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# Project summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Project ID:** | 9675 |  |  | |
| **Implementing Agency:** | UNEP  UNDP | **Executing Agency:** | UNEP DTU Partnership: Component 1  UNDP: Components 2 and 3 | |
| **Relevant SDG(s) and indicator(s):** | 13.2.1 Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalisation of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production (including a national adaptation plan, nationally determined contribution, national communication, biennial update report or other)  17.16.1 Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals | | | |
| **Sub-programme:** | Climate Change | **Expected Accomplishment(s):** | **EA I:** CBIT platform for  coordination, learning  opportunities and  knowledge sharing  **EA II:** Coordination  and exchange  events  **EA III:** CBIT Needs  and Gaps identified | |
| **UNEP approval date:** | 28-September-2017 | **Programme of Work Output(s):** | Programme of Work 2018-2019 – Sub-Programme Climate Change  Expected Accomplishment B: countries increasingly adopt and/or implement low greenhouse gas emission development strategies and invest in clean technologies | |
| **GEF approval date:** | 11-August-2017 | **Project type:** | Medium Size Project | |
| **GEF Operational Programme #:** |  | **Focal Area(s):** | Climate Change[[1]](#footnote-1) | |
|  |  | **GEF Strategic Priority:** | Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency | |
| ***Expected* start date:** |  | **Actual start date:** | 05-October-2017 | |
| ***Planned* completion date:** | 31-March-2019 | **Actual operational completion date:** | UNEP: 31-December-2019  UNDP: 28-February-2020 | |
| ***Planned* project budget at approval:** | 1,400,000 | **Actual total expenditures reported as of [date]:** |  | |
| **GEF grant allocation:** | 1,000,000 | **GEF grant expenditures reported as of 20 June 2020:** | UNEP: US$ 492,726.50  UNDP: US$ 483,231.00 | |
| **Project Preparation Grant - GEF financing:** | 0 | **Project Preparation Grant - co-financing:** |  | |
| ***Expected* Medium-Size Project co-financing:** | 400,000 | **Secured Medium-Size Project co-financing:** | 400,000 + leverage contributions from Germany and Italy | |
| **First disbursement:** | 05-September-2018 | **Planned date of financial closure:** | 31-January-2021 | |
| **No. of formal project revisions:** | 1 | **Date of last approved project revision:** | 29-March-2019 | |
| **No. of Steering Committee meetings:** | 2 | **Date of last/next Steering Committee meeting:** | Last:19-December-2019 | Next: N/A |
| **Mid-term Review/ Evaluation *(planned date):*** | N/A | **Mid-term Review/ Evaluation (actual date):** | N/A | |
| **Terminal Evaluation *(planned date):*** | 30-April-2020 | **Terminal Evaluation (actual date):** |  | |
| **Coverage - Country(ies):** | Global | **Coverage - Region(s):** | Global | |
| **Dates of previous project phases:** | N/A | **Status of future project phases:** | PIF (GEFID: 10128) for Phase II-A approved, CEO Endorsement request submitted, GEF Sec. comments received, UNDP resubmitted on 27-May-2020. | |

# Acronyms

BSP Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building

BUR Biennial Update Report

CBIT Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency

CIS Commonwealth of Independent States

COP Conference of the Parties (UNFCCC)

DP Development Partner

DTU Technical University of Denmark

EA Executing Agency

EMG Executive Management Group

EQ Evaluation Question

FMO Finance Management Officer

GCP Global Coordination Platform

GEF Global Environment Facility

GEF Sec. GEF Secretariat

GSP Global Support Programme for National Communications and Biennial Update Reports

HQ Headquarters

IA Implementing Agency

LDC Least Developed Country

MRV Measuring, Reporting, and Verification

MTS Medium Term Strategy

NC National Communication

NDC Nationally Determined Contribution

PIF Project Identification Form

PIR Project Implementation Review

PoW Programme of Work

PSC Project Steering Committee

SIDS Small Island Development State

S-SC South-South Cooperation

SMART Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound.

TE Terminal Evaluation

ToC Theory of Change

ToR Terms of Reference

UNDP United Nations Development Programme

UNEP United Nations Environment Programme

UNEP DTU UNEP DTU Partnership

UNFCCC United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
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# 1. Introduction

1. **Objective and purpose an of the terminal evaluation (TE):** This TE covers the first phase (2017-2019) of the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency Global Coordination Platform (CBIT GCP). It is carried out in accordance with the provisions of the UNEP Evaluation Policy and the UNEP Programme Manual. As specified in the terms of reference (ToR), the objective is “*to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability*”. The TE has two main purposes:
2. to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements
3. to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, UNDP and signatories to the Paris Agreement (forward-looking and practicable recommendations will be provided for the second phase of CBIT GCP)
4. The principal outputs of the TE are: i) this inception report, ii) a draft TE report, and ii) a final TE report.
5. **Project problem and justification:** Parties to the 2016 Paris Agreement under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have committed to prepare, submit and implement Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) which sets out the countries’ efforts, priorities and goals vis-à-vis combatting climate change, including its mitigation and adaptation goals and means of implementation. NDCs are implemented at the country-level through policies and actions. Moreover, countries are committed to establish measuring, reporting, and verification (MRV) systems to assess the impact of their climate change actions and policies, in order to report to the Convention and provide information for knowledge-based decision-making. The Paris Agreement also establishes an “enhanced transparency framework for action and support,” which covers information about the mitigation and adaptation actions undertaken by all Parties. Article 13 of establishes that each Party must submit a national greenhouse gas inventory report, and the information necessary to track progress vis-à-vis NDC implementation progress. However, developing countries (non-Annex 1 Parties) face challenges in establishing their MRV systems and implementing their reporting obligations under the convention. Moreover, at the start of CBIT GCP there was no mechanism for systematic global coordination and global knowledge management, and therefore no overview of the progress towards establishing a transparency system that all countries have the capacity to report on, and also a risk of duplication of efforts and lack of synergy. CBIT GCP was established to address this gap, and also to facilitate the sharing of lessons and best practices among developing countries.
6. **Institutional context of the project:** CBIT GCP was funded under the GEF climate change sub-programme implemented by UNEP and UNDP.
7. The Energy and Climate Branch of the UNEP Economy Division implemented one component through the UNEP DTU Partnership (UNEP DTU). Implemented in October 2017 – December 2019, CBIT GCP fell under the UNEP 2018-2021 Medium Term Strategy and 2018-2019 Programme of Work[[2]](#footnote-2), and the following UNEP sub-programmes under which it aimed to contribute to the following expected accomplishments:
8. Sub-programme 1 climate change, expected accomplishment (b): *countries increasingly adopt and/or implement low greenhouse gas emission development strategies and invest in clean technologies*
9. Sub-programme 7 environment under review, expected accomplishment: *governments and other stakeholders use quality open environmental data, analyses and participatory processes that strengthen the science-policy interface to generate evidence-based environmental assessments, identify emerging issues and foster policy action*
10. UNDP implemented two components through its programme team for the Global Support Programme (GSP) under the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support; the GSP is based at the Europe and CIS Regional Hub in Istanbul. CBIT GCP contributed to the UNDP Strategic Plan Output 1.4 *scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation cross sectors which is funded and implemented*.
11. **TE Target audience:** The TE will in particular inform staff from UNEP, UNEP DTU, UNDP and the GEF Secretariat with a direct involvement/role in relation to CBIT GCP and will inform the design and implementation of the upcoming second phase CBIT GCP as well as other global coordination and knowledge management projects. Moreover, the TE will be made available to the general public, including participating countries and donors to the GEF.

# 2. Project outputs and outcomes

1. CBIT GCP had the following objective: *Establish an online platform supporting countries to understand and implement the transparency framework of the Paris Agreement. The platform will both provide development partners with an overview of existing initiatives to coordinate support efficiently and countries with knowledge and information forums for sharing best practices.* (CEO Endorsement Request, 2017[[3]](#footnote-3))
2. CBIT GCP had three intended outcomes:
3. Enhanced coordination and best practice sharing for transparency practitioners through the establishment of a web-based coordination platform
4. Information sharing enhanced through regional and global meetings
5. Needs and gaps identified for enhancing transparency systems and CBIT coordination

(CEO Endorsement Request, 2017)

1. The above outcomes were pursued through the components and outputs presented in the table below.

**CBIT GCP outputs**

|  |
| --- |
| Component 1 (UNEP):  Output 1.1 A web-based coordination platform on transparency designed and operational  Output 1.2 Self-assessment tool for Countries to assess the state of their national transparency systems developed and deployed  Output 1.3 Platform interface for self-progress reporting by national CBIT projects and other transparency initiatives designed  Output 1.4 Coordination platform populated with data and information on transparency initiatives, CBIT national projects and country efforts (collected from 1.2 and 1.3)  Output 1.5 Available transparency-related emerging practices, methodologies, and guidance collected and made available through the coordination platform |
| Component 2 (UNDP):  Output 2.1 Coordination platform launched in kick-off event  Output 2.2 Three technical workshops on transparency organized and executed |
| Component 3 (UNDP):  Output 3.1 Needs & gaps identified for enhancing transparency systems and CBIT coordination  Output 3.2 Roadmap for Phase 2 to expand the CBIT coordination platform as per the scope of paragraph 21 of the CBIT programming paper, including: institutional arrangements, best practices and community of practice, global and regional capacity building programmes, implementation tracking tool, coordination with other platforms, etc. |
| Source: CEO Endorsement Request, 2017 |

However, while the results framework overall is logical and coherent, there are a couple of shortcomings, as shown in the table below (see Annex F for a detailed assessment of the results framework).

**Justification for Reformulation of Results Statements**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Formulation in original project document(s)** | **Formulation for Reconstructed ToC at Evaluation Inception (RTOC)** | **Justification for Reformulation** |
| LONG TERM IMPACT  INTERMEDIATE STATES |  |  |
| Objective: Establish an online platform supporting countries to understand and implement the transparency framework of the Paris Agreement. The platform will both provide development partners with an overview of existing initiatives to coordinate support efficiently and countries with knowledge and information forums for sharing best practices. | *Enhanced understanding and capacity of countries to implement the transparency framework of the Paris Agreement.* | The original objective was not phrased as an impact/outcome.  The platform itself is an output, which in turn leads to the three outcomes.  It is thus at a lower level, not at a higher level, than the outcomes. |
|  |  |  |
| PROJECT OUTCOMES |  |  |
| 1: Enhanced coordination and best-practice sharing for transparency practitioners and donors through the establishment of a web-based platform. | Enhanced coordination and best practice sharing for transparency practitioners and donors. | Appropriate outcome for the project, but the “*through the establishment of a web-based platform”* part is deleted, since the web platform itself is an output. |
| 2: Information sharing enhanced through regional and global meetings | Enhanced sharing of information. | Appropriate outcome for the project, but the “*regional and global meetings”* part is deleted, since the meetings are outputs.  In a sense, there is some overlap between outcome 1 and 2 (“*sharing*”), but they fall under different components and were implemented by different agencies, hence both outcomes are kept. |
| 3: Needs and gaps identified for enhancing transparency systems and CBIT coordination | Strategy/plan in place for post-project continuation of global coordination, sharing and information in relation to Paris Agreement transparency. | Original outcome 3 was not phrased as an outcome, but an output. A new, outcome-oriented, phrasing is used. |
| Note: the three outcomes all concern enhancing coordination and sharing of knowledge and could effectively be combined in a single outcome. However, the structure with three outcomes is kept for practical reasons, given the project components were implemented by two different agencies and through different mechanisms (UNEP – web platform, UNDP – events), and outcome 3 focused on preparing post-project mechanisms. | | |
|  |  |  |
| OUTPUTS |  |  |
| 1.1: A web-based coordination platform on transparency designed and operational | | Appropriate outputs, no changes made. |
| 1.2: Self-assessment tool for Countries to assess the state of their national transparency systems developed and deployed | |
| 1.3: Platform interface for self-progress reporting by national CBIT projects and other transparency initiatives designed | |
| 1.4: Coordination platform populated with data and information on transparency initiatives, CBIT national projects and country efforts (collected from 1.2 and 1.3) | |
| 1.5: Available transparency-related emerging practices, methodologies, and guidance collected and made available through the coordination platform | |
| 2.1: Coordination platform launched in kick-off event | |
| 2.2: Three technical workshops on transparency organized and executed | |
| 3.1: Needs & gaps identified for enhancing transparency systems and CBIT coordination | |
| 3.2: Roadmap for Phase 2 to expand the CBIT coordination platform as per the scope of paragraph 21 of the CBIT programming paper, including: institutional arrangements, best practices and community of practice, global and regional capacity building programmes, implementation tracking tool, coordination with other platforms, etc. | |

# 3. Stakeholder analysis

1. UNEP and UNDP were each responsible for their own budget and activities. This setup was unusual in that there was not one agency with the overall responsibility.
2. Component 1 had UNEP as GEF implementing agency (IA) providing strategic oversight and the UNEP DTU Partnership as GEF executing agency (EA) responsible for day-to-day implementation.
3. For component 2 and 3, UNDP had the dual roles as implementing agency and executing agency, and the implementing and executing roles were separated internally (firewall). This setup was unusual in that the implementing and executing functions were carried out by the same agency.
4. Project Steering Committee (PSC): The implementation of CBIT GCP was overseen and guided by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) comprising representatives from UNEP, UNDP, UNEP DTU Partnership, the UNFCCC Secretariat, and the GEF Secretariat. For each meeting, one Annex I country and one Non-Annex I country were invited (different countries in each meeting). The PSC approved annual work plans and budgets as well as any major changes in the project plans. The PSC met twice, on 26 September 2018 and 19 December 2019.
5. Executive Management Group (EMG): Implementation was coordinated by the Executive Management Group (EMG) comprising the UNEP task manager, the UNDP project manager and task manager, and the UNEP DTU Partnership (UNEP DTU) project manager. The EMG met in 17-18 January 2018, 13 February 2019, and 18-19 June 2019.
6. CBIT GCP was exclusively implemented through global and regional activities broadly targeting all CBIT countries and did not engage directly in specific CBIT countries. CBIT events were accessible to interested countries and development partners – but within the budget available the project could only accommodate a small number of people from each country and thus specifically targeted national focal points for CBIT processes. As such, the stakeholder identification and targeting were clear. Technical resources (e.g. tools, publications) on the CBIT GCP website are publicly available. However, there is no information on the design process and participation of stakeholders in the process. The focus of CBIT GCP was to provide access to information and technical resources, and opportunities for networking and sharing of experiences both between countries and between developing partners. The actual application of the resources and knowledge provided was at the volition of the participants, so the project itself had little direct influence. As such, the project did not have a direct influence or effect (positive or negative) on direct stakeholders or on vulnerable people in the participating countries – although gender mainstreaming was promoted through technical resources and awareness raising at events – and indicators were gender disaggregated when appropriate. The project carried out a survey to get stakeholder feedback on the relevance and utility of the website, which showed an overall appreciation.
7. The table below present the main stakeholders and their role in the project and in their envisaged engagement in the TE:

**Stakeholder analysis**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** | **Interest/role in CBIT GCP** | **Role in TE** |
| UNEP: GEF Climate Change Mitigation Unit, Energy and Climate Branch (Paris), Economy Division (Nairobi) | Implementing agency for component 1. | Key informant – to be interviewed and provided opportunity to comment on draft report. |
| UNEP DTU | Executing agency for component 1 – day-to-day implementation. | Key informant – to be interviewed and provided opportunity to comment on draft report. |
| UNDP:  Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (New York) | Implementing agency for components 2 and 3. | Key informant – to be interviewed and provided opportunity to comment on draft report. |
| UNDP: Europe and CIS Regional Hub (Istanbul) | Executing agency for components 2 and 3, day-to-day implementation done by the programme team for the Global Support Programme (GSP). | Key informant – to be interviewed and provided opportunity to comment on draft report. |
| GEF Secretariat | Donor, member of the steering committee and of the MRV Group of Friends. | Key informant – to be interviewed and provided opportunity to comment on draft report. |
| UNFCCC Secretariat | Member of the steering committee and of the MRV Group of Friends. | Key informant – to be interviewed. |
| Governments of Non-Annex I Parties/CBIT countries | Staff from government entities responsible for CBIT were the primary stakeholders and end beneficiaries targeted by the project. | 10-20 selected representatives from countries participating proactively in CBIT GCP – to be interviewed.  Brief online survey to be distributed to all CBIT country focal points. |
| Other development partners and support initiatives (e.g. FAO, Conservation International) | Also supporting CBIT/MRV processes and with an interest in sharing of experiences and approaches and coordination of activities. | Selected representatives of key partners to CBIT GCP – to be interviewed. |
| MRV Group of Friends (informal coordination platform initiated by GSP) | Entry point for cooperation with other agencies and donors, e.g. in relation to joint events and sharing of experiences and approaches. | Selected representatives of key partners to CBIT GCP – to be interviewed. |

# 4. Review of project design

1. CBIT GCP is a global programme broadly targeting all CBIT countries, and which works only at the global level with a focus on improved coordination, tracking of national CBIT processes, provision of access to tools, and networking and sharing of experiences and best practices. As such, it does not engage at national level and has limited influence over the extent to which, the access to knowledge and capacities it helps develop are translated into tangible and strengthened CBIT implementation at the national level. Hence, the project does not directly deliver policy- and institutional outcomes, let alone direct climate impacts, but rather contributes indirectly to enhanced effectiveness and efficiency of climate action by filling coordination and knowledge gaps.
2. The underlying analysis is clear, as is the problem and stakeholder identification. However, there is no information on the design process and participation of stakeholders in the process. Careful attention has been paid to providing an input to strengthened gender mainstreaming in CBIT processes. The link to UNEP, UNDP and GEF priorities is not clearly spelled out, but given that CBIT GCP is fully supportive of the Paris Agreement, there is no doubt about its alignment with these agencies’ climate agendas.
3. The implementation strategy is coherent and realistic with a causal link from outputs to outcomes and clearly spelled out in the theory of change (ToC) and the results framework. However, the intended impact stated is not truly an impact but rather an output and at a lower level than the intended outcomes. Similarly, outcome 3, is an output rather than an outcome. The indicators are SMART, however, the indicators for outcomes 2 and 3 are not outcome oriented but rather output indicators. See Annex F for a detailed assessment of the results framework.
4. No risks are identified in the ToC (although risks were identified in a risk matrix) and one of the two assumptions/drivers is not truly an assumption. A number of assumptions are presented in the results framework, but not all of them are truly assumptions and they are mainly output-related.
5. The project management setup is appropriate with clear roles for the implementing partners and stakeholders, but the project seems partly set up as two separate projects, one for UNEP and another for UNDP. The budget and time frame were adequate vis-à-vis the intended activities and outputs, not least seen in the light of the presence of a second phase, the latter also is an important part of the sustainability strategy of the project. The project also took advantage of cost-efficiencies and synergies through the implementation and coordination being carried out by the UNDP GSP project team and UNEP DTU, which were already engaged in related activities.
6. Being in essence a global platform for coordination, networking and knowledge management, the project had clear strategies for partnerships and cooperation, knowledge management, communication, and outreach. For example, the project engaged in the MRV Group of Friends network.
7. Overall, the project design is rated as satisfactory. A detailed assessment of the project design is provided in annex C. The table below presents an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the project design.

**Main strengths and weaknesses of project design**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| Context relevance | * Clear underlying analysis * Clear problem identification * Clear stakeholder identification * Supportive of Paris Agreement | * No information on participation of stakeholders in the process * Link to UNEP, UNDP and GEF priorities not clearly spelled out |
| Results framework and ToC | * Coherent and realistic implementation strategy * Clear causal link from outputs to outcomes * SMART indicators * Attention to promoting gender mainstreaming | * Impact not truly an impact but an output and at lower level than outcomes * Outcome 3 is an output, not an outcome * Indicators for the project objective and outcomes 2 and 3 are output indicators |
| Risks and assumptions | * Risks identified in a risk matrix | * No risks identified in ToC * A number of assumptions are not truly assumptions * Assumptions are mainly output-related |
| Management | * Appropriate project management setup with clear roles * Adequate budget * Adequate time frame * Synergy with UNDP GSP and UNEP DTU | * Set up as two separate projects (UNEP+UNDP) |
| Partnership and outreach | * Clear strategies for partnerships and cooperation, * Clear strategies for knowledge management, communication and outreach |  |

# 5. Theory of Change

1. The TE consultant has elaborated a diagram of the “faithful” Theory of Change (ToC) expressed in the CEO Endorsement Request; this diagram is presented in annex G. The ToC has been assessed for consistency and a “reconstructed” ToC has been elaborated to ensure that there is a consistent and clear conceptual understanding of the project impact pathways that can guide the TE; this diagram is presented in the figure at the end of this chapter. The main substance differences between faithful and reconstructed ToCs are a) the wording of the impact/objective and outcome 3, and b) rewording and positioning of some of the risks/assumptions, based on the findings described in chapter 4 and annex C and the proposed rewording presented in chapter 2. The intervention logic and the causal links from activities to outputs and outcomes presented in the ToC and results framework are coherent, and thus remain unchanged. The ToC focuses on results and the activities are thus not included.
2. Outputs to outcomes: The outputs are organised in three components, which each lead to one of the three intended outcomes:
3. Outputs 1.1-1.5 relate to the establishment of a web-based platform for coordination, reporting on country progress, sharing of experiences and technical resources (guidelines and tools), which will lead to outcome 1, enhanced coordination and sharing.
4. Outputs 2.1-2.2 concerns events and workshops, which will lead to outcome 2, enhanced information sharing.
5. Outputs 3.1-3.2 relate to the identification of needs and gaps hampering CBIT coordination and establishing transparency systems and developing a roadmap to address these through a second phase of CBIT GCP, which will lead to outcome 3, a strategy/plan in place for post-project continuation of global coordination, sharing and information.
6. Outcomes to impact: The enhanced coordination, sharing of best practice and information, and a tangible (and funded) plan for continued coordination and sharing, are expected to contribute to the impact (or rather, higher level outcome) of countries having an enhanced understanding and capacity of countries to implement their transparency commitment under the Paris Agreement.
7. Assumptions and drivers: The CEO Endorsement Request (ToC and results framework) identifies a number of assumptions and risks at the output-to-outcome and outcome-to-impact levels. These are generally valid and have been included in the reconstructed ToC, albeit with some modifications to the wording to phrase them more clearly as assumptions. Those related specifically to component 2 have been relabelled as drivers, since they are under the direct control of the project partners (UNEP and UNDP).
8. Risks: While risks are normally not included in the standard UNEP ToC approach, the risks that can threaten the delivery of the intended outcomes as identified in the CEO Endorsement Request have been added to the bottom of the ToC, since these are generally included in UNDP ToCs. All of the risks identified are relevant and important for the project.

**Reconstructed Theory of Change**

# 6. Evaluation methods

1. **Methods:** The TE will be based on a combination of direct consultations with stakeholders and secondary sources, i.e. project documentation and data. The TE will adhere to UNEP/GEF TE guidelines. A combination of methods will be used to gather information in order to triangulate information/data and thereby ensure their solidity, and the combination of sources will also help reducing information gaps:
2. Document and secondary data review: The available project documentation will be reviewed, including: the CEO Endorsement Request and amendments, PIRs, work plans, project budget, coordination minutes, website traffic information, publications, workshop outputs, available survey data, and the GEF tracking tool. The assessment of results (outcomes) will utilise the project’s own indicators and monitoring data as much as possible/appropriate. See Annex D for details on the documents to be reviewed and Annex C for details on the documents reviewed during the inception preparations.
3. Stakeholder consultation: Different methods of stakeholder consultations will be carried out. Distance interviews and discussions will be held with the PSC, GSE, and other key staff at UNEP, UNDP, UNEP DTU, the GEF Secretariat, the UNFCCC Secretariat, selected representatives from partner organisations (e.g. FAO), and selected focal points from Non-Annex I countries that have participated significantly in CBIT GCP activities. Depending on the COVID-19 pandemic situation, interviews with UNEP DTU may be carried out in person in Copenhagen. Moreover, since the TE consultant is expecting to visit Nairobi in connection with another assignment, it could be considered to extent this visit with a couple of days to allow for in-person interviews with relevant staff at UNEP HQ, depending on timing. See Annex D for details on the stakeholders to be interviewed and Annex C for details on the people consulted during the inception preparations.
4. A brief online survey with CBIT national focal points will be conducted to get wider and quantitative information on value added of CBIT GCP and the benefits participation provided to national MRV and CBIT processes. All CBIT countries will be invited to participate in the survey in an effort to ensure a) that all countries a given an opportunity to participate in the evaluation and present their perspectives, and b) to ensure that a sufficiently large and solid sample base is available for the evaluation. To ensure a good response rate it is proposed that the UNEP DTU and UNDP project teams send the survey invitation (the evaluator will provide a link to the survey) and link to the national focal points, and if necessary, UNEP and UNDP send follow-up reminders to the national focal points. The TE consultant will manage the online survey, collect the responses received, and carry out the analysis and present data in an anonymised form. See Annex B for the survey questions.
5. Analysis and reporting: The analysis of findings will be an iterative process throughout the TE. The TE consultant will discuss and test initial findings and recommendations with stakeholders as the TE progresses, to ensure a) that the analysis is participatory and stakeholders can assume ownership of the findings, and b) that the TE consultant can adjust the emphasis to stay on track and ensure that the evaluation focuses on the key issues.
6. The ToR contain a comprehensive set of questions (40 questions). These have been further crystallised and expanded into evaluative questions with indicators and data sources (presented in Annex A). In some cases, the evaluative questions (which take departure in the standard UNEP TE guidelines) are not fully applicable to CBIT GCP; in such cases, this is indicated in Annex A. The evaluative questions are organised in accordance with the structure used in the ToR, and are thus organised into the following main categories: strategic relevance, quality of project design, nature of external context, effectiveness (availability of outputs, achievement of project outcomes, likelihood of impact), financial management, efficiency, monitoring and reporting, sustainability, and factors and processes affecting project performance and cross-cutting issues.
7. The assessments of results, outcomes, impact, drivers and assumptions are structured on the basis of the reconstructed ToC. The project’s own indicators are utilised as much as possible for the evaluation questions.
8. The TE will also use the scoring matrix for UNEP TEs as a tool for assessing project performance.
9. The findings will be translated into implementable recommendations for the next phase of CBIT GCP.
10. **Limitations:** Due to the COVID-19 pandemic as well as budget and time limitations, stakeholder consultations will mainly, or exclusively, be in the form of distance consultation.
11. The TE consultant will not be able to interview representatives from all the countries participating in CBIT GCP, but only a sample of those, selected on based on information from UNEP and UNDP about the countries that have been actively and significantly engaged in project activities; the national focal points identified are listed in Annex D. Considering the very diverse contexts and specificities of each country, the general picture obtained by the TE consultant may not be fully applicable for all countries and regions.
12. The TE consultant will not visit the supported Non-Annex I Parties, and will thus not be able to make a detailed assessment/verification of the application of the skills and capacities gained at the national level, nor will the TE consultant be able to make an in-depth assessment of other factors promoting or inhibiting the application of the skills and capacities at the country level.
13. The accuracy of the assessment of outcomes and results achieved and the ability to quantify these, will to a large extent depend on the availability of baseline and monitoring data at outcome level. The available data mainly captures outputs, and only to a lesser extent outcomes and the contribution made to influencing national processes.
14. A unique feature of CBIT GCP is that it was global in nature, with possible access for all CBIT countries. Unlike other global programmes, there was not a predetermined set of programme countries or a direct engagement at the country level. Instead, CBIT GCP’s involvement with CBIT countries was more ad-hoc and to a large extent based on requests for support and an interest from countries to participate. Hence, CBIT GCP provided an option for countries to participate in capacity development “enabling” activities. However, the extent to which the participation in these led to results in terms of improved monitoring reporting hinges on a number of factors at the national level, over which CBIT GCP had little control or influence. Hence, it will be difficult for the TE to attribute changes specifically to CBIT GCP. Moreover, any absence or partial absence of the intended results can most likely not be directly attributed to possible shortcomings in the CBIT GCP implementation, as they are more likely driven by national level dynamics. Indeed, it is anticipated that there will be substantial differences in the performance of countries which have engaged to a similar degree in CBIT GCP.
15. Auditing of the finances of the project is done as part of the overall UNEP, UNDP and DTU (for the UNEP DTU Partnership) auditing, as per the rules and regulations for each institution. No separate statements have been made on the project by the auditors (or at least not been made available to the TE). This limits the ability of the TE to assess financial management and compliance with GEF procedures.

# 7. Team roles and responsibilities

1. The TE is carried out by an international consultant. The Evaluation Officer at the UNEP Evaluation Office will provide guidance to the consultant on UNEP requirements and expectations, facilitate access to documents and stakeholders, and review written TE outputs.

# 8. Evaluation schedule

1. The TE is scheduled for completion no later than 30 September 2020. However, it is envisaged that the TE can be completed already before the main holiday season starts in August. The table below provides an overview of the TE activities, with milestones and expected completion dates.

**Tentative TE schedule**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activities and milestones** | **Completion** |
| Inception distance meeting with UNEP evaluation manager and project team | 8 April |
| Draft Inception Report | 15 April |
| UNEP and UNDP comments on Inception Report | 14 June |
| Final Inception Report | 3 July |
| Document review | 15 July |
| Survey | 30 July |
| Distance interviews | 30 July |
| PowerPoint/presentation on preliminary findings and recommendations | 15 August |
| Draft TE Report | 31 August |
| Draft Report shared with UNEP Task Manager and team | 14 September |
| Stakeholders comments | 25 September |
| Final TE Report | 9 October |
| Final Report shared with all respondents | 10 October |

# 9. Learning, communication and outreach

1. To ensure that the TE will be promoting learning and reflection, and that the key stakeholders find the recommendations relevant and useful, the TE consultant will apply the following approach:
   * The reconstructed ToC will be discussed and validated with the EMG. Assumptions and impact drivers will also be tested with key stakeholders
   * Findings, impressions and potential recommendations will be discussed and tested with the EMG and stakeholders in a continuous and iterative process during the assignment, especially during the distance interviews
   * Interviews will be conducted in a semi-structured manner, allowing space for interviewees to ask questions and communicate their priorities and views, and enabling the TE consultant to follow up on unforeseen and emerging points and findings
   * Recommendations will seek to provide advice for planned next phase of CBIT GCP
   * Preliminary findings and recommendations will be presented to the EMG over Skype
   * The TE consultant will be available to the EMG and stakeholders through email and Skype for further contact and discussions
   * The draft TE report will be shared with UNEP and UNDP, who will thus be provided with an opportunity to comment and provide further inputs
   * The TE team will provide a justification/explanation whenever a stakeholder comment is not included in the revised TE report

# Annex A: Evaluation framework/matrix

| **No.** | **Evaluation questions** | **Indicators/criteria** | **Data sources** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic relevance** | | | |
|  | Was the project responding to UNEP, UNDP and GEF strategies and priorities? | * Alignment with UNEP MTS and PoW, Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building (BSP) and South-South Cooperation (S-SC) * Alignment with UNDP Strategic plan * Alignment with GEF Climate Change Programme | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * CEO Endorsement Request * UNEP MTS, PoW, BSP, S-SC * UNDP Strategic Plan * GEF Climate Change Programme |
|  | Was the project responding to needs of CBIT countries vis-à-vis implementation of the Paris Agreement’s Article 13? | * Alignment of activities and products with gap and needs assessment findings * Responsiveness to priorities of CBIT countries | * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and final reports * Gap and needs assessments uploaded by countries or carried out by the project * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points * Survey with CBIT country focal points |
|  | Was the project complementary with other CBIT and MRV interventions? | * Consultation with members of the MRV Group of Friends during project design * Coordination and cooperation with other global initiatives implemented by UNEP, UNDP and other agencies * Synergy with national CBIT projects supported by UNEP and UNDP | * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and completion reports * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points * Survey with CBIT country focal points |
| **Quality of project design** | | | |
|  | Was the project design appropriate, realistic and coherent? | * Consistency of results framework and ToC * Project objectives were understood, and agreed to, by key stakeholders * Feasibility of achieving objective and outcomes * Comprehensiveness of outputs and outcomes vis-à-vis achieving objective | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * Inception report analysis of ToC and results framework * CEO Endorsement Request * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |
| **Nature of external context** | | | |
|  | Was the context conducive for pursuing and achieving the project objective and outcomes? | * Influence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval on project implementation * High-level ownership and support in CBIT countries and from donor community | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * PIR, progress and completion reports * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with member of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |
| **Effectiveness** | | | |
| *Availability of Outputs* | | | |
|  | Is the project on track in its output delivery? | * The intended outputs in CEO Endorsement Request and work plans have been delivered * Progress against the delivery of output-oriented indicators in the project’s results framework:   + *Indicator D:* Number of regional and global meetings held   + *Indicator E:* Meeting attendance (per event, disaggregated by gender)   + *Indicator F:* Number of countries with needs and gaps identified through participating in the self-assessment tool   + *Indicator G:* Number of knowledge products developed based on insights from analysing the self-assessment tool results | * Work plans * PIR, progress and completion reports * Written products produced (e.g. publications, knowledge products, workshop and training reports) * Web traffic data * Web platform * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |
|  | Are the outputs completed useful and of good quality? | * Number of online visits and downloads * Number of events and number of participants * Users and participants express appreciation of the outputs and activities and their usefulness * Actual use of the written products and lessons shared at events by CBIT countries in their national implementation (examples) | * Web traffic data * Workshop participation data * Workshop participant feedback forms * PIR, progress and completion reports * Survey with CBIT country focal points carried out by UNEP * Written products produced (e.g. publications, knowledge products, workshop and training reports) * Web platform * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points * Survey with CBIT country focal points |
| *Achievement of outcomes* | | | |
|  | Outcome 1: Has the coordination and best practice sharing increased? | * Number of partners using methodologies/tools listed on the platform (results framework indicator B) * Number of entities using the platform to enhance partnerships (results framework indicator C) * CBIT country focal points have used resources on the web platform in their national CBIT processes | * PIR, progress and completion reports * GEF tracking tool * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points * Survey with CBIT country focal points |
|  | Outcome 2: Has the sharing of information increased? | * CBIT country focal points have used knowledge at CBIT GCP events in their national CBIT processes * CBIT country focal points discuss implementation challenges and share lessons * MRV Group of Friends members have used knowledge and lessons obtained at event in their own interventions | * PIR, progress and completion reports * GEF tracking tool * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points * Survey with CBIT country focal points |
|  | Outcome 3: Is a strategy/plan in place for continuation of global coordination, sharing and information in relation to Paris Agreement transparency? | * CBIT GCP phase 2 has been designed, received positively by the PRC and granted GEF funding | * PIR, progress and completion reports * GEF tracking tool * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interview with GEF Sec. staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |
| *Likelihood of impact* | | | |
|  | Impact: Has the understanding and capacity of CBIT countries to implement the transparency framework of the Paris Agreement improved? | * Number of countries where implementation of comprehensive measures – plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets – to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient development objectives have improved * Number of partners using the platform’s services every quarter (in average) when developing/strengthening their national transparency systems (results framework indicator A) * Examples of catalytic or replication effects vis-à-vis transparency interventions at the global, regional or national levels * Other positive effects, including unintended/unplanned effects | * PIR, progress and completion reports * GEF tracking tool * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interview with GEF Sec. staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points * Survey with CBIT country focal points |
|  | Negative effects: Is there a risk that the project will lead to significant negative effects? | * Risks for negative outcomes/impacts were systematically monitored * Action was taken to prevent or mitigate negative outcomes/impacts | * PIR, progress and completion reports * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff |
| **Financial management** | | | |
|  | Were financial management and decisions appropriate and conducive for project delivery? | * Fund allocations and reallocations were clearly justified/explained * Financial resources were made available in a timely manner that did not cause implementation delays or implementation gaps * EMG and UNEP and UNDP financial staff responsiveness to addressing and resolving financial issues * Ease of communication between EMG staff and UNEP and UNDP financial staff | * CEO Endorsement Request * Financial reports * Budgets * Budget amendments * EMG and PSC meeting minutes * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with UNEP financial staff * Interviews with UNDP financial staff |
|  | Has co-financing materialised as expected at project approval? | * Amount of co-funding mobilised per component, from each anticipated source * Amount of co-funding leverage from other sources (in-cash and in-kind) | * CEO Endorsement Request * Financial reports * Budgets * Interviews with EMG staff |
| **Efficiency** | | | |
|  | Was the project implemented in a timely manner? | * Timeliness of activities, outputs and milestones vis-à-vis work plans * Corrective measures taken to mitigate delays * Annual spending compared to budgeted/planned spending per component and output * Justification and appropriateness of non-cost project extension * Management and activity cost implications of no-cost extension | * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and completion reports * Work plans * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members |
|  | Was the project implemented in a cost-effective manner? | * Actual vs. planned costs of components and outcomes * Number of outputs per component and related activities delivered compared to original design * Measures taken to adjust and adapt budget and activities to actual costs * Extent to which co-financing was leveraged * Extent to which the project achieved economy of scale, costs-savings and/or was able to increase the level of activity and output through partnerships (e.g. joint activities and division of labour) and use of existing data and processes | * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and completion reports * Work plans * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff |
| **Monitoring and reporting** | | | |
| *Monitoring design and budgeting* | | | |
|  | Were the indicators appropriate for results-oriented monitoring? | * Indicators were SMART * Presence of results-oriented indicators capturing contributions to global coordination and national capacities, and how these contributions influenced global programming and national CBIT processes * Availability of clear indicator targets and milestones * Indicators were gender disaggregated, when appropriate | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * Inception report analysis of ToC and results framework * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR * Final report * Interviews with EMG staff |
|  | Were adequate provisions put in place for monitoring and evaluation? | * Sufficiency of resources (financial, human) available for monitoring and evaluation * Clarity of monitoring responsibilities | * CEO Endorsement Request * Financial reports * Budgets * Interviews with EMG staff |
| *Monitoring of project implementation* | | | |
|  | Was the monitoring system sufficiently and in a timely manner capturing implementation progress and results? | * Reliability and accuracy of baseline and monitoring data * Frequency and comprehensiveness of data gathering and analysis * Utilisation of pre-existing data sources * Gender-disaggregation of data, when appropriate | * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and completion reports * Web traffic data * Survey with CBIT country focal points carried out by UNEP * Workshop participation data * Workshop participant feedback forms * Interviews with EMG staff |
|  | Were risks monitored and reported on? | * Risks identified in CEO Endorsement Request were regularly monitored and documented * The list of risks was regularly updated * Relevance, importance and comprehensiveness of the risks identified and accuracy of risk rating | * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and completion reports * EMG and PSC meeting minutes * Interviews with EMG staff |
|  | Was project monitoring used as a management tool? | * Tangible examples of monitoring data leading to changes/adjustments in project approach and implementation | * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and completion reports * EMG and PSC meeting minutes * Interviews with EMG staff |
| *Project reporting* | | | |
|  | Was project reporting timely and of adequate quality? | * Timeliness of report submission * Realism and accuracy of information in PIR, progress and completion reports * Adherence to GEF, UNEP and UNDP reporting requirements * PIR ratings | * PIR, progress and completion reports * EMG and PSC meeting minutes * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with GEF Sec. staff |
| **Sustainability** | | | |
|  | Did the project implement a clear sustainability strategy? | * The project proactively influenced and utilised the impact drivers identified in the reconstructed ToC * The assumptions identified in the reconstructed ToC proved valid * The project documented lessons and shared them with members of the MRV Group of Friends to promote upscaling and replication | * PIR, progress and completion reports * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends |
| *Socio-political sustainability* | | | |
|  | Are CBIT countries politically committed to CBIT? | * Level of stakeholder awareness, ownership and commitment to national CBIT processes * National CBIT projects have embedded the tools and lessons promoted by CBIT GCP in their approaches | * CBIT GCP website * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |
| *Financial sustainability* | | | |
|  | Did the project implement a clear post-project continuation strategy? | * Component 3 led to an approved and financed second phase of CBIT GCP * Other funding has been secured to ensure the continuation of the CBIT GCP platform | * Phase 2 grant agreement * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with GEF Sec. staff * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends |
| *Institutional sustainability* | | | |
|  | Have UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP internalised the project in their work? | * UNEP and UNEP DTU have allocated staff resources and integrated the CBIT GCP web platform in its institutional work plan for the coming years * UNDP has allocated staff resources and integrated support and facilitation of the MRV Group of Friends network in its institutional work plan for the coming years | * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff |
| **Factors and processes affecting project performance and cross-cutting issues** | | | |
| *Preparation and readiness* | | | |
|  | Was the project responsive and adaptive? | * Appropriate changes were made to the activities and outputs to address weaknesses * Changes were made to respond to emerging opportunities and needs, and in response to stakeholder interests | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * PIR, progress and completion reports * EMG and PSC meeting minutes * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members |
| *Quality of project management and supervision* | | | |
|  | Was the project implementation and management setup conducive for implementation? | * The PSC provided clear strategic guidance to the project and helped addressing institutional bottlenecks and convening engagement of senior officials * UNEP and UNDP coordinated and prepared joint reporting effectively * The EMG had sufficient capacity and performed well vis-à-vis acting on directions given by the PSC and facilitating project implementation * The EMG was able to mobilise and engage UNEP and UNDP colleagues at global, regional and national levels * Adaptive action was taken to respond to opportunities and mitigate emerging risks * Timeliness of decision-making | * PIR, progress and completion reports * EMG and PSC meeting minutes * Work plans * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with GEF Sec. staff |
|  | Were UNEP’s and UNDP’s dual roles of supervision and providing execution support conducive for project delivery? | * Clarity of separation of implementing and executing agency roles, reporting lines and accountability within UNEP and UNDP * Clarity and responsiveness of communication, guidance and supervision between the executing and implementing agencies/functions | * EMG and PSC meeting minutes * Work plans * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with GEF Sec. staff |
| *Stakeholder participation and cooperation* | | | |
|  | Did the project engage stakeholders beyond their participation in events and as users of the web platform? | * Level of consultation/involvement of key stakeholders in the project design process * Level and nature of involvement of key stakeholders at all levels in implementation * Stakeholders were heard in the development of products * Level of cooperation and dialogue with key stakeholders * Existence of partnerships with stakeholders | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with PSC members * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with UNFCCC Sec. staff * Interviews with GEF Sec. staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |
| *Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity* | | | |
|  | Did the project consider the inclusion of human rights and gender in transparency systems? | * Events and products addressed human rights and gender considerations in CBIT processes (including participation of women as workshop panellists and presenters) * Number of countries that have applied gender tools and approaches made available by CBIT GCP in their national CBIT processes | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * PIR, progress and completion reports * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |
| *Environmental and social safeguards* | | | |
|  | Were environmental risks mitigated? | * Environmental and social safeguarding screening at project design * Steps taken to minimise or offset the project’s environmental footprint (e.g. vis-à-vis air travel)   *Note: no social risks apply, due to the global networking nature of the project.* | * Assessment of design quality (Annex B) * CEO Endorsement Request * PIR, progress and completion reports * Interviews with EMG staff |
| *Country ownership and driven-ness* | | | |
|  | Did CBIT countries have a degree of ownership to CBIT and the project? | * Level of high-level ownership and commitment to national CBIT processes * Level of interest among CBIT countries to engage in project activities * Ability to engage LDCs and SIDS in project activities * Level of use of CBIT learnings and products at the national level (*drawn from EQs 7-12 and 25*) | * EQs 7-12 and 25 * PIR, progress and completion reports * Web traffic data * Workshop participation data * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points * Survey with CBIT country focal points |
| *Communication and public awareness* | | | |
|  | Did the activities and outputs under components 1 and 2 ensure that the project and its services were visible and reached the intended audience? | * Number of hits and downloads from web platform (*drawn from EQ7*) * Number of participants in events (*drawn from EQ7*) * The project and its services were communicated through various channels (e.g. UNFCCC COPs and intersessionals, and UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP websites and newsletters, by UNEP and UNDP staff) | * EQ7 * PIR, progress and completion reports * Web traffic data * Workshop participation data * Interviews with EMG staff * Interviews with UNEP, UNEP DTU and UNDP staff * Interviews with members of MRV Group of Friends * Interviews with selected CBIT country focal points |

# Annex B: Draft data collection tools

**Overview of use of interviews, survey and web traffic data per EQ**

*(Note: EQs are presented in Annex A)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EQ** | **Interviews** | | | | | | | **Survey** | **Web data** |
| **EMG** | **PSC** | **UNEP**  **DTU**  **UNDP** | **UNFCCC** | **GEF** | **MRV Group of Friends** | **CBIT focal points** |
| **Relevance** | | | | | | | | | |
| **1** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** | X | X |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| **3** | X | X |  | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| **Project design** | | | | | | | | | |
| **4** | X | X | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| **Context** | | | | | | | | | |
| **5** | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** | | | | | | | | | |
| **6** | X | X | X | X |  |  | X |  | X |
| **7** | X | X | X | X |  |  | X | X | X |
| **8** | X | X | X | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| **9** | X | X | X | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| **10** | X | X |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |
| **11** | X | X | X |  | X | X | X | X |  |
| **12** | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Financial** | | | | | | | | | |
| **13** | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **14** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency** | | | | | | | | | |
| **15** | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **16** | X | X |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| **Monitoring** | | | | | | | | | |
| **17** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **18** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **19** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| **20** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **21** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **22** | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** | | | | | | | | | |
| **23** | X |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| **24** | X |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| **25** | X |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
| **26** | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Factors** | | | | | | | | | |
| **27** | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **28** | X | X |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| **29** | X | X |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| **30** | X | X |  | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| **31** | X |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| **32** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **33** | X |  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |
| **34** | X |  | X |  |  | X | X |  | X |

**CBIT country focal point survey outline**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EQ** | **No.** | **Survey question** | **Response options**  *(+ comment boxes)* |
| EQ2: Was the project responding to needs of CBIT countries vis-à-vis implementation of the Paris Agreement’s Article 13? | 1 | Did the CBIT GCP address key needs and priorities of your country vis-à-vis setting up an appropriate and functional transparency system? | * Entirely agree * Partly agree * Disagree |
| 2 | What were the elements you found relevant for your work and CBIT in your country? | * Methodologies, guidelines and tools * Training * Networking and sharing experiences with peers * Dialogue with development partners and donors * Other (pls specify) |
| EQ3: Was the project complementary with other CBIT and MRV interventions? | 3 | To what extent did CBIT GCP complement or reinforce your work on a national transparency system or MRV processes? | * Significantly * To some extent * Not at all |
| EQ7: Are the outputs completed useful and of good quality? | 4 | How useful/relevant would you rate the following CBIT GCP services/products?   * Library on website * CBIT GCP resources/publications on website * Project database on website * Website page with profile of your own project * Webinars * Workshops | * Highly useful * Useful * Somewhat useful * Not useful   *(for each category)* |
| EQ8: Outcome 1: Has the coordination and best practice sharing increased? | 5 | Have you used any of the resources on the CBIT GCP website in your work on your national transparency system?   * Tools and methodologies found in the online library * Tools and approaches from CBIT GCP publications * Self-assessment tool * Documents and profiles of other countries’ CBIT projects * Knowledge gained from webinars | * Yes * No   *(for each category)* |
| EQ9: Outcome 2: Has the sharing of information increased? | 6 | Did you use knowledge obtained at CBIT GCP in your work on your national transparency system? | * Yes * No |
| 7 | In the annual meetings, have you learnt experiences from other countries which could be used in your CBIT project? | * Yes * No |
| EQ11: Impact: Has the understanding and capacity of CBIT countries to implement the transparency framework of the Paris Agreement improved? | 8 | To what extent has your participation in CBIT GCP activities (use of website resources, participation in events) contributed to improving/strengthening the following elements of your national transparency system?   * Policy framework * Plans/strategies * Programmes * Budgets * Other *(pls specify)* | * Significantly * To some extent * Not at all   *(for each category)* |
| EQ33: Did CBIT countries have a degree of ownership to CBIT and the project? | 9 | To what degree do you find that there is high-level government commitment and ownership to implement a national transparency system in your country? | * To a high degree * To a medium degree * To a low degree |

# Annex C: Assessment of the project design quality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A.** | **Nature of the External Context[[4]](#footnote-4)** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 1 | Does the project document identify any unusually challenging operational factors that arelikely to negatively affect project performance? | | i)Ongoing/high likelihood of conflict? | | | No | None - a global scope and global level activities, and no impacts of conflict on the project have been reported - although some participating countries may have been affected by conflict. | 2 |
| ii)Ongoing/high likelihood of natural disaster? | | | No | None - a global scope and global level activities, and no impacts of disasters on the project have been reported - although some countries could have been affected by natural hazards/disasters. The project was completed before the Covid-19 pandemic. |
| iii)Ongoing/high likelihood of change in national government? | | | No | None - the project did not depend on any specific government and no impact has been reported - although some participating countries have likely been affected by changes in government, e.g. in connection with elections. |
| **B.** | **Project Preparation** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 2 | Does the project document entail a clear and adequate problem analysis? | | | | | Yes | The UNFCCC and Paris Agreement context and challenges vis-a-vis transparency and reporting are clearly framed, as is the role/position of the project in the wider landscape | 4 |
| 3 | Does the project document entail a clear and adequate situation analysis? | | | | | Yes | The UNFCCC and Paris Agreement context and challenges vis-a-vis transparency and reporting are clearly framed, as is the role/position of the project in the wider landscape |
| 4 | Does the project document include a clear and adequate stakeholder analysis, including by gender/minority groupings? | | | | | Yes | The identification and description of stakeholders is somewhat brief and generic, but the stakeholders and their roles are fairly straightforward to deduct from the information presented. |
| 5 | *If yes to Q4:* Does the project document provide a description of stakeholder consultation during project design process? *(If yes, were any key groups overlooked: government, private sector, civil society, gendered groups and those who will potentially be negatively affected)* | | | | | No | There is no description of any stakeholder consultation during project design. But the project mainly operates as a support and coordination function at the global level, with links to national level CBIT. It has also been discussed in the GSP context. |
| 6 | Does the project document identify concerns with respect to human rights, including in relation to sustainable development? | | | | i)Sustainable development in terms of integrated approach to human/natural systems | No | Not described in the CEO Endorsement Request, but in the approval request, the following statements are made:   * "*The projects is aimed at improving national capacities in understanding climate change and in implementing climate action at the national level. Through this support, Countries will be able to have a better knowledge on how climate change will impact national sustainable development, thus protecting and promoting human rights*." * "...*this project does not entail any risk for human rights, women empowerment or environmental sustainability. No risk has been identified*."   Considering the global and platform nature of the project, with no in-country engagement, this statement is plausible. Access to transparency information can be beneficial to human rights and empowerment. |
| ii)Gender | Yes | While the project had a low gender risk, considerable thought is given to gender mainstreaming into the project. |
| iii)Indigenous peoples | Yes | Described in the approval request. The global and platform nature of the projects means that it did not engage in locations with indigenous peoples and is thus likely to have had a significant influence on these, although transparency information can benefit them. |
| **C** | **Strategic Relevance** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 7 | Is the project document clear in terms of its alignment and relevance to: | | | 1. UN Environment MTS and PoW | | No | No reference is made in the CEO Endorsement Request to UNEP strategies - but given the project is fully anchored in the Paris Agreement and MRV/transparency, it corresponds to the climate change and environment under review aspirations of UNEP. A brief link is made to the UNDP Strategic Plan's output 1.4. The approval request briefly links the project to the GEF's climate change focal area. The CEO Endorsement Request states: "*The Transparency Coordination Platform is aligned with the UN Environment and UNDP’s approach to the Agenda 2030 and the Mid-term strategy 2014-17. Specifically, the platform will contribute to the strategic focuses on climate change and environmental governance.*" | 3 |
| 1. UN Environment /GEF/Donor strategic priorities (including Bali Strategic Plan and South-South Cooperation) | | No | No references is made in the CEO Endorsement Request to UNEP or GEF strategic priorities, but a brief link is made to the UNDP Strategic Plan's output 1.4. |
| iii) Regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities? | | No | The CEO Endorsement Request only makes brief reference to the UNDP Regional Programme's outcome 1. |
| iv. Complementarity with other interventions | | Yes | The project specifically aims at enhancing coordination and synergy between initiatives. |
| **D** | **Intended Results and Causality** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 8 | Is there a clearly presented Theory of Change? | | | | | Yes | The ToC and strategy are clearly described and mostly coherent, but the intended impact stated is not an impact and is at a lower level than the intended outcomes. | 4 |
| 9 | Are the causal pathways from project outputs (goods and services) through outcomes (changes in stakeholder behaviour) towards impacts (long term, collective change of state) clearly and convincingly described in either the logframe or the TOC? | | | | | Yes | The link between outcomes and outputs is clearly presented in the strategy and results framework. But the impact/project objective presented is at a lower level than the outcomes and outcome 3 is an output rather than and outcome. |
| 10 | Are impact drivers and assumptions clearly described for each key causal pathway? | | | | | No | One of the two assumptions/drivers in the ToC is not truly an assumption. A number of assumptions are presented in the results framework, but could have benefited from further scrutiny, not all of them are truly assumptions. The assumptions are mainly output-related. |
| 11 | Are the roles of key actors and stakeholders, including gendered/minority groups, clearly described for each key causal pathway? | | | | | Yes | The descriptions of roles are brief, but clear. |
| 12 | Are the outcomes realistic with respect to the timeframe and scale of the intervention? | | | | | Yes | The outcomes are realistic, pragmatic and directly related to the outputs and activities. |
| **E** | **Logical Framework and Monitoring** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 13 | Does the logical framework … | i)Capture the key elements of the Theory of Change/ intervention logic for the project? | | | | Yes | The results framework and ToC are fully aligned. | 4 |
| ii)Have ‘SMART’ indicators for outputs? | | | | Yes | Indicators are only presented at objective and outcome level but for the objective and outcomes 2 and 3, they are de-facto output indicators. The indicators are SMART. All indicators are quantitative in nature. |
| iii)Have ‘SMART’ indicators for outcomes? | | | | No | The outcome indicators are SMART, but only the indicators for outcome 1 are outcome-oriented, for outputs 2 and 3 they are output-oriented. |
| iv)Reflect the project’s scope of work and ambitions? | | | | Yes | There is a good link. |
| 14 | Is there baseline information in relation to key performance indicators? | | | | | Yes | A baseline figure of "0" is presented for each indicator. |
| 15 | Has the desired level of achievement (targets) been specified for indicators of outputs and outcomes? | | | | | Yes | Targets are available for project completion. No mid-term targets are presented in the results framework. |
| 16 | Are the milestones in the monitoring plan appropriate and sufficient to track progress and foster management towards outputs and outcomes? | | | | | No | No milestones are presented in the monitoring plan, the monitoring plan is narrative in nature. But the work plan presents a clear timeline for the deliverables. |
| 17 | Have responsibilities for monitoring activities been made clear? | | | | | Yes | The roles are clear from the table presented. But the narrative seems somewhat generic and not fully relevant for the project (e.g. with a sentence on the responsibility of UNDP country offices). |
| 18 | Has a budget been allocated for monitoring project progress? | | | | | No | There is only a budget for the kick-off workshop and for the TE. Monitoring was part of the project managers’ tasks. |
| 19 | Is the workplan clear, adequate and realistic? *(eg. Adequate time between capacity building and take up etc)* | | | | | Yes | The work plan is realistic, but activity oriented. |
| **F** | **Governance and Supervision Arrangements** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 20 | Is the project governance and supervision model comprehensive, clear and appropriate? *(Steering Committee, partner consultations etc. )* | | | | | Yes | The management setup and the roles of the implementing and executing agencies are clear. However, the overall project management role is less clear, and the project seems in part to have been set up as two projects, one for UNEP and another for UNDP. | 5 |
| 21 | Are roles and responsibilities within UN Environment clearly defined? | | | | | Yes | The role within UNEP and UNDP are clearly spelled out, e.g. vis-a-vis the executing and implementing functions |
| **G** | **Partnerships** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 22 | Have the capacities of partners been adequately assessed? | | | | | No | Considering the global nature of the project, and the diversity of the countries participating, it would be impossible to establish the capacities in advance. But the project design included a self-assessment activity | 5 |
| 23 | Are the roles and responsibilities of external partners properly specified and appropriate to their capacities? | | | | | Yes | The role of various partners (e.g. the link to the MRV Group of Friends) is clear and appropriate for their respective mandates. |
| **H** | **Learning, Communication and Outreach** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 24 | Does the project have a clear and adequate knowledge management approach? | | | | | Yes | The project is by nature and design a knowledge management and learning project in its own right and designed accordingly. | 6 |
| 25 | Has the project identified appropriate methods for communication with key stakeholders, including gendered/minority groups, during the project life? *If yes, do the plans build on an analysis of existing communication channels and networks used by key stakeholders?* | | | | | Yes | The project is by nature a platform for communication and designed accordingly. |
| 26 | Are plans in place for dissemination of results and lesson sharing at the end of the project? *If yes, do they build on an analysis of existing communication channels and networks?* | | | | | Yes | The project is by nature a platform for communication and lesson sharing and designed accordingly. The rationale for the project is the lack of a global coordination/communication mechanism |
| **I** | **Financial Planning / Budgeting** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 27 | Are the budgets / financial planning adequate at design stage? *(coherence of the budget, do figures add up etc.)* | | | | | Yes | The budget appears appropriate and figures tally. | 6 |
| 28 | Is the resource mobilization strategy reasonable/realistic? *(E.g. If the expectations are over-ambitious the delivery of the project outcomes may be undermined or if under-ambitious may lead to repeated no cost extensions)* | | | | | Yes | Apart from in-kind co-financing from UNEP, the entire planned and executed budget was from the GEF. No resource mobilisation was envisaged/required |
| **J** | **Efficiency** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 29 | Has the project been appropriately designed/adapted in relation to the duration and/or levels of secured funding? | | | | | Yes | The timing and financing were appropriate compared to the planned activities and outputs. | 6 |
| 30 | Does the project design make use of / build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency? | | | | | Yes | The GSP and MRV Group of Friends were banked upon by the project. By nature, the project sought to facilitate coordination and synergies. |
| 31 | Does the project document refer to any value for money strategies (i.e. increasing economy, efficiency and/or cost-effectiveness)? | | | | | Yes | Cost-savings are referred to in the context of utilising the GSP structure and network. The project also sought to promote cost-effectiveness by providing a platform for enhanced donor coordination. |
| 32 | Has the project been extended beyond its original end date? *(If yes, explore the reasons for delays and no-cost extensions during the evaluation)* | | | | | Yes | A no-cost extension was requested and granted to bridge the gap between the project and the second phase of CBIT GCP. |
| **K** | **Risk identification and Social Safeguards** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 33 | Are risks appropriately identified in both the TOC/logic framework and the risk table? *(If no, include key assumptions in reconstructed TOC)* | | | | | No | Risks are only presented in the risk table. Two assumptions are presented in the ToC, with additional assumptions in the results framework. | 5 |
| 34 | Are potentially negative environmental, economic and social impacts of the project identified and is the mitigation strategy adequate*? (consider unintended impacts)* | | | | | Yes | These were screened and assessed as low, since the project was global and capacity-coordination related, without any investments at the country level. |
| 35 | Does the project have adequate mechanisms to reduce its negative environmental foot-print? *(including in relation to project management)* | | | | | No | Low risk and no mitigation measures. The main negative environmental footprints would be related to a) emissions from workshop participants and project team flying, and b) the power consumption related to internet use by users of the online platform. |
| **L** | **Sustainability / Replication and Catalytic Effects** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 36 | Was there a credible sustainability strategy at design stage? | | | | | Yes | A second phase was envisaged and its planned covered under component 3. However, continuation of the platform would need continued do not financing as this type of activity cannot be expected to become self-financing - UNEP DTU reportedly has a history of continuing platforms after project completion. The sustainability and continued use of the skills imparted at the country level are beyond the means of the project to ensure. | 5 |
| 37 | Does the project design include an appropriate exit strategy? | | | | | Yes | See above. |
| 38 | Does the project design present strategies to promote/support scaling up, replication and/or catalytic action? | | | | | Yes | The CEO Endorsement Request briefly describes options for upscaling the functions of the platform. Replication at the national level is beyond the means of the project to ensure. Component 3 includes a roadmap for continuation and upscaling. |
| 39 | Did the design address any/all of the following: socio-political, financial, institutional and environmental sustainability issues? | | | | | No | Not applicable for a project of this nature. |
| **M** | **Identified Project Design Weaknesses/Gaps** | | | | | **YES/NO** | **Comments/Implications for the evaluation design** | **Section Rating:** |
| 40 | Were recommendations made by the PRC adopted in the final project design? If no, what were the critical issues raised by PRC that were not addressed. | | | | | Yes | The PRC requested a number of improvements to the design, which were generally addressed. | 5 |
| 41 | Were there any critical issues not flagged by PRC? | | | | | No | The PRC review was generally positive and did not flag any critical issues, but mainly asked for clarifications and elaboration on certain points. The PRC rated the design as satisfactory. |
| **N** | **Gender Marker Score** | | | | | **SCORE** | **Comments** | **No rating.** |
|  | What is the Gender Marker Score applied by UN Environment during project approval? *(This applies for projects approved from 2017 onwards)*  UNEP Gender Scoring:  **0 = gender blind:** Gender relevance is evident but not at all reflected in the project document.  **1 = gender partially mainstreamed:** Gender is reflected in the context, implementation, logframe, **or** the budget.  **2a = gender well mainstreamed throughout:** Gender is reflected in the context, implementation, logframe, **and** the budget.  **2b = targeted action on gender:** (to advance gender equity): the principle purpose of the project is to advance gender equality.  **n/a = gender is not considered applicable:** A gender analysis reveals that the project does not have direct interactions with, and/or impacts on, people. Therefore gender is considered not applicable. | | | | | 1 | The gender marker score given was 1: *The project has partially mainstreamed gender; it is likely to contribute to gender equality in a limited way.*  However:   * Changes were made to the project design after receiving PRC comments, including: gender-disaggregating indicators when appropriate, a gender analysis and gender-related activities * Considerable attention was given in the implemented activities to promoting gender mainstreaming in CBIT/MRV, see relevant section above. * The gender marker score could arguably have been “n/a” the project did not engage at the country level, and only engaged directed with the government and development partner staff participating in project events. | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SECTION** | **RATING** (1-6) | **WEIGHTING** | **TOTAL** (Rating x Weighting) |
| A | Nature of the External Context | 2 | 0.4 | **0.08** |
| B | Project Preparation | 4 | 1.2 | **0.48** |
| C | Strategic Relevance | 3 | 0.8 | **0.24** |
| D | Intended Results and Causality | 4 | 1.6 | **0.64** |
| E | Logical Framework and Monitoring | 4 | 0.8 | **0.32** |
| F | Governance and Supervision Arrangements | 5 | 0.4 | **0.2** |
| G | Partnerships | 5 | 0.8 | **0.4** |
| H | Learning, Communication and Outreach | 6 | 0.4 | **0.24** |
| I | Financial Planning / Budgeting | 6 | 0.4 | **0.24** |
| J | Efficiency | 6 | 0.8 | **0.48** |
| K | Risk identification and Social Safeguards | 5 | 0.8 | **0.4** |
| L | Sustainability / Replication and Catalytic Effects | 5 | 1.2 | **0.6** |
| M | Identified Project Design Weaknesses/Gaps | 5 | 0.4 | **0.2** |
|  |  |  | **TOTAL SCORE**  *(Sum Totals divided by 100)* | **4.52** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 (Highly Unsatisfactory) | < 1.83 | 4 (Moderately Satisfactory) | >=3.5 <=4.33 |
| 2 (Unsatisfactory) | >= 1.83 < 2.66 | 5 (Satisfactory) | >4.33 <= 5.16 |
| 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory) | >=2.66 <3.5 | 6 (Highly Satisfactory) | > 5.16 |

# Annex D: Documents and individuals to be consulted during the main evaluation phase

**Stakeholders to consult**

|  |
| --- |
| ***UNEP*** |
| Myles Sven Hallin, Evaluation Manager, UNEP Evaluation Office |
| Tania Daccarett Pinzás, GEF Climate Change Mitigation Unit, Energy and Climate Branch, Economy Division (Paris) |
| Leena Darlington, Finance Management Officer |
| Aaron Mulli, Assistant Finance Management Officer |
| Ruth Zugman Do Coutto, Task Manager, GEF Climate Change Mitigation Unit, Energy and Climate Branch, Economy Division (Paris) |
| Camilla Piviali, Project Assistant, GEF Climate Change Mitigation Unit, Energy and Climate Branch, Economy Division (Paris) |
| Suzanne Lekoyiet, Task Manager, Enabling Activities Project (Nairobi) |
| Moema Correa, CBIT Senior consultant |
| Miriam L. Hinostroza, Head of Global Climate Action – former UNEP DTU Project Director |
|  |
| ***UNEP DTU*** |
| Frederik Staun, Project Manager, CBIT GCP Component 1 |
| Ana Cardoso, technical expert design and programming, CBIT GCP component 1 |
|  |
| ***UNDP*** |
| Damiano Borgogno, Project Manager for CBIT GCP Component 2 and 3, Coordinator, GSP, Europe and CIS Regional Hub (Istanbul) |
| Stephen Gold, Project Director – since Dec 2019 |
| Tugba Varol, CBIT GCP Component 2 and 3, GSP, Europe and CIS Regional Hub (Istanbul) |
| Yamil Bonduki – former Project Director |
|  |
| ***GEF Secretariat*** |
| Milena Gonzalez Vasquez, CBIT portfolio Project Manager, Latin America regional team, Climate change mitigation (Washington DC) |
| Chizuru Aoki (Washington DC) |
|  |
| ***UNFCCC Secretariat*** |
| Jigme (Bonn) |
|  |
| ***MRV Group of Friends, development partners, Annex I parties*** |
| Salvatore, Mirella, CBIT Focal Point, FAO (Rome) |
| Rocio Condor, CBIT Focal Point, FAO (Rome) |
| Charity Nalyanya, CBIT Focal Point, Conservation International |
| Roberta Ianna, Italian Ministry of Environment (Rome) |
| Rocio Lichte, German Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) (Berlin) |
| Klaus Wenzel, Lead, PATPA, GIZ (Berlin) |
| ***Non-Annex I parties/CBIT countries*** |
| UNEP: |
| Khetsiwe Khumalo, CBIT Focal Point, Government of eSwatini |
| Jenny Liesbeth Mager Santos, CBIT Focal Point, Government of Chile |
| Macarena Maia Moreira Muzio, CBIT Focal Point, Government of Argentina |
| Rodrigo Alvites, CBIT Focal Point, Government of Peru |
| Kakha Mdivani, CBIT Focal Point, Government of Georgia |
| Daniel Benefor, CBIT Focal Point, Government of Ghana |
| UNDP: |
| Virginia Sena, CBIT Focal Point, Government of Uruguay |
| Vahakn Kabakian, CBIT Focal Point, Government of Lebanon |
| Pavlina Zdraveva, UNDP Country Office, North Macedonia |
| Miroslav Tadic, UNDP Country Office, Serbia |

**Documents to be consulted:**

* GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review for Full-Sized/Medium-Sized Projects, 2017
* GEF Project Identification Form (PIF), 2016
* Letter of Approval, 2016
* GEF CEO Endorsement Request, 2017
* UNDP Project Document, 2017
* Amendment 1, 2019
* Request for no-cost extension, 2019
* UNEP Routing Slip for Project Revisions, 2019
* UNEP-UNEP DTU Project Cooperation Agreement, 2017
* UNEP Revised Budget with Budget Variance Analysis
* Revised Workplan
* Selected emails
* EMG meeting notes and agendas, 2018-2019
* PSC meeting reports and agendas, 2018-2019
* Project Implementation Review (PIR) July 2018-June 2019, 2019
* UNEP DTU Half-yearly Progress Reports: July-December 2017, July-December 2018, July-December 2019
* UNEP Project Action Sheet, 2019
* Final Report, 2020
* GEF Tracking Tool, 2017 and 2020
* Non-Annex I country survey, 2019
* <https://www.cbitplatform.org/>
* CBIT GCP Phase II PIFs, 2018-2019
* Output 3.1.3 report, 2020
* Outcome reports and agendas, CBIT GCP events, 2017-2019
* Overview of CBIT GCP webinars, 2019
* CBIT Good Practice Brief template
* CBIT Snapshot issue 1
* CBIT GCP Self-assessment Tool
* CBIT GCP Platform Welcome Note
* CBIT GCP Platform Guidance for Country Focal Points
* Perspective Articles on CBIT GCP Platform
* A road map for establishing information systems for climate action and support, 2019
* Unfolding the reporting requirements for Developing Countries under the Paris Agreement’s Enhanced Transparency Framework, 2019
* UNEP Cash Advance Request, 2019
* UNEP Annual Co-Finance Reports, 2020
* UNEP Quarterly Expenditure Statements, 2017-2019
* UNEP Medium Term Strategies, 2014-2017, 2018-2021
* UNEP Biennial Programme of Work (PoW), 2016-2017, 2018-2019

# Annex E: Individuals and documents consulted for the inception report

**People consulted:**

* Myles Sven Hallin, Evaluation Manager, UNEP Evaluation Office
* Tania Daccarett Pinzás, GEF Climate Change Mitigation Unit, Energy and Climate Branch, Economy Division (Paris)
* Camilla Piviali, GEF Climate Change Mitigation Unit, Energy and Climate Branch, Economy Division (Paris)
* Damiano Borgogno, Project Manager for CBIT GCP Component 2 and 3, Coordinator, GSP, Europe and CIS Regional Hub (Istanbul)

**Documents consulted:**

* GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review for Full-Sized/Medium-Sized Projects, 2017
* GEF Project Identification Form (PIF), 2016
* Letter of Approval, 2016
* GEF CEO Endorsement Request, 2017
* UNDP Project Document, 2017
* Amendment 1, 2019
* Request for no-cost extension, 2019
* UNEP Routing Slip for Project Revisions, 2019
* UNEP-UNEP DTU Project Cooperation Agreement, 2017
* UNEP Revised Budget with Budget Variance Analysis
* Revised Workplan
* Selected emails
* EMG meeting notes and agendas, 2018-2019
* PSC meeting reports and agendas, 2018-2019
* Project Implementation Review (PIR) July 2018-June 2019, 2019
* UNEP DTU Half-yearly Progress Reports: July-December 2017, July-December 2018
* UNEP Project Action Sheet, 2019
* GEF Tracking Tool, 2017
* Non-Annex I country survey, 2019
* <https://www.cbitplatform.org/>
* UNEP Medium Term Strategies, 2014-2017, 2018-2021
* UNEP Biennial Programme of Work (PoW), 2016-2017, 2018-2019

# Annex F: Assessment of results framework

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective, outcomes, indicators** | | **Assessment/comments** |
| Project Objective:  *Establish an online platform supporting countries to understand and implement the transparency framework of the Paris Agreement. The platform will both provide development partners with an overview of existing initiatives to coordinate support efficiently and countries with knowledge and information forums for sharing best practices.* | | Not phrased as an impact/outcome.  The platform itself is an output, which in turn leads to the three outcomes.  It is thus at a lower level, not at a higher level, than the outcomes.  The Objective should be rephased, for example as follows:  “*Enhanced understanding and capacity of countries to implement the transparency framework of the Paris Agreement”.* |
|  | Indicator A: Number of partners using the platform’s services every quarter (in average) when developing/strengthening their national transparency systems | This indicator duplicates/overlaps with indicator 2 but is more precise and specifically tailored to CBIT GCP. It is, however, an output indicator rather than objective indicator. |
| Component/Outcome 1:  *Enhanced coordination and best-practice sharing for transparency practitioners and donors through the establishment of a web-based platform.* | | Appropriate outcome for the project, but the “*through the establishment of a web-based platform”* part is should be deleted, since the web platform itself is an output.  Suggested rephrasing: “*Enhanced coordination and best practice sharing for transparency practitioners and donors”.* |
|  | Indicator B: Number of partners using methodologies/tools listed on the platform | Appropriate indicator for outcome 1. |
| Indicator C: Number of entities using the platform to enhance partnerships | Appropriate indicator for outcome 1. |
| Component/ Outcome 2:  *Information sharing enhanced through regional and global meetings* | | Appropriate outcome for the project, but the “*regional and global meetings”* part is should be deleted, since the meeting are outputs.  In a sense, there is some overlap between outcome 1 and 2 (“*sharing*”).  Suggested rephrasing: “*Enhanced sharing of information”.* |
|  | Indicator D: Number of regional and global meetings held | Output indicator, not an outcome indicator. |
| Indicator E: Meeting attendance (per event, disaggregated by gender) | Output indicator, not an outcome indicator. |
| Component/ Outcome 3:  *Needs and gaps identified for enhancing transparency systems and CBIT coordination* | | Not an outcome, but an output.  Suggested rephrasing: “*Strategy/plan in place for post-project continuation of global coordination, sharing and information in relation to Paris Agreement transparency*”. |
|  | Indicator F: Number of countries with needs and gaps identified through participating in the self-assessment tool | Output indicator, not an outcome indicator. |
| Indicator G: Number of knowledge products developed based on insights from analyzing the self-assessment tool results | Output indicator, not an outcome indicator. |

# Annex G: Faithful Theory of Change

# Annex H: Comparison of reconstructed and faithful Theory of Change

# Annex I: CBIT countries and supporting agencies

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UNEP** | **UNDP** | **Other countries** | |
| 1. Antigua and Barbuda | 1. Armenia | 1. Kenya | Conservation International |
| 1. Argentina | 1. Bosnia-Herzegovina | 1. Liberia |
| 1. Azerbaijan | 1. Colombia | 1. Madagascar |
| 1. Burkina Faso | 1. Cote d’Ivoire | 1. Rwanda |
| 1. Chile | 1. Haiti | 1. Uganda |
| 1. Costa Rica | 1. India | 1. Afghanistan | FAO |
| 1. Dominican Republic | 1. Indonesia | 1. Bangladesh |
| 1. Eswatini | 1. Lebanon | 1. Benin |
| 1. Georgia | 1. Mauritius | 1. Cambodia |
| 1. Ghana | 1. Montenegro | 1. Cuba |
| 1. Honduras | 1. Morocco | 1. Mongolia |
| 1. Lao PDR | 1. Namibia | 1. Nicaragua |
| 1. Malawi | 1. North Macedonia | 1. Papua New Guinea |
| 1. Panama | 1. Serbia | 1. Sri Lanka |
| 1. Peru | 1. Uruguay | 1. Jamaica | IADB |
| 1. Sierra Leone | 1. Mexico |
| 1. South Africa | 1. China | Foreign Economic Cooperation Office |
| 1. Thailand |
| 1. Togo |

1. PIR 2019 says GEF Focal area - Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency; CEO Approval says GEF Focal Area Climate Change [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The first three months were during the 2014-2017 Medium Term Strategy and the 2016-2017 Programme of Work, but since the project was mainly in its inception and mobilisation during the last three months of 2017, it did not contribute significantly to these. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. No subsequent revisions/amendments were made to the results framework. No mid-term review was carried out. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For Nature of External Context the 6-point rating scale is changed to: Highly Favourable = 1, Favourable = 2, Moderately Favourable = 3, Moderately Unfavourable = 4, Unfavourable = 5 and Highly Unfavourable = 6. *(Note that this is a reversed scale)* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)