# Executive summary

##

## 1.1 Project description

This is a Terminal Evaluation (TE) report for Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) implemented in Uganda over a period of four years. The project development and implementation phases consumed a total budget of USD 1,275,500 USD. The project was designed with the objective to support the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals, Uganda’s National Development Plan, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP’s Country Programme. The specific objectives were to i) develop national capacities for coordination and implementation of climate change mitigation activities in the country in support of social welfare and national development in general, ii) ensure climate proof development planning and, iii) promote low carbon development paths.

The project document was approved and signed on September 21, 2012 and officially launched in Kampala on February 20, 2013. The project implementation was originally planned to last 2.5 years but no-cost extensions were approved, and the project has taken a total of 4 years.

The project focus and activities have been revised and significantly updated from the Initial Project Document, based on the recommendations of the implementing stakeholders to better address actual local needs and a changed national context.

Initially, the LECB Program in Uganda aimed at the realization of three initial objectives, known as outputs 1 to 3. During the lifetime of the project, two new outputs were added, to respond to new national and international commitments. The outputs are detailed below.

* Output 1: Robust national system for preparation of GHG emission inventories established at national level
* Output 2: NAMAs formulated within the context of national development priorities
* Output 3: MRV systems designed to support identified NAMAs and linked to GHG inventory system
* Output 4: LEDS elaborated (Green Growth Development Strategy (GGDS)
* Output 5: Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC)

Building technical and institutional climate change capacities allow the reinforcement of country mitigation actions to exploit climate change financing opportunities in renewable energy and energy efficiency that promote growth, employment opportunities, increased incomes, poverty reduction and improved livelihoods. Beyond the improvement of the climate change mitigation capacity, the project contributed to reduced emissions and anthropogenic impacts of climate change.

The original budget was 672,000 USD, but the project has eventually been financed to a total final amount of 1,275,500 USD due to added output activities. The added activities and cost implications are shown in the Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Project funds secured**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Budget (USD) |
| Initial project budget for GHG inventories, NAMAs and MRVs  | 672,000.00 |
| Additional funds for GGDS  | 336,000 |
| Additional funds for INDC  | 160,500 |
| Additional funds for NAMA  | 107,000 |
| **Total project budget**  | **1,275,500** |

The project has mobilized additional local in-kind support to the project implementation where operations have been hosted in national institutions and public civil service officers have been involved in project activities and management.

## 1.2 Context and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation has been performed on a request of the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Uganda, as a standard mandatory requirement of all UNDP projects. The terminal evaluation mission took place from August 16, 2017 to September 12, 2017. The evaluation was done according to the 2012 Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-financed Projects

The objective of the evaluation was to assess the achievement of project’s objective, the affecting factors, the broader project impacts, its sustainability, and the project partnership strategy. The terminal evaluation focused specifically also on recommendations and lessons learned that could be utilized in similar projects in other countries of UNDP operations.

## 1.3 Summary of evaluation findings

This TE study finds the project as designed relevant and appropriate to address national challenges and development needs in line with commitments to climate change mitigation. The project fits well in national efforts as guided by the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management and in line with UNDP’s mandate and UNDAF/Country Programme Document.

The project key objectives have been achieved and target outputs realized. The evaluation finds the project evolution justified and the added outputs vital for supplementing the three in the in the initial project document. The initial three outputs were expanded to five to include the Green Growth Strategy Development process and the implementation of the nationally determined contributions due to the national interest in tackling mitigation issues and helping the country to establish structures and systems to enable the country track mitigation aspects generated by of the LECB project. The evaluation also finds that in addition, the LECB activities contributed substantially to the process of development of the INDC and ratification of the Paris Agreement.

The partnerships between MWE and other government ministries guided by UNDP Uganda Country Office were effective in delivering expected results. The Ministry which as DNA on climate change in Uganda was the project’s implementing government partner and provided high-level government support to the project though the offices of the Permanent Secretary (being the chair and secretary of the Project Steering Committee). There were strong direct and tangential partnership arrangements with relevant stakeholders in delivering project objectives. UNDP Uganda country office performed exceptionally well to ensure that the project was implemented smoothly.

There was value for money as project funds were well utilized in implementation of planned activities. Financial management was well coordinated between UNDP, MWE and other partners involved in the project.

The project was a good prototype for incorporation of gender concerns, equality as well as women empowerment. During the execution of the project, women were actively involved both as part of the project implementation team to selection among the different stakeholders that were directly or indirectly involved in the project activities.

This evaluation finds that capacity building support provided under the project was guided by clearly defined institutional mandates and focused on strengthening low emission development. More specifically this included developing GHG inventory systems, NAMAs and MRVs. Strengthening the technical and institutional climate change mitigation capacities allow the reinforcement of country mitigation actions to exploit climate change financing opportunities. Improvement of the climate change mitigation capacity will contribute to a reduction in emissions and anthropogenic climate change contributions which will in turn reduce risk and vulnerability in the country. It was also noted in this TE that information generated by the performance indicators during project implementation to was effectively used to adapt and improve the project and lessons learned reported which was good practice to support future projects and interventions.

## 1.4 Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

With an efficient Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework at project design, the project has delivered good results that are unique and useful for the country in its commitment to mitigate climate change and promote low carbon technologies and behaviors. These conclusions are also important as Uganda is designing a second phase of the project. The TE specific conclusions are:

1. Technical assistance needs on climate change mitigation are still important in Uganda. It is recommended to continue to support the country, both for assistance that responds to identified situations, and for long-term support, and to provide the country with the recent but already important experience in designing and implementing a low carbon and climate resilient strategy. This technical assistance should focus on the new issues under negotiation at the international level, along the Paris Agreement.
2. A second phase of the LECB project is necessary for Uganda, to consolidate the achievements of the first phase. This should reassure certain beneficiaries as to the continuation of their activities, and that project results and lessons learned are shared with all stakeholders.
3. The country, in particular through activities initiated by the project, is well informed of the new sources of climate finance, first and foremost being the Green Climate Fund (GCF). It is suggested to adopt a coherent strategy in terms of raising climate finance.

However, challenges and barriers remain, to reach the GHG emissions reductions targets set by the country under the Paris Agreement, including financing and technical capacity. More sector-specific actions are needed to set targets and policies in each sector, especially in relation with energy production and consumption, forestry, agriculture and transport.

The project implementation suffered from a limited number of indicators and targets. However, adjustments were made with the addition of two new outputs to the original project document. GHG emissions monitoring and evaluation plan and methodology needed more support for an effective implementation. The table below summarizes the results of the project per criterion.

Overall, the project is rated Satisfactory (S).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| Project Formulation | S | The formulation of the project was good and the design adequate. |
| Country Ownership | HS | The project goal and objectives properly addressed the country needs and were fully in-line with country priorities and policies. |
| Stakeholders’ participationProduction and dissemination of informationInvolvement of governmental institutions | HSSHS | The Project design process involved consultation with the key stakeholder groups, analyzing characteristics as well as problems and needs, interests of potential stakeholders. The latter were therefore more inclined to participate during the implementation. The GoU participation was significant and a large amount of information was produced and disseminated. |
| Replication Approach | HS | The project presents good ground for replication thanks to well-documented activities and sustainable achievements of the project. |
| Project implementationGeneral ManagementRelevance | SSS | The overall quality of the project is explained by a quite efficient adaptive management, successful partnerships and a good execution of financial resources over the project period. During its implementation, the project adapted to international progress in terms of mitigation’s mechanisms. |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | HS | The planning for the M&E was comprehensive and detailed in the project document. The implementation of M&E strategy was very comprehensive and efficient. |
| Financial Management | S | The amounts and allocation between the different budget lines were appropriate and in line with the planned and implemented project activities |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS):**  | The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |
| **Satisfactory (S):**  | There were only minor shortcomings |
| **Marginally Satisfactory(MS):**  | There were moderate shortcomings |
| **Marginally Unsatisfactory(MU):**  | The project had significant shortcomings |
| **Unsatisfactory (U):**  | There were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):**  | The project had severe shortcomings |

The following are the recommendations on the basis of Terminal Evaluation findings:

1. Technical assistance needs are still important in Uganda. It is recommended to ccontinue to accompany the country, both for assistance that responds to identified situations, and for long-term support, and to provide the country with the recent but already important experience of UNDP in the formulation of projects.
2. There is a need to develop a second phase of the LECB project in Uganda. This second phase should reflect on the continued operation of the project and should reassure certain beneficiaries as to the continuation of their activities, and that project results and lessons learned are shared with all stakeholders.
3. There is a need to adopt a coherent strategy in terms of raising climate finance to sustain the project achievements.
4. There is a need for the Ugandan entities involved in the national mitigation to periodically meet with their regional counterparts to enhance their capacity in tackling climate change with mutual experience’s sharing. For instance, aspects of the implementation and outcomes of the Low Emission Capacity Building Program in Uganda could be considered as useful examples for neighboring country mitigation strategy and vice-versa.
5. The country National Determined Contribution strategy could benefit from engaging the private sector more into its climate finance strategy. More public and private partnership could be enhanced to develop investments opportunities reducing the resource constraint for the implementation of mitigation mechanisms.
6. Gender-responsive mitigation mechanisms could be more developed. Although the LECB program had positive results in gender equality and inclusiveness, it is recommended to improve women’s participation into the technical and managing teams and leaderships positions. The impact on gender issues could also be more considered while developing further NAMAs and NDCs.