**To the comments received on** *March 3* **from the Terminal Evaluation of** *UNDP/GEF Project: Strengthening institutional and technical Macedonian capacities to enhance transparency in the framework of the Paris Agreement project name) (UNDP Project )*

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Institution/ Organization** | **#** | **Para No./**  **comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team**  **response and actions taken** |
|  | **EH** |  | p.1 | Please include information on:  • TE timeframe  • GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program  • Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners | added |
|  | **EH** |  | p.7 | UNDP Atlas Bus. Unit and both Award Id and Project ID should be provided here.  Indormation on the Planned Start date is not required. ProDoc signature date is Project Start date.  Please revise to CBIT-1 | revised |
|  | **AK** |  | p.7 | We would suggest either including this as a quote from the Project Document (it is cut and pasted) or changing the narrative tense to past tense. | agree. it is in past tense now |
|  | **AK** |  | **p.8** | The networks formed were intentionally designed as bridge measures until national legislation was adopted to address climate action and transparency, and the project fully support the latter as well. Maintaining a network that would be superseded by new legal arrangements would be very inefficient. | * As I highlighted during the debriefing, your own document “Macedonian Climate Transparency Network of National Practitioners” foresees “the Network of CC Professionals **to have a roadmap for post-project management of the network”** If you had evidence to change the position than this should be elaborated in the PIRs which was not the case * There are also pros in continued network, but ultimately it is up to them to decide * No change made |
|  | **AK** |  | **p.8** | The project shared knowledge through a 3-day national event, through regional south-south workshops, and through a global synthesis report on CBIT projects. I would not consider that to be a “narrow focus.” Moreover, knowledge products will remain available to decision-makers and the broader public on the national climate change website | Added words “According to PRF” More substantive discussion is all over the report, including about these activities etc. |
|  | **AK** |  | **p.8** | Reporting included annual PIRs, additional information for GEF, and special reporting related to COVID impacts. The evaluation should specify gaps or shortcomings in reporting that were observed. | added. This is abtu PIRs. Rather untidy, with pieces here and there that belong elsewhere, etc. This is not in the TE, but it looks like the PM had little time for these (which brings us to staffing)  a few words added |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.8** | Agree. Please briefly mention gaps in the reporting here |  |
|  | **AK** |  | **p.8** | We would suggest that the effectiveness of the project lies in its achievements relative to the Theory of Change; i.e., better reporting will allow North Macedonia to set and achieve more robust NDCs under the Paris Agreement and will advance global knowledge about climate action while emphasizing sustainable economic growth and European integration. | What you see here is in line with the UNDP GEF 2021 evalaution guidance. The paras are swapped to highlight the reportign bit  *Effectiveness is the extent to which the project’s objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved. Effectiveness is also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgment about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact. The TE team must consider the following points when assessing effectiveness:*  *• Extent to which the project contributed to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF strategic priorities, and national development priorities; and factors that contributed to the achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and outputs;*  *• Extent to which the project’s actual outcomes/outputs were commensurate with what was planned;*  *• Areas in which the project had the greatest and fewest achievements; and the contributing factors;*  *• Extent to which the intervention achieved, or expects to achieve, results (outputs, outcomes and impacts, including global environmental benefits) taking into account the key factors that influenced the results;*  *• Constraining factors, such as socio-economic, political and environmental risks; cultural and religious festivals, etc. and how they were overcome;*  *• Any alternative strategies that would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives;*  *• Gender- Extent to which the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human rights-based approach? Extent to which a gender responsive and human rights-based approach were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention.* |
|  | **AK** |  | **p.9** | Technical manuals and studies are available to the professionals who need them, and that is the priority for the project. In addition, nearly all project analytical reports included summaries and recommendations for policy-makers in order to increase uptake and all of them are availble at the web site klimatskipromeni.mk. Communications strategies for CBIT projects are difficult, because they have a unique focus. This project had strong and consistent messaging ( #itspossible) to the media. | for example, were the training manuals for munis setn to ZELS? of think tanks? It would have been useful. They migth have missed your events. This is just an example.  why not have own commuictaions plan – as a management tool? I.e. just table, when you develop a distributon plan for each of the products you deliver  No change made |
|  | **AK** |  | **p.9** | This was not foreseen in the project document but is a good recommendation, so we suggest to be moved to that section of the TR. | Rephrased, it is already in the Recommendations |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.16** | I believe this sentence comes from the TE inception report and shall be revised here. | revised |
| Please revise. |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.20** | Please comment on the timeline and any delays and related circumstances.  In line with the M&E plan in the ProDoc, the Inception workshop was expected to take place within two months after the project document has been signed. It has been slightly delayed. | added |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.20** | In some sentences present tense is used in others past tense. Please revise for consistency. | edited |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.26** | By definition, UNDP cannot be a Responsible Party in UNDP project.  UNDP is GEF Implementing Agency, providing execution support under support to NIM modality.  I suggest to revise the language to avoid any confusion.  In cases when UNDP provides support services to a project, UNDP does so in a separate capacity termed country office support (COS) and this must be pre-approved by the GEF. | revised |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.28 p.32** | Under this section, it is also expected to comment on:  Gender responsiveness of project design, and  Social and Environmental Safeguards | added |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.28** | Suggest to elaborate on: How were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame? Was the project designed to address country priorities and be country-driven? | added |
|  | **EH** |  | **p.28** | Could you please also explicitly mention on whether you found outcomes and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change. | added |
|  | **AK** |  | **p.28** | The UNDP PRF allows for a description of the indicator (which is cited here) and then a SMART target, so the targets (which we believe are SMART) should be considered in this discussion and not the description of the indicator.  Moreover, there is no reflection on the CBIT-specific capacity targets (2 numeric assessment scores), and they are very important because they allowed this project to benchmark its progress in capacity development but also because it allowed for comparison across CBIT countries. | Disagree, and this cannot be down to UNDP PRF, to which you are refeerign to. M&E has universally accepted rules, and so you have the concept of SMART INDICATORS  expanded now – to explain   * That discussion is elsewhere but I added here as well |
|  | **EF** |  | p.28 | Under this section, it is also expected to comment on:   * Gender responsiveness of project design, and * Social and Environmental Safeguards | 2 paras added |
|  | AK |  | p.29 | Project activities and approach were designed to address gaps identified in the GEF-funded Enabling Activity projects that supported the compilation of the BURs and the National Communications. These lessons (e.g. ad hoc reporting has serious shortcomings, certain aspects of the inventory, barriers to gender mainstreaming, etc.) are presented on pages 7, 10, and 11 by the document rather than by the supporting project. | fine, but it is a best practive for ProDoc to identify the LLs from other relevant projects (as a section of proDoc) and this will not necessarily apply to the main theme of the project, but also to the approaches, w.g. to capacity building  no change made |
|  | AK |  | p.32 | This is a very important conclusion given the extraordinary nature of the project implementation period, and maybe you could consider emphasizing it in the summary too. | it is there, but fine, emphasized |
|  | **EF** |  | p.33 | Please revise co-financing table into the requested format provided in the TE guidelines. That is the standard template request to be used. | revised |
|  | **EF** |  | p.33 | Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form | There was a sentence on that just above the table, but now also included below the table |
|  | AK, EH |  | p.33 | We agree, but it should be noted that the project did not have a choice in the matter – this is essentially standard UNDP policy for CBIT projects and not something that the CO or project team could influence.  EH  Actually, there is no UNDP policy for CBIT projects specifically. The M&E activities are planned/budgeted according to M&E requirements as defined by UNDP and GEF policies. The M&E Requirements and M&E Budget are better visible on p. 35-36 of the ProDoc. Currently, most projects have a separate M&E component, but that was not a practice when the CBIT project was designed and therefore M&E budget was included under technical components.  The budget line for TE is also covering Inception Workshop and Knowledge Management Specialist for Lessons Learned Report in the ProDoc. | Revised |
|  | ZG |  | p.33 | Extent to which information provided by the M&E system was used to improve and adapt project performance; o Whether the M&E system included proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. How were perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed? How were relevant groups’ (including women, indigenous peoples, children, elderly, disabled, and poor) involvement with the project and the impact on them monitored? | One para added |
|  | ZG |  | p.34 | Kindly elaborate on the following points;  Were new risks or changes to existing risks reported on in the annual PIRs and/or MTR (if applicable)? o How did those risks affect project implementation? o What systems and tools were used to identify, prioritize, monitor and manage those risks? Were action plans developed and followed? Was escalation necessary? • Was the project’s risk register properly maintained during implementation? • Did the Project Team keep the Project Board informed of new risks, changes to existing risks and the escalation of risks? | added |
|  | AK |  | P.34 | Correct but the risks related to the MRV unit were provided in the Project Results Framework. | The PRF has the following risk “Risks: Insufficient human and financial resources for operationalization of a national platform/MRV system”, which is a bit different than what is discussed here. One sentence added |
|  | ZG |  | P.34 | In your opininin, what was the consequences of that? | One sentence added |
|  | AK |  | p.35 | Correct although this was beyond the control of the project, and when the project was designed, the Ministry submitted official letter for this (letter is in the dropbox folder) | A few words added. We are evaluating the project and not the performance of the Project team however, especially in this case when it is NIM. |
|  | AK |  | p.41 | It would be helpful for us to understand a bit more about this discussion and the comments received so we can take it into consideration by the end of the projects, and for other similar projects in the future | *A sentence added:*  *For example, the training manuals could be sent to all the training institutions and organizations that could benefit for them, the research reports could be sent to the research entities with the related profile, and there could be email notifications to all agencies that would benefit from the various platforms and tools supported by the project.* |
|  | AK |  | P.54 | The Macedonian Government provided endorement letter for the project, so this statement which is based on the individual opinion of one individual intervierer, is problematic for us and we woyld suggest to be revised. It is understandable that you can qoute individual oppinions but it should not be a bases for such a strong statement that the Government was not ready for the project.  Moreover, the MRV and transparency is already embeded in the draft Law on Climate Action (to be addopted this year) so the project created an strong enabling environment for smooth enhfiorcement of this law. | the sentence is revised. But the point stays. The fact that it will undergo structural changes was known (IPA project). These changes are rarely quick and most often protracted. |
|  | ZG |  | P54 | Gender  o Extent to which the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human rights-based approach?  o Extent to which a gender responsive and human rights-based approach were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention. | One para added |
|  | AK |  | p.55 | Could you please elaborate what do you mean by this? | there was some mess up here. corrected |
|  | EH |  | p.56 | More than 2 are listed | Corrected |
|  | EH |  | p.56 | Was this GEF funded? | Climate promise. Revied |
|  | ZG |  | P.59 | Kindly indicate whether the gender results achieved are short-term or long term. | A para added |
|  | AK |  | p.60 | Maybe you can add that in this case it is important to take advantage of modules and tools that are available in other countries so as to avoid “re-inventing the wheel.” | fine, added. but thes manial is in local langauge and adapated to NM |
|  | AK |  | p.60 | Each event/training that the project implemented was designed for a specific target group and the trainings were fine-tuned based on the background of the targeted group of participants. For example. spatial planning events were attended by urban planners, gender events were attended by the coordinators for equal opportunities departments/commissions on central and local level. We consider that creating mix groups of participants and providing training on general topics related to climate change is less beneficial than having targeted trainings/events. | all that is clear. Agreed. Here we are talking only abour knowing if other trainings were taking place. This might have promoted sytnegies within municipalities  No change made |
|  | AK |  | p.62 | You might consider mentioning the participation of ministers (and the prime minister) in project events and briefings and the appearance of the President at a UNDP COP event. | added |
|  | ZG |  | p.62 | From the six areas of GEF’s additionally, which one of them project contributed to, kindly elaborate. | added |
|  | ZG |  | p.63 | Please assess any real change in gender equality, e.g. access to and control of resources, decision‐ making power, division of labor, etc | added |
|  | ZG |  | P.63 | Kindly also include here main findings. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as 44Access at: https://www.gefieo.org/evaluations/guidelines-gef-agencies-conducting-terminal-evaluation-full-sized-projects 63 factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions. | added |
|  | AK |  | P.65 | We agree but would point out that “sustainability” is complicated in all of the CBIT projects, as the funding is still ad hoc on a project by project basis through the GEF even though Non Annex I countries are guaranteed funding under Article 12 of the UNFCCC for MRV. | this is about internal sources of sustainability. i.e., linking, e.g., linking with ZELS and alike. no change made |