rio Conventions project. UNDP-GEF is primarily interested in analysis of how successful implementation of the project has been, what impacts it has generated, if the project benefits will be sustainable in the long-term and what the lessons learnt are for future interventions in the country, region and other parts of the globe where UNDP-GEF provides its assistance. The Ministry of Environment Science and Technology (MEST) is a key audience for the evaluation as it considers the best ways to move from piloting of the approach at the different planning levels, to full implementation in future development planning. As the

UNDP Regional Office is supporting other projects in the region with similar objectives it is also a key audience to enable transfer of lessons learnt between projects

#### **2.4. Key issues addressed**

The Final Evaluation Team (FET) focused on a number of key issues identified in the Inception workshop, review meetings and those that arose as important during the Desk Review and interviews.

These specific issues included:

- a) The extent to which the capacities of MEST and other stakeholders has been strengthened by the project to integrate global environmental concerns into development planning.
- b) Structures put in place by GECCA to address issues concerning long-term impacts of the project through ensuring sustainability and institutionalization of project achievements.
- c) Mechanism put in place to ensure operationalization of GECCA is promoted and institutionalized.
- d) Whether a strong partnership had been created with relevant stakeholders to manage and implement the demonstration planning of project.
- e) Mechanisms to ensure that project findings would be integrated into district level developmental planning.
- f) The impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the potential for achievement of global environmental goals.
- g) Stakeholder involvement in both design and implementation phases of project.
- h) Relevance of project to the process of Regional Development Planning and Spatial Planning in Ghana.
- i) Contribution of project to the implementation of the UNCBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC.

j) Recommendations for follow-up activities.

## **2.5. Methodology and Approach**

The FE was conducted between May 10 – June 30, 2012 by a National Consultant and his team. The methodology and work activities of the FE consisted of three principal activities: (1) Initial Consultation and Document Review; (2) Information Gathering and Field Investigation; and (3) Analysis and Reporting. A description of the principal activities of the FE Team is presented below:

### **2.5.1. Initial Consultation and Document Review:**

This phase of the work began with an initial briefing to the FE National Consultant by the UNDP Climate Change Programme Officer, on the status of the project and key issues which had arisen during its implementation. Through the UNDP, contact was made to the Project Coordinating Unit at MEST where a number of key project documents were obtained for review. A complete list of documents reviewed is presented in Annex Four: Documents Reviewed

Following the initial briefing and document review, the FE Team began to develop and refine the methodology and analytical framework for information gathering. To give context to the information gathered from the UNDP office and the Project Management Unit, the FE Team undertook a number of field visits to stakeholder institutions to conduct in-depth interviews with intended beneficiaries.

### **2.5.2. Information Gathering and Field Investigation:**

The Final Evaluation Team employed a participatory methodology in conducting the information gathering component of the FE. The FE Team interviewed a wide variety of stakeholders who were involved at differing levels of project implementation including; UNDP Ghana, National



Project Coordinator, Project Technical Assistant, the Environment Protection Agency, Academia, Research, Private sector, Media and District Assemblies.

The participatory methodology used in interviewing the stakeholders included key informant interviews, semi-structured interviews, and focus group discussions. In addition, to better understand participation, involvement and ownership of project results at the district levels, the FE Team undertook some field visits and conducted focus group discussions with some of the stakeholders.

### **2.5.3. Analysis and Reporting:**

The FE Team conducted a detailed analysis of the information gathered. Particular attention has been paid during the analysis to reviewing the following aspects of the Project:

The relevance and effectiveness of the project objectives and the extent to which they are achievable in the context of Project implementation.

The appropriateness and adequacy of project design, implementation arrangements, and accountability mechanisms.

The efficiency and effectiveness of the project components and outputs in meeting the project objectives.

The adequacy of institutional arrangements and operational procedures, including planning, budgeting, bidding, implementation, and technical supervision.

The likely long-term sustainability and institutional development impacts of the project outcomes.

## **2.6 Rating of Project Success**

An evaluation matrix was used, in accordance with the Terms of Reference and the GEF Guidelines, to rate each outcome of the evaluation in terms of its success on a scale from 1 to 6 (Table 1). They were used to construct a project performance matrix with necessary comments with respect to the ratings.

Some of the criteria that were used to rate the items included achievement of objectives and planned results; attainment of outputs and activities; cost-effectiveness; impact; sustainability; stakeholder involvement; country ownership; implementation approach; financial planning and management; replicability, sustainability and monitoring and evaluation.

### 2.6.1 Interpretation of outcome ratings

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R)  1.. Not relevant (NR)
		<b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i>  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A)		

### 2.7. Limitations and constraints to the FE

There was no indication that the project has had any evaluation since its implementation. That notwithstanding, the FE team met with the key project implementation partners and the relevant stakeholders involved with project implementation, and was able to gather a lot of information

from review and quarterly reports regarding the project outputs and possible impacts. We appreciate the efforts by the PMU to make available all the reports needed and the maximum cooperation provided to the FE mission.

As with many projects that focus on building capacity and piloting new approaches or methods the impacts are usually visible sometime after the project period; trying to evaluate impacts rather than planning and activities during the project is therefore based on assumptions.

### **3.0. The Project and its development context**

#### **3.1. Project start and its duration**

The official start of the project was August 2007 with an end date of October 2010. However, Project Inception Workshop took place on March 26, 2010.

#### **3.2. Problems that the project seeks to address**

A comprehensive participatory assessment of the capacities needed to implement the three Rio conventions of which Ghana has rectified showed that the Rio Conventions have common challenges and constraints. It was recognized that strengthening capacity to address these needs would lead to better management of natural resources and in turn to better implementation of the Convention and positive impacts on the environment. Hence the proposed project is to improve coordination structures and mechanisms, so that stakeholders in Ghana will address the above need in an effective manner.

The proposed project will first help the Government to merge all existing management structures at the national level into one structure consisting of the Ghana Environmental Convention Coordinating Authority (GECCA) and its Secretariat. The project will then help these mechanisms become operational by building their capacity and supporting them to perform specific tasks. Finally, the project will help these mechanisms provide support to five pilot districts, in order to build national level capacity to support districts.

#### **3.3. Goal, objectives and outcomes of the Project**

The overall goal of GECCA is to “develop the institutional framework and capacity to coordinate at the national level efforts being made by various stakeholders into concerted actions to address

the environmental and developmental concerns confronting Ghana as well as the global community”. This objective will be realized through the following three outcomes:

- a) A functioning national structure and mechanisms for coordinating activities within and across the Rio Conventions.
- b) Coordinated national stakeholders responsible for the Rio Conventions, to perform the following key tasks: mainstreaming; knowledge management; reporting to Conventions; financial investment and mobilization; and increasing participation of stakeholders in Convention implementation.
- c) The coordination of implementation of the Conventions at the District level is piloted in five diverse and representative Districts.

### **3.4. Main stakeholders**

During the Project Development Process a comprehensive review of stakeholders was undertaken.

The main stakeholders identified were:

- Environmental Protection Agency
- Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MFA)
- Ministry of Lands, Forestry and Mines (MLFM)
- Ministry of Energy (ME)
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MFEP)
- Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLG)
- National Development and Planning Commission (NDPC)
- Ministries responsible for industry, transport, energy and foreign affairs, etc.
- Universities and Research Institutes, for example the University of Ghana (Geography Department), and the University of Cape Coast (Faculty of Agriculture), CSIR.

- ‘Friends of River Bodies’, ‘Environmental Protection Association’, ‘Environmental Applications and Technology Centre’, and Earth Services
- Large scale enterprises (e.g. mining, energy, forestry), chamber of commerce
- District Assemblies
- CIDA

### **3.5. Results expected**

The key project results were formulated as project outputs (related to the project outcomes), as follows:

- Establishment of structures and mechanisms at the Nation level to coordinate activities within and across the convention.
- Key staffs from GECCA and other relevant Stakeholders, including the media are trained to integrate biodiversity, climate change and land degradation objectives into their regular work activities related to regional development.
- National agencies responsible for the Rio convention are task to perform specific functions including mainstreaming, knowledge mismanagement, reporting to convention and increasing participation of stakeholders in convention implementation.
- A website dedicated to the integration of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation issues into development planning is operational for all stakeholders (government, NGOs, Community Based Organizations (CBOs), businesses, academic and research institutions, private sector, media and general public).
- Stakeholders in representative districts adequately integrate biodiversity, climate change and land degradation issues into their development and spatial planning.
- Development of standardized Monitoring and Evaluation Terms of Reference for conducting interim evaluation to enable stakeholder to monitor, evaluate, adapt, replicate and learn from the project.

## **4.0. Findings and conclusions**

### **4.1. Project formulation**

#### **4.1.1. Project conceptualization**

Ghana has ratified the Rio Conventions, and is committed to fulfilling its obligations under them.

Ghana was therefore an active participant on the regional National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) process, and carried out a comprehensive, and participatory, assessment of its capacity to implement its commitments and obligations under the three conventions.

Traditionally much of the delivery of environmental obligations, in most countries, has been carried out through specialist environmental agencies, and much of the focus of capacity building to support implementation of environmental conventions has been targeted at those agencies. However, the NCSA in Ghana recognized that most of the potential threats to the environment come from decisions made outside of these environmental agencies, and that, very much in line with the CBD's Ecosystem Approach, improving environmental performance to meet national obligations under the Rio Conventions requires genuine mainstreaming into other decision making processes. The NCSA recommended the need to strengthen coordination in order to more effectively address the challenges facing the implementation of the convention. The project strategy is to remove the barriers to coordination.

Accordingly, the government will be able to firmly take responsibility for coordinating actions and implementing the conventions. Three key strategic pillars are set to drive implementation of the project. The first pillar is to bring all existing institutional structures for the three conventions into one structure. Under the leadership of MEST, all ongoing initiatives with government involvement and related to the conventions will be brought into a single structure. For example existing internationally supported projects that target the implementation of the UNCBD and UNCCD have agreed to be brought into this structure. This structure will consist of a single Ghana Environmental Convention Coordinating Authority (GECCA) and a Secretariat to serve the GECCA. The GECCA and Secretariat will be backed by a national Law and budget

allocation. The second pillar of the strategy is to do with capacity building and third pillar recognizes that ultimately the most important convention stakeholders are at the local level.

The evaluators are of the view that improving structures and mechanisms for implementing the Rio convention will go a long way to reverse the current practice of treating global environmental issues as a stand-alone agenda of limited concern to national or local development priorities. By so doing Ghana will be able to fulfill its obligations under the Rio Conventions.

#### **4.1.2. Project relevance**

Although the project does not explicitly identify, or address, the underlying reasons why environmental issues were not already mainstreamed in development planning and development, it is directly relevant to them and provides an excellent foundation that can be broadened out to address these issues. Because the specific environmental issues addressed in the development plans are directly generated through analysis of the local situation, it can emphatically be stated that the project is directly relevant to local environmental issues. Many of the stakeholder representatives confirmed during the interviews, that the project was highly relevant to the country's planning needs and development agenda in its quest to mitigate climate change. The evaluators fully concur with this assessment.

The overall project conceptualization was about improving structures and mechanisms to mainstreaming GEIs into the main development planning system, rather than continuing with just separate environmental planning. This is likely to be more effective in achieving the overall principles of the Rio Conventions at a global level.

The project is also relevant to enhancing the capacity and participation of stakeholders in national environmental safeguard processes which is a hall mark for project sustainability.

#### **4.1.3. Project preparation**

Preparation towards the project was nationally driven, under the leadership of the then MLGRDE, with active participation from other MDAs and stakeholders who participated in the



NCSA, together with technical assistance provided by UNDP, in particular on how to structure the required activities as a GEF project.

The focus for the preparation came directly from the priority identified in the NCSA. The proposed strategy agreed upon by stakeholders was that when barriers hampering coordination of the Rio convention by various individual stakeholders are removed then Government will according be able to firmly take responsibility for coordinating actions and implementing the conventions effectively.

The project will bring clear environmental benefits directly related to the objectives of the Rio Conventions, through the awareness creation, training, and the development of indicators, guidelines and methodologies.

#### **4.1.4. Project log frame (logic from analysis to goal, indicators)**

The Logical framework matrix, developed and recorded as Table 1 in the project document, presents the internal logic of the project. The set of outcomes appears clearly stated and accordingly, presents a reasonable approach, based on best practice to achieving the objectives. Though the logical frame work was agreed upon at the inception workshop at start of the project as achievable, not all planned activities could be achieved.

#### **4.1.5. Strategies for replication and sustainability**

A key factor in GEF eligibility is whether initial investment in one project will have broad impact, either through overcoming more widely applicable obstacles, or through the development of methodologies and skills that will be transferable and replicable.

This Project was designed specifically to improve institutional structures and mechanisms for effective coordination, create awareness and build capacity and pilot these mechanisms at the district level, which should allow its benefits to be sustained. The proposal to merge all existing structures at the national level into one structure was innovative in that it will allow government to have a far more coherent, streamlined and effective allocation of resources to meeting the Rio obligation.

The training component of the project that was extended to schools and colleges is considered as built in incentives for environmental capacity building for future generation that will ensure sustainability by individuals after the project.

Although piloting the coordinating mechanism at the district level was a replicable model part of the project design, and has been initiated in three out of the 5 designated districts, specific mechanisms to promote that replication could have been better addressed in project design. The project design did not also lay down a clear foundation for the Exit Strategy.

#### **4.1.6. Inclusion of participatory mechanisms**

Participatory mechanisms were appropriately built into the project during the design phase through the inception meeting, Expert Groups, an Advisory Group, information and data exchange mechanism, dissemination and media participation in the development planning process. The sustainability of these mechanisms may have been strengthened by the re-designation of the MLGRD to MEST.

#### **4.1.7. Risks and assumptions**

The project was designed to build the foundations for environmental mainstreaming in development and implementation of national development plans by raising the awareness and capacity of stakeholders. However, there is the risk that local decision makers, especially the broad-based, regional and district assemblies might not fully support the national environmental directives coming through in development plans. Adoptions of plans are always the responsibility of the district assemblies not the national planning authority. If these risks had been identified and their monitoring and management included in the Project Document, different approaches could have been used to engage with some sectors of the stakeholders.

## **4.2. Project implementation**

### **4.2.1 Project inception**

The inception phase of the project lasted from January 2006, when the project document was signed, until March 2010, when the Project Inception Workshop took place. The objective of the inception workshop was to convene technical professionals and key stakeholder organizations in the environment and natural resources sector, including representatives from key Government Ministries and Agencies, Civil Society Organizations and Development Partners to discuss the project document and provide vital inputs/recommendations for its review and finalization.

The inception process was effective in not only operationalizing the project but in the required revision of budgets and work plans required because of the delay in start-up. The Inception report comments on the mandate of GECCA and limited it to coordination. The issue of implementing project in the pilot districts was considered appropriate and useful that will help inform decisions that harness coordination/harmonization of efforts and the efficient use of resources.

Staff recruitment fully complied with procedures and ensured fair competition. The National Project Coordinator, Assistant Project Coordinator and Secretary were recruited in November 2009. The National Project Coordinator has managed the project successfully, as indicated by all parties, the results achieved, and the staff evaluation.

### **4.2.2 Activity Planning and management**

The project team has done an excellent job in planning and managing the project activities. Although, there was a delay in project start-up this was not of unusual scale and work plans and budgets were appropriately modified to deal with it. Preparation and refinement of ToRs for consultants were all well done. Work plans, milestones, outputs, budgets and reports were all jointly approved by the Project Coordinating Unit and UNDP Office.

### **4.2.3. Financial management**

Financial management within, and of, the project has been carried out accurately, and in full compliance with the financial systems. Financial management followed laid down procedures and was of high standard judging from the available reports.

### **4.2.4. Cost effectiveness**

The project has delivered an impressive set of outputs, especially over the training, data and information gathering and development of brochures, M&E model planning methodologies, creation of website and establishment of coordination structures in three Districts.

The project has been cost effective within UNDP assessment norms. One way in which the project has been cost effectively is the engagement of consultancy support from within the country.

### **4.2.5. Co-financing and leveraging**

An agreement was reached between the MEST and UNDP as to how co-financing through other development projects will contribute directly to this project. According to the PIR an estimated amount of US\$ 144,000 from the UNDP and US\$ 140,300 from Government of Ghana were committed to this project. These amounts were fully realized in-kind.

It is clear that the Government of Ghana, as demonstrated by the inputs from MEST and other Stakeholders and District Assemblies were, and are, fully committed to supporting the project.

### **4.2.6. Co-ordination mechanisms**

The project co-ordination mechanisms were well designed and operated effectively. The Project Advisory Committee worked very well, playing a balanced role between overseeing project management, steering the project and dissemination of results to key agencies. Recommendations made through the Advisory Committee were implemented and were seen by

the PMU as beneficial to project implementation. The Expert Groups that were established for each of the conventions and that of other conventions proved to be an effective mechanism for providing coordinated technical inputs, and in providing two-way communication with a wider audience than was possible through the Advisory Committee.

#### **4.2.7. Monitoring and evaluation**

Monitoring and Evaluation processes are key parts of project implementation, which (1) allow tracking the progress of activities and how they deliver results and impacts, (2) provide the basis for Adaptive Management, (3) promote accountability and (4) allow lessons learnt to be identified and disseminated to improve the planning and management of future projects.

The Monitoring and Evaluation components of the project have been conducted to a high standard following UNDP requirements and as laid out in the Project Document. Reports prepared by the PMU have been thorough and have been prepared against the log-frame indicators.

The project has demonstrated good practice in Adaptive Management, utilizing information from the monitoring and evaluation process to identify issues that required change, such as the need to reduce the piloting districts from 10 to five.

#### **4.2.8. Adaptive management**

The monitoring and evaluation and co-ordination correctly identified areas where work plans, budgets, outputs and even indicators needed to be adapted, and then the PMU followed the correct procedures for proposing, and getting endorsement for the required changes - e.g. for the significant change to the Outcome 3.

#### **4.2.9. Risk management**

The PCU has thoroughly tracked, reported on, and managed the risks identified in the Project Document. As already indicated the project planning did not, identify, consider or establish

mechanisms to manage other risks that could impact the ability of the project to achieve its goal – such as key decision makers in the districts still perceiving a conflict between development and environmental objectives, and in prioritizing the development objectives.

#### **4.2.10. Institutional arrangements**

The institutional links between the UNDP, the PCU and MEST have been excellent, with the project being well integrated into the Ministry, bringing benefits for both management and institutional support and learning, and in increasing the chances of long term impact. Informal linkages to other MDAs and the Private Sector have been important in supporting the formal processes. However participation has not been as strong as expected in spite of the declared political commitment and efforts of the PCU to regularly provide information. It is not clear whether linkages were developed with other government initiatives and other development projects focusing on environmental issues. Effective linkages and partnerships with other government and donor initiatives allows for more efficient resource sharing and cost-effectiveness while promoting harmonization of initiatives.

#### **4.2.11. Participation**

A sound process for participation by all stakeholders was built into the project and every effort was made by the PCU to make the project as visible as possible and also provided opportunity for feedback to the main project products. However some interviewed persons expressed the opinion that the project was not visible enough. Some were worried as to whether participation would be sustained beyond the project period; although participatory processes have been built into the model process how effective they prove to be will only become apparent in the future.

#### **4.2.12. Reporting, transparency and dissemination**

Reporting on project activities has been carried out to a high standard. The range of report outputs developed through the project activities, are of a high standard. The Project has

established a website which not only disseminates the information from the project but also gathers and allows access to relevant Rio Conventions information and documents.

### 4.3 Project results

The project has achieved significant results. The three Project Outcomes and all the key outputs, planned in the Project document were largely achieved.

#### 4.3.1 Performance against the Project Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Objectives.

<p><b>Project Objective:</b> To generate global environmental benefits through the effective coordination of activities related to the Rio Convention at the national and local level.</p>	
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> The GECCA law is passed by parliament of Ghana within 12 months.</p>	<p>At the time of developing the Project Document, there was no Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology. The idea of passing an Act in parliament to create an autonomous Authority with its own budgetary allocation for coordinating the implementation of Environmental Conventions was relevant given the fact that the Environmental issues and their representation as well as coordination were subsumed within the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development. At the time of implementing the project, the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology was recreated with</p>

	<p>representation in Cabinet and so Stakeholders were of the view that GECCA should be set up as a Unit within the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology with budgetary allocation to be able to carry out its functions and not as an autonomous body “Authority” with the passage of an Act in parliament.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> The GECCA secretariat is fully staffed and resourced within 24 months.</p>	<p>The GECCA secretariat was staffed with a Project Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator as well as a secretary. The Unit housed within the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology was also equipped with computers (2 lap tops and a desk top), a printer and a photo copier.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> The number and duration of visits to secretariat website</p>	<p>Data not available</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> The national level structure and mechanisms for coordination activities within and across the Rio Conventions are functioning.</p>	<p><b>Key output</b></p> <p>The Secretariat has been able to revitalize the National Biodiversity Committee to be become visible and functional as the National Committee to Combat Desertification and Draught and the National Climate Change Committee. The Platform for networking and collaboration among the three national committees of the Rio Conventions has been created. The Secretariat also coordinated the work of Civil Society Groups related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions and created the avenues for Non-Governmental and Governmental institutions to work together towards the implementation of the Rio</p>



	Conventions and ultimately achieve sustainable development.
<b>Indicator 1:</b> The number of Memoranda of understanding (MoU) between the GECCA and other MDA by end of the project.	Set up as Unit within the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology and not as an Authority, the GECCA secretariat does not need to enter into MoUs with other Ministries, Department and Agencies in order to solicit their support and collaboration in the coordination of the Rio Conventions in Ghana
<b>Indicator 2:</b> The number of position papers for Conventions prepared within 14 months.	The documents developed by the secretariat include: Capacity Building Need Assessment and the Development of Public Participation Plan, National Data and Information Exchange Mechanism, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Ghana, Communication Strategy for the Rio Conventions, Baseline ecological and socio-economic surveys of three Selected Districts
<b>Indicator 3:</b> Significant reduction in the amount of land converted to unsuitable uses in the five districts	Data not available
<b>Outcome 2:</b> National Agencies responsible for the Rio Convention are coordinating to perform the following key tasks, mainstreaming, knowledge management, reporting to conventions, financial investment and mobilization. Increasing participation of stakeholders in convention implementation	<b>Key output</b> The Secretariat was instrumental in the development of the National Climate Change Policy and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) and in the implementation of the National Action Program to Combat Desertification which was developed in 1992. These are indicative of the functional role of the secretariat in facilitating mainstreaming of the Rio Conventions into

	national development policy and programs.
<b>Indicator 1:</b> District assembly allocates 1.5 % of its budget to environment, with due attention to Rio issues	Though there has not been any appreciable increase in the proportion of government subventions allocated for environmental programs, the three districts involved in the pilot project have increased the scope of their environmental portfolio to include Climate Change, Land Degradation and Biodiversity related interventions as compared to other districts that limit their environmental budget to only solid waste management activities.
<b>Indicator 2:</b> Awareness and understanding of district assembly members of Rio issues in the pilot districts	The Pilot Districts chosen in the GECCA project coincided with the Districts participating in another project on Mainstreaming Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction into District Development Planning. The impacts of the GECCA project combined with those of Disaster Risk Reduction have contributed substantially in increasing awareness on the Rio Conventions and related issues by 70%.
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Stakeholders in five diverse and representative districts are piloting the coordination of implementation of the conventions at the district level	<b>Key output</b> As a result of resource constraints, the pilot Districts were limited to three for the GECCA projects. The capacities of the Environmental Committees of the District Assemblies involved in the pilot project have been strengthened so that they can coordinate activities related to the Rio Conventions within their Districts.

### **4.3.2. Impacts – achievement of Project Goal**

It is difficult to measure the project impacts at this stage but some key indicators suggestive of positive impacts could be outlined:

- The establishment of GECCA to coordinate all aspects of the Rio convention has a positive impact on the National Development Planning on environmental issues in Ghana. To be able to sustain this positive impact, steps should be taken to mainstream the activities of GECCA to that of MEST.
- The capacity of MEST and other relevant stakeholders in terms of mainstreaming the GEIs have significantly been improved. The impact of this positive change is difficult to assess at this stage.
- The number of training courses organized and the audience reached including the mainstreaming of GEIs into school and colleges is in the positive direction. Even though the trainees' feedback could not be adequately measured, the initial feedback was very positive regarding the way that the course raised awareness and understanding is indicative that it has led to change.
- The development of standardized Terms of Reference for coordinating and implementation of the Rio convention through piloting in five diverse and representative districts is highly commendable, as it will create a model of good practice, which is expected to be replicated in the other districts and regional administrations in both formal and informal channels.
- The creation of a project website and establishment of national information mechanisms for data management will ensure effective data and information circulation on the convention.

### **4.3.3 Unanticipated benefits of the Project**

The project has improved both formal and informal links among different MDAs and Institutions, which should have positive benefits in future integrated planning.

#### **4.3.4. Effectiveness and cost effectiveness**

The project is likely to leave a large legacy (training courses, capacity, planning and review methodologies, and the inclusion of environmental indicators). It has therefore been highly cost effective.

#### **4.3.5. Sustainability**

The Project has brought about a number of significant outputs that should ensure its sustainability. These include the establishment of GECCA, capacity building, awareness creation, stakeholder training mainstreaming and piloting coordination mechanisms at the district level and national information and data exchange mechanisms. The project also supported the development of a set of training materials that will live beyond the project.

It is not clear whether the PCU developed an Exit strategy for the project that will ensure outputs sustainability. It is anticipated that after the official project end the project will be mainstream into the activities of MEST with the necessary budget allocation to ensure effective functioning. This important aspect of project sustainability is highly dependent of MEST's willingness and possible follow-up actions.

#### **4.3.6. Replicability**

The project was seen by MEST as developing and piloting at selected districts which would then be rolled out across the entire country. Further development of methodologies and criteria for mainstreaming should take place in spatial planning at municipal and district levels. Although in-country replication will be effective, regional level replication could have been enhanced by closer links with other UNDP supported projects in the region that are also addressing similar issues.

## 5.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that the project management team put more focus on long-term sustainability and institutionalization of project achievements. Long-term impact and long-term sustainability are closely related and are ultimately the main drivers for the success of a project. All achievements should be well institutionalized within the national system.

To allow for a more accurate assessment of the success of the project the PMU should conduct a follow up evaluation of the training and capacity building specifically looking at:

- The extent to which the project has impacted on the activities of target stakeholders.
- What lessons have been learnt?
- What they find particularly useful and what not?
- Which practices have changed as a result of the project implementation?

This evaluation should be carried out immediately so that the results could be incorporated into the project Final Report.

## **6.0 Lessons learnt**

Up scaling of participation at the district level was recommended by several of the people interviewed as most appropriate as the local level is considered the action spot where capacity development and practices changes are most needed. Projects, such as this which aim to improve national coordination structure and mechanisms for development planning and spatial planning should put in place other financial mechanisms that will lend support to the implementation of the development strategies and plans in order to sustain activities. Such an action should not be left to the tail end of project implementation.

## 7.0 Annexes

- **Annex 1** – Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project: Establishing an Effective and Sustainable Structure for Implementing Multilateral Agreements
- **Annex 2** – Documents reviewed
- **Annex 3** – List of People interviewed
- **Annex 4** – Interview Guide Used
- **Annex 5** – Itinerary of activities of the Final Evaluation Mission

## **Annex 1. Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project: Establishing an Effective and Sustainable Structure for Implementing Multilateral Agreements**

### **UNDP Ghana**

#### **Purpose:**

The evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Establishing an Effective and Sustainable Structure for Implementing Multilateral Agreements aims to review the performance of the project from start up to the end of the project, towards achieving its target objective and outcomes. This final evaluation is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP Country Office in Ghana. It will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility. The review will assess and rate project results, the sustainability of project outcomes, the catalytic effect of the project, and the quality of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems. The evaluation will also identify "lessons learned and best practices" from the project and offer recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

#### **Background:**

The degradation of Ghana's renewable natural assets is equal to 5.5 % of its annual GDP i.e. US\$ 475 million. Threats to biodiversity, increasing risk to climate change vulnerability and adaptability and land degradation are the major consequences. As part of efforts toward addressing these environmental challenges, Ghana has ratified the three Rio Conventions and taken active steps to meet its obligations.

A comprehensive and participatory assessment by various Ghanaian stakeholders called the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA), was conducted to indentify the capacity needs to implement the Rio Conventions. Through this process, they recognized that they have common functions and tasks, have shared resources, and face common challenges and constraints. A priority recommendation of the assessment was to strengthen coordination in order to more



effectively and jointly address the challenges facing them. The purpose of this project is to improve coordination structures and mechanisms necessary for stakeholders in Ghana to address their shared needs when it comes to the implementation of the three conventions in an effective manner.

Under the leadership of the then Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Environment (MLGRDE), initiatives related to the Conventions that had governmental involvement was brought under a single structure called the Ghana Environmental Conventions Coordinating Authority (GECCA), designed to respond to both technical and political requirements under each Convention.

The overall goal of GECCA is to “develop the institutional framework and capacity to coordinate at the national level efforts being made by various stakeholders into concerted actions to address the environmental and developmental concerns confronting Ghana as well as the global community”. Specific objectives are:

- d) A functioning national structure and mechanisms for coordinating activities within and across the Rio Conventions
- e) Coordinated national stakeholders responsible for the Rio Conventions, to perform the following key tasks: mainstreaming; knowledge management; reporting to Conventions; financial investment and mobilization; and increasing participation of stakeholders in Convention implementation
- f) The coordination of implementation of the Conventions at the District level is piloted in five diverse and representative Districts.

### **Relevance to GEF Programmes**

The GECCA project addresses objectives under three of the GEF Focal Areas (biodiversity conservation, climate change and land degradation). Specifically, and fits under the Strategic Priority related to cross-cutting capacity building (CB2).

In the ongoing process to elaborate a programming framework for CB2, four thematic areas are emerging, of which the third is improving national convention institutional structures and mechanisms. This project lies in this emerging thematic area. Notably, in line with this programming framework, the proposed project will improve cross-institutional coordination, it will increase synergies and efficiencies, and it will reduce wastages and overlaps.

This GECCA project sets out to develop the capacity necessary to increase synergies across the three (3) Rio Conventions i.e. Biodiversity, Climate Change and desertification conventions and to reduce the risk of duplication or conflicts. It aims to do this by strengthening the coordination of the many stakeholders responsible for implementing the Conventions.

### **Project Executing Arrangements**

The project is executed by the Government (GoG). Initially this was through the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Environment (MLGRDE) which is now superseded by the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology.

### **Specific Objectives:**

The evaluation of the project should properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. The following areas should be covered in the final evaluation report:

#### **1. General Information about the Evaluation**

The final evaluation report should include information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. The final evaluation report will also include the evaluation team's TOR and any response from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report.

## **2. Assessment of Project Results**

The final evaluation will assess achievement of the project's objective, outcomes and outputs and will provide ratings for the targeted objective and outcomes. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term and positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's results, the final evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established.

Assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. An assessment of impact is encouraged when appropriate. The evaluator should assess project results using indicators and relevant tracking tools.

To determine the level of achievement of the project's objective and outcomes, the following three criteria will be assessed in the final evaluation:

- **Relevance:** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- **Effectiveness:** Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objective?
- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of the project's effectiveness and efficiency. Outcomes will be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness and efficiency:

**Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Unsatisfactory (U):** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

While rating the project's outcomes, relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. If separate ratings are provided on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, the overall outcomes rating of the project may not be higher than the lowest rating on relevance and effectiveness. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes, the project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

The evaluator will also assess other results of the project, including positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long-term effects of a project. Wherever possible the evaluator should indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

## Implementation of the Conventions

The GECCA project's activities on the coordination of implementation of the Conventions in five diverse and representative Districts will be assessed.

### Raising awareness

- The GECCA project's contribution to raise awareness of environmental issues and of the GEF will be examined.
- The GECCA project's contribution to coordinate national stakeholders, responsible for the Rio Conventions to perform various key tasks, will be assessed.

The following table should be completed to provide a summary of the planned and actual activities of the project as well as the expenditures up to the present.

Activities	Budget			
Planned	Actual	As per ProDoc	Actual Expenditures	% of Project Budget

### 3. Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

The final evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this. Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- Socio-political: Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it

is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

- Institutional framework and governance: Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- Environmental: Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The final evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project, outcomes will be rated as follows.

**Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

**Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

**Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

**Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an ‘Unlikely’ rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than ‘Unlikely’.

#### **4. Catalytic Role**

The final evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the catalytic role.

## **5. Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results**

Among other factors, when relevant, it is suggested that the evaluation team considers the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. However, evaluators are not expected to provide ratings or separate assessment on the following issues but they could be considered while assessing the performance and results sections of the report:

- **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks that are in line with the project's objectives?
- **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?

- Financial planning. Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize?
- Implementing/Executing Agency's supervision and backstopping. Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did the Implementing/Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the GEF projects?
- Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

## **6. Lessons and Recommendations**

The evaluator will present lessons and recommendations in the final evaluation report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. The evaluator will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation.

The evaluator should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead they should seek to provide a few well formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to GEF's overall portfolio. Final evaluations should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the final evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.



## **Methodology**

The evaluation will consist of a desk review of relevant project documents and reports related to the planned evaluation and of the GEFs. The expert will then conduct focused group discussions, meetings, and interviews with the Project Director and other partners on topics and issues that relate to the implementation and impact of the project. The Expert is expected to become well versed as to the objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, project activities and already documented “lessons learned” of the project. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. More specifically, the evaluation will be based on the following sources of information:

- Review of documents related to the project such as project document, quarterly and annual progress reports, other activity/component specific deliverables, reports and evaluation, if there are any, etc.
- Structured interview with knowledgeable parties, conveniently a focus group discussion with a balanced representation of all key project stakeholders at relatively same level of seniority, experience and expertise.

The project will use a capacity development monitoring and evaluation scorecard to monitor the project capacity development progress. It will monitor all fifteen indicators in the five categories of capacity development for this project, (see table below). These 15 capacity indicators would be assessed in terms of what they were like at the beginning of the project start up, until the project’s end (See Annex II)

### **Capacity Result / Indicator Contribution to which Outcome**

#### **CR 1: Capacities for engagement**

Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations

Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms

Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups

## **CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge**

Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders

Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders

Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes

Indicator 7 – Extend of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development

Indicator 8 – Extend of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making

## **CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development**

Indicator 9 – Extend of the environmental planning and strategy development process

Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks

Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making

## **CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation**

Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources

Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer

## **CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate**

Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process

Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process

## **Timing and Submission of the Report**

The report should be completed within 30 days after signature of contract.

Preparation before field work: Six (6) days:

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, quarterly reports, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country).
- Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office and the Project team.
- Initial telephone discussion with UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

### **Mission: Twelve: (12) days:**

- Meeting with UNDP Country Office team;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in Ghana
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Visit to Project site
- Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities,(capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
- Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

**Draft report: Eight: (8) days:**

To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP RCU and Project team.
- Drafting of report in proposed format
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA
- Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 1 month

**Final Report Four: (4) day:**

- Presentation of final evaluation report is to be delivered after the evaluation exercise highlighting important observations, analysis of information and key conclusions including its recommendations are made. The report will be prepared and submitted to the UNDP CO, a copy furnished to the GECCA office and to MEST.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

The UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Climate Change will assist the UNDP CO and the evaluator in preparing for the final evaluation of the project. The evaluator will be an independent national consultant. The executing agency shall provide in advance copies of the necessary documents needed by the experts during the evaluation period. Likewise, the GECCA office shall provide the list of contact persons representing the various stakeholders of the project, which will be the basis for the tentative itinerary/schedule of activities, which the national consultant will prepare. With the support of UNDP CO, the GECCA office will finalize the schedule of activities in consultation with the national consultant, and will coordinate the logistical arrangements for the evaluation.

## Annex 2 – Documents reviewed

1. Project proposal document.
2. Report on Consultation workshop on the convention on biodiversity.
3. Report on stakeholder forum on biodiversity conservation.
4. Report on capacity building workshop for the media.
5. Report on engagement workshop on the three Rio conventions.
6. Inception workshop proceedings.
7. Report on establishment of national information and data exchange mechanism.
8. Report on monitoring and evaluation plan for the implementation of the Rio conventions.
9. Communization strategy report.
10. Baseline ecological survey of three selected districts in Ghana.
11. Policy advisory committee report.
12. Capacity needs assessment and public participation in the Rio conventions.
13. Baseline socioeconomic survey of three selected districts in Ghana.
14. Annual report 2010.
15. First quarterly report April, 2011.
16. Second quarterly report, July 2011.
17. Third quarterly report October, 2011.
18. Project Implementation Report 2011.
19. Report of visit to Keta district.
20. Report on visit to Atwima Kwanwoma district. The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, February 2006.
21. Report on visit to selected districts in the three Northern regions.
22. The Evaluation Policy of UNDP, May 2006.
23. UNDP, Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results, <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>.
24. UNDP, Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability, <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>.
25. GEF, Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>.

26. UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit,  
<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>.

### Annex 3 – List of People interviewed

Name	Organization
Dr. Nicholas Iddi	Project Coordinator – GECCA
Mr. Paolo Dalla Stella –	Climate Change Programme Officer- UNDP
Dr Raymond Babanawo	Project Technical Assistant- GECCA
Doris Duncan	Project Secretary- GECCA
Dr Dua Yentumi	Formerly of UNDP office
Mr. Sarpong -	Planning Officer - Antwima Kwanwoma District, Ashanti Region,
Mr. Mucassa -	Planning Officer - Talensi Nabdam District, Upper East Region
Abdul-Kareem Fuseini -	Site Manager, Keta Lagoon Complex Ramsar Site, Wildlife Division of Forestry Commission, Keta District, Volta Region.
Dr. Dua-Yentumi	Formerly of UNDP, Ghana.

## **Annex 4. Interview Guide Used**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FINAL EVALUATION**

#### **1. PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS**

**1.1 Changes in function/implementation conditions:** Focus on the perception of change of coordination structures and mechanisms among stakeholders in all three conventions.

- a) To what extent has the project caused any functional change?
- b) What changes have occurred at the national level through the merger of existing management structures?
- c) To what extent have GECCA provided support towards the operation of the pilot district concerned?
- d) To what extent has the project changed the activities of partners concerned with the project? (Beneficiaries, project staff, development partners, NGOs, government institutions, etc)

**1.2 Measurement of change:** Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project implementation.

- a) What change in all indicators has occurred compared to the baselines? Have the OVI's (i.e., targets according to the logframe been achieved as planned to date?
- b) What are partner perceptions regarding changes in the indicators?
- c) If there has been no change in the indicators, why has this been the case?
- d) Based on observations and discussions, what are the operational mechanisms of GECCA compared to previous?



**1.3 Project strategy:** How and why outcomes and the applied strategies (e.g. the capacity building approaches being applied by the project now, but also other strategic documents of the project or produced by the project) contribute to the achievement of the expected results (the project objective and goal).

**1.3.1** How feasible and flexible was the project design? (This is a judgment on the planning, not on the implementation)

a) Quality of Project Design (The appropriateness of project objectives to the recommendations of NCSA, needs and priorities of the intended target groups and beneficiaries that the project is supposed to address, and to the physical and policy environment within which it operates)

b) what was the quality of the logframe?

c) Were the Overall Objectives, Goal and Outcomes clear and logical, and did they address clearly identified needs?

d) Were the coordination, management and financing arrangements clear?

**1.3.2** Examine project relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

What is the present level of relevance of the project?

a) Do the planned target groups/beneficiaries correspond to the ones that are actually benefiting?

b) If applicable: How well did the project management adjust the project design (including the intervention logic / (hierarchy of objectives) to make it more relevant?

**1.3.3** Do the project outcomes, as formulated in the PRODOC still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives?

a) How adequate (relevant) are the aspects addressed in the intervention logic (the logframe) of the project set out? (Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, Overall Objective, Goal and Assumptions)

b) Are the project Goal and Overall Objective consistent with and supportive of Partner Government policies and relevant sector programs?

c) To what extent are the Outcomes contributing to the achievement of the project Goal and Objective?

d) Why are the Outcomes making the present contributions?

e) To what extent are the applied strategies of the project contributing to the achievement of project Goal and Objective?

f) Why are the applied strategies making the present contribution?

g) To what extent have key observations and recommendation, if any, from previous monitoring/evaluation visits been taken into account for improving the relevance of the project?

**1.3.4** Analyze the degree of country-ownership and stakeholder involvement/public awareness in the project.

Partner Contribution / Involvement

a) Are the inter-institutional structures adequate to allow efficient project implementation?

b) Have all partners been able to provide contributions to the project?

c) How good /fluent is the communication between the partner country responsible, the UNDP, GEF and the project?

**1.3.5** Considering that the development of national capacity for the RIO convention is a means to the ultimate goal of the project, how useful and adequate is the project's approach to strengthening this capacity?

a) To what extent is the capacity building approach used in this project useful in strengthening capacity?

b) Is there a need for the existence of a capacity building strategy for up-scaling RIO convention in Ghana?

c) If yes what are the main elements of this capacity building strategy? (Who or what should be strengthened? In what time frame?)

**1.3.6** Considering the time used for the project implementation was the timeframe set realistic?

#### Implementation of Activities

- a) To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled?
- b) Have all planned results been delivered to date?
- c) How well is the achievement of results monitored regularly by the project and corrective measures taken if required?
- d) To what extents are activities implemented or below planned cost? Specify if necessary?
- e) How well are activities monitored regularly by the project and corrective measures taken, if required? (e.g. new activities due to rising additional needs, cancellation of activities)
- f) To what extent have key observations and recommendations, if any, from previous monitoring /evaluation been taken into account for improving the quality of the implementation of activities?

**1.4 Performance:** With focus on the expected results, the evaluators are to assess how well the project performed in terms of:

#### **1.4.1** Achieving Goal and Outcomes

- a) What is the likelihood of the project achieving its Goal as envisaged and measured by the OVI's?
- b) To what extent did the project adapt to changing external conditions (assumptions) in order to ensure benefits for the target groups?
- c) If any unplanned negative effects on target groups/beneficiaries occurred, through the project to what extent did the project management take appropriate measures?
- d) To what extent have key observations and recommendations, if any, from previous monitoring/evaluation been taken into account for improving the achievement of the PP?

#### **1.4.2** Achieving the set of outputs that is expected;

- a) To what extent has the project achieved its planned Outputs?
- b) Were there any factors that prevented it from achieving the output effectively or in a timely manner?

#### **1.4.3 Improving the national capacity for the sustainable implementation of Rio convention**

- a) To what extent has the project succeeded in improving national capacity for sustainable implementation of the RIO convention?
- b) What are the key successes?
- c) Has the project any constraint preventing it in achieving this capacity improvement?
- d) What are key recommendations for improving the capacity for the RIO convention?

#### **1.4.4 Cost-effectiveness;**

(This has to do with fact that the results were obtained at reasonable cost, ie. How well means and activities were converted into results, and the quality of the results achieved

- a) To what degree are inputs/resources provided or available on time to implement activities from all parties identified?
- b) To what degree are inputs provided/available at planned cost (or lower than planned), from all parties identified?
- c) How appropriately are the inputs monitored regularly to allow cost-effective implementation of activities?

#### **1.4.5 Professional capacity and the quality of inputs and activities by GECCA;**

- a) What is the professional capacity of the GECCA?
- b) What has been the quality of inputs made so far by GECCA?
- c) What has been the quality of the activities carried out by GECCA?
- d) Constraints, if any, to carrying out good quality work?

**1.4.6** Managerial aspects of the project, including how the co-ordination is organized, how it organizes the teams, the set of skills required vis-à-vis the challenges, the management style and the management of human and financial resources (noting that the evaluators will not be auditing the project, but should have insight in any financial audit reports that have been produced).

a) How was the project managed? Give a sense of how the work is organized, who b) is responsible at various levels and the management structure.

b) What are the positive and negative aspects of the existing management structure?

c) How well is the project contributing to institutional management capacity?

d) What is the level of availability of qualified human resources to implement the project?

e) What is the relationship between the various institutions regarding the management of the project?

**1.4.7** Adequacy, effectiveness of implementation arrangements of the project.

a) How adequate are the implementation arrangements of the project?

b) Overall did the project obtained anticipated results and to what extent?

c) What changes needed to be made to improve overall effectiveness of the implementation arrangements?

**1.5 Sustainability:** The FE the focus will be on the extent to which the benefits of the project are likely to continue, within and outside the zones of project intervention, after the project has come to an end. The FE should also pay special attention to the potential contribution of the project to creating the basic conditions to ensure sustainability through capacity building at the local, regional and national levels.

**1.5.1** Institutional sustainability

a) How well is the project embedded in institutional structures as a means of achieving sustainability beyond the project's life?

- b) What institution will take the lead role after the end of this project?
- c) To what extent are project partners being properly trained (technically, managerially, financially) to take over the project?
- d) What mechanisms exist within the project to ensure that benefits are enjoyed by others outside the zone of intervention of the project?

**1.5.2** What is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between project and policy level?

- a) What support has been provided from the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies?
- b) Do changes in policies and priorities affect the project and how well is it adapting, also to long-term needs for support?
- c) How much support did the project receive from the public and private sector?
- d) To what extent does the project enhance the role of non-state actors as partners in public policy making and implementation?

**1.5.3** Financial /economic viability?

- a) If the activities (results) have to be supported institutionally, are funds likely to be made available?
- b) Are the responsible persons/ institutions assuming their (financial /economic) responsibilities?
- c) Can the benefits be maintained if economic factors change (e.g. commodity prices, exchange rate)?
- d) Are the target groups (and relevant authorities/institutions) in the position to afford maintenance and replacement of technologies introduced and /or used by the project?
- e) Is there a phase-out strategy defined and (to be) implemented?

## **2. THE PROJECT'S ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK**

### **2.1 Monitoring Systems**

#### **2.1.1** Assess the monitoring tools currently being used

- a) What are the monitoring tools currently being used?
- b) To what extent are the monitoring tools providing the necessary information?
- c) How are key partners involved in the use of the monitoring tools?
- d) How efficient are the monitoring tools being used?
- e) Are additional tools required? If so what is required?

### **2.2 Risk Management**

Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important ones and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

#### **2.2.1** How relevant are the identified risks and how can they be better defined?

- a) Are the risks identified for this project the most important ones?
- b) How appropriate are the risk ratings applied?
- c) If the risk ratings are not appropriate, explain why.
- d) What are additional risks?
- e) What are suggested risk ratings?
- f) What risk management strategies can be suggested?

### **2.2.2 Assess the project's risk identification and management systems**

- a) To what extent is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System appropriately applied?
- b) How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen the project's adaptive management?
- c) How has the management of the project responded to project risks? Assess the management response to project risks.

## **2.3 Work Planning**

Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it

Ensure the modified logical framework meets UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content.

Assess whether the congruence between the outputs-based budget (Project Output Budget in project brief/PRODOC) and the inputs-based budget (the Atlas budget) is adequate and propose ways to improve it as applicable.

Assess the use of routinely updated work plans.

Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities

Ensure work planning processes are result-based.

## **3. UNDERLYING FACTORS**

**3.1** Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.



- a) What are the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results?
- b) How have these underlying factors influenced the project's outcomes?
- c) What has the project done to manage these factors and how effective have these management strategies been?

#### **4. UNDP CONTRIBUTION**

**4.1** With focus on the support provided by the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination and considering the scope and availability of results from the GEF Evaluation Office Desk Review of the project – so as to avoid duplication – evaluators are to assess:

The role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:

- Field visits
- Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
- APR/PIR preparation and follow-up
- GEF guidance
- Quarterly Progress and Financial Reports.
- Work plans

a) What is or has been the role of UNDP compared to the requirement set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results?

b) What has been this role with respect to the following?

- Field visits
- Steering Committee/TOR follow-up an analysis

- Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review preparation and follow-up
- Quarterly Progress and Financial Reports
- Work plans

**4.2** Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide, especially the quality assurance elements, and ensure they are incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework

a) How do the new requirements UNDP User Guide compare to the project’s adaptive management framework?

b) What are the quality assurance elements needed to be incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework?

**4.3** Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance to the project management.

a) What has been the “soft assistance contribution by UNDP (policy advice and dialogue, advocacy and coordination) to the project? (Outline these contributions)

b) What suggestions can be made to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance?

## **5. PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY**

**5.1** Assess how partners are involved in the project’s adaptive management framework:

a) How well does the project correspond to the local perception of needs?

b) What was the level of participation of the beneficiaries in the design of the project?

c) What is the level of participation for the beneficiaries in the implementation of the project?

d) How good is the relationship between project management, the beneficiaries and their representatives?

Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies

- a) To what extent are partners involved in analyzing progress made within the project?
- b) To what extent are partners involved in determining project strategies?

Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships between the key stakeholders and relevant Ghana Government agencies, and international agencies

- a) What is the level of partnerships between key stakeholders?
- b) To what extent is there need to strengthen the partnerships? With what partners?
- c) How can the partnerships be strengthened?

**5.2** Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary.

What is the level of ownership of the project by beneficiaries and how will it likely be after the end of external support?

- a) To what extent have beneficiaries and possibly other relevant interest groups/stakeholders been involved in the planning process?
- b) How do local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making?
- c) What are the strengths and the approach used for the participation of local stakeholders in project management and decision making?
- d) How can local stakeholder participation in project and decision-making be improved?
- e) What is the likelihood that the target groups/beneficiaries will continue to make use of relevant services after external support has ended?

**5.3** Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and, if necessary, suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

a) Do all stakeholders and partners have access to project results and services?

b) What types of information has the project disseminated to partners and stakeholders?

c) To what extent does the project management promote the use and benefit of the results of the project?

## Annex 5. Itinerary of activities of the Final Evaluation Mission

<b>Date</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Location</b>
09 May 2012	Arrive in Accra from Kumasi Meeting with Palo Dalla Stella and signing of contract and project de-briefing	Climate Change Programme Officer- UNDP Office.
10 May 2012	Return to Kumasi. Briefing of evaluators	CSIR- Soil Research Institute.
11 May 2012	Desk preparation	CSIR- Soil Research Institute
14 May 2012	Depart to Accra. Meet with GECCA PCU staff. Interviewed Project coordinator and staff	MEST Office
15 May 2012	Visit to MEST again. Collect project documents Return to Kumasi.	MEST Office
21 May 2012	Visit to Atwima Kwanwoma District. Meet with Project planning Officer. Return to Kumasi.	District Office
22 May 2012	Visit to Talensi Nabdam District, Upper East Region. Meet with Project Planning Officer	District office
24 May 2012	Return to Kumasi	
25 May 2012	Visit to Keta District, Volta Region. Meet Project Planning Officer	District Office.
26 May 2012	Return to Kumasi	

## Annex 6: Evaluation consultant agreement form



### UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

#### Contract for the services of an Individual Contractor

No:2012/022

This Contract is entered into on 02 May 2012 between the **United Nations Development Programme** (hereinafter referred to as "UNDP") and **Joseph Opoku Fening** (hereinafter referred to as "the Individual Contractor") whose address is CSIR-Soil Research Institute, Academy Post Office, PMB, Kwadaso, Kumasi.

WHEREAS UNDP desires to engage the services of the Individual Contractor on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, and:

WHEREAS the Individual Contractor is ready and willing to accept this Contract with UNDP on the said terms and conditions,

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

#### 1. Nature of services

The Individual Contractor shall perform the services as described in the Terms of References which form an integral part of this Contract and are attached hereto as *Annex I* in the following Duty Station(s): Accra

#### 2. Duration

This Individual Contract shall commence on **10<sup>th</sup> May 2012**, and shall expire upon satisfactory completion of the services described in the Terms of Reference mentioned above, but not later than **30<sup>th</sup> June 2012**, unless sooner terminated in accordance with the terms of this Contract. This Contract is subject to the General Conditions of Contract for Individual contractors which are available on UNDP website at [www.undp.org/procurement](http://www.undp.org/procurement) and are attached hereto as *Annex II*.

#### 3. Consideration

As full consideration for the services performed by the Individual Contractor under the terms of this Contract, UNDP shall pay the Individual Contractor a total of **\$ 11,100 (Ghana Cedis Equivalent)** in accordance with the table set forth below. Payments shall be made following certification by UNDP that the services related to each Deliverable, as described below, have been satisfactorily performed and the Deliverables have been achieved by or before the due dates specified below, if any

DELIVERABLE	DUE DATE	AMOUNT
40% upon submission of draft report	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2012	\$ 4,440 (GH¢ equivalent)
60% upon submission of final report	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2012	\$ 6,660 (GH¢ equivalent)

If unforeseen travel outside the Duty Station not required by the Terms of Reference is requested by UNDP, and upon prior written agreement, such travel shall be at UNDP's expense and the Individual Contractor shall receive a *per diem* not to exceed United Nations daily subsistence allowance rate in such other location(s).

Where two currencies are involved, the rate of exchange shall be the official rate applied by the United Nations on the day the UNDP instructs its bank to effect the payment(s).

#### 4. Rights and Obligations of the Individual contractor

The rights and obligations of the Individual Contractor are strictly limited to the terms and conditions of this Contract, including its Annexes. Accordingly, the Individual Contractor shall not be entitled to any benefit, payment, subsidy, compensation or entitlement, except as expressly provided in this Contract. The Individual Contractor shall be solely liable for claims by third parties arising from the Individual Contractor's own acts or omissions in the course of performing this Contract, and under no circumstances shall UNDP be held liable for such claims by third parties.

#### 5. Beneficiary

The Individual Contractor selects **Peggy Ama Fening** as beneficiary of any amounts owed under this Contract in the event of death of the Individual Contractor while performing services hereunder. This includes the payment of any service-incurred liability insurance attributable to the performance of the services for UNDP.

Mailing address, email address and phone number of beneficiary, KNUST, Metal Section Dept., PMB, KNUST Post Office, Kumasi - 0208182746

Mailing address, email address and phone number of emergency contact (if different from beneficiary):

COA: 00069261-1-62000-10003-33605-001390-71305

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Contract.

By signing below, I, the Individual Contractor, acknowledge and agree that I have read and accept the terms of this Contract, including the General Conditions of Contracts for Individual contractors available on UNDP website at [www.undp.org/procurement](http://www.undp.org/procurement) and attached hereto in Annex II which form an integral part of this Contract, and that I have read and understood, and agree to abide by the standards of conduct set forth in the Secretary-General's bulletins ST/SGB/2003/13 of 9 October 2003, entitled "Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse" and ST/SGB/2002/9 of 18 June 2002, entitled "Regulations Governing the Status, Basic Rights and Duties of Officials other than Secretariat Officials, and Experts on Mission".

AUTHORIZING OFFICER:  
Rene da Silva  
United Nations Development Programme

Signature:



Date:

02/05/12

INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR:

Joseph Opoku Fening

Signature:



Date:

04/05/12