

Terminal Evaluation

Climate Change Enabling Activity

Second National Communication

Commonwealth of Dominica

Project Funded by: The Global Environmental Facility (GEF)
Implementing Agency: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
National Executing Agency: Environmental Coordinating Unit;
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment (MoAFE)

Prepared by: Varsha Persaud

December 2011

ACRONYMS

BPOA	Barbados Plan of Action
CARICOM	Caribbean Community and Common Market
CCCCC	Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre
COP	Conference of the Parties
DOMLEC	Dominica Electric Company
DOWASCO	Dominica Water Authority
ECU	Environmental Coordinating Unit
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GHG	Green House Gas
HACT	Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer
INC	Initial National Communication
IWCAM	Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management
LULUCF	Land Use-Land Use Change and Forestry
MoAFE	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NANGO	National Association of Non-Governmental Organisations
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NIM	National Implementation Modality
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PPCR	Pilot Project on Climate Resilience
PSIP	Public Sector Investment Programme
SNC	Second National Communication
SRCA	Sub-Regional Country Assessment
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TNA	Technology Needs Assessment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	<i>Executive Summary</i>	4
2	<i>Introduction</i>	7
3	<i>The Project and its Development Context</i>	9
4	<i>Findings</i>	11
4.1	<i>Project Formulation</i>	11
4.2	<i>Project Implementation</i>	13
4.3	<i>Results</i>	17
5	<i>Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	20
6	<i>Lessons learned</i>	22
7	<i>Annexes</i>	24
7.1	<i>TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONDUCTING THE TERMINAL EVALUATION</i> ..	24
7.2	<i>FINAL REPORT OUTLINE</i>	32
7.3	<i>ITINERARY</i>	42
7.4	<i>LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED</i>	43
7.5	<i>LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR</i>	44
7.6	<i>QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR INTERVIEWS</i>	45
7.7	<i>LIST OF CONSULTANTS ON SNC</i>	47
7.8	<i>SAMPLE OF MISSION REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT</i>	48

1 Executive Summary

The Commonwealth of Dominica submitted its Initial National Communication (INC) to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in December 2001. In June 2006, Dominica was awarded funding for the Second National Communication (SNC) Enabling Activity. The SNC Project was expected to take advantage of lessons learnt, skills developed and progress made in adapting to climate variability and change during the activities implemented under the INC and under the Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) project. It was intended that the SNC would identify the gaps in the national Climate Change response mechanism and develop appropriate responses. Public awareness activities during the SNC process were expected to enhance the awareness and knowledge of Dominicans on Climate Change and its related issues, as well as to promote the mainstreaming of Climate Change into the national planning and development process. The overall goal of the SNC was to help Dominica to build its capacity to respond to the impacts of Climate Change, and to help the country meet its reporting obligations under the UNFCCC.

The principal components of the SNC project were the National Circumstances Report, the Greenhouse Gas Inventory, the Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment, the Mitigation Assessment, and the Preparation of a Comprehensive Report to the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The project document further suggested that mitigation might focus on sectors such as Agriculture, Tourism and Water Resources, including its service sector and the hydrological cycle. There was also a call for support of the development of renewable energy projects as a mechanism to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

The project was developed with the assistance of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Risk reduction and Climate Change had been identified as priority areas for action in the UNDP 2005 Sub-Regional Country Assessment (SRCA), and as a result the project was expected to respond to the major local and sub-regional concerns in these priority areas. The project was executed within the framework of the SRCA and the Barbados Plan of Action (BPOA), enabling the Commonwealth of Dominica to fulfil its obligations in accordance with Article 12 of the UNFCCC.

A Terminal Evaluation (TE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF. The TE is to examine the implementation of the project, review the achievements, and assess the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of the results. The evaluation should also capture lessons learnt and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed and the implementation arrangements. With respect to the SNC project, the TE found that project implementation was effective and efficient in both a technical and financial sense. Implementation was marred only by delays caused primarily by local contractual challenges. There were no changes made to the project format or logical framework during the execution of the project. However, there were changes to the timeframe and delivery schedule occasioned by the contractual delays. The result is that the project completion date had to be reset for December 2011, and submission of the final SNC Report to the COP is now expected in

the first quarter of 2012. With the exception of finalisation and submission of the SNC Report all major activities of the project had been completed at the time of this terminal evaluation.

Several factors contributed to the effective implementation of the project. The technical capacity of persons implementing the project was strong and the quality of work undertaken in all project activities was high. Operational relationships between the institutions and agencies involved in project implementation were excellent. One of the significant successes of the project was the inter-sectoral and inter-agency linkages that were developed and the consequent collaboration that strengthened planning and decision making. There was a good working relationship between the Project Manager and the UNDP Programme Manager, and this allowed flexibility in budget line adjustments. The Project Manager was creative in finding ways to deliver project outputs within budget. There was strong and enthusiastic stakeholder participation in the project, with more than 95% of the stakeholders listed in the project document being involved in the implementation process, shaping activities, taking part in data reviews and disseminating information. However, there were some challenges, resulting primarily from financial constraints with respect to information dissemination to the wider public through the use of local media.

Although no formal monitoring and evaluation programme was established for the project, several activities collectively ensured that monitoring and evaluation did occur. Monthly reports which documented project expenditures and output delivery rates were provided to Government through the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP). The Ministry of Finance required project data and results in order to authorise project payments through UNDP, and UNDP itself required quarterly and annual operational and financial reports. The project was also subject to a NIM Audit by an independent consulting firm, and is again being independently assessed by this terminal evaluation.

The probability of sustainability of project outputs after termination is high. It is quite likely that financial resources to further pursue the Climate Change agenda will be available, the sociopolitical environment is supportive and there are no legal or environmental threats to the sustainability of project outputs.

Lessons learned from the implementation of this project can be used to improve the implementation of future projects. Some of these are:

- Institutional procedures for the issuing of contracts, payment of consultants and data dissemination and review must be streamlined effectively to avoid project delays.
- There are situations in which aspects of project implementation can benefit significantly from external support provided by Implementing Agencies, since this can enable the project team to overcome local bottlenecks, such as the delays associated with national contractual modalities in the present project.

- Collaboration and cooperation between and among state agencies can facilitate planning and decision-making at the local level, improve the implementation of projects, and ensure responsiveness to international obligations.
- Economic and social implications need to be at the forefront of public awareness programmes, rather than an emphasis on pure science, since this is more likely to attract the attention of the political directorate and reach a larger section of the general public.
- Significant data gaps exist, both at the sectoral and national level, which affected the execution of both the INC and SNC, as well as other national development initiatives. This speaks to the need for a focused effort on the acquisition and management of data relevant to national development.

Table 1 Project Ratings

Table 1- Main Project Ratings		
		Rating
Project Formulation	Conceptualization	Satisfactory
	Stakeholder Participation	Satisfactory
Project Implementation	Implementation Approach	Highly Satisfactory
	Monitoring and Evaluation	Satisfactory
	Stakeholder participation in implementation	Highly Satisfactory
Results	Attainment of outcomes/ Achievement of objectives	Highly Satisfactory
Sustainability	Financial resources	Moderately Likely (ML). There are only moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
	Sociopolitical	Likely (L). There are only minimal risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
	Institutional framework and governance	Likely (L). There are only minimal risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
	Environmental	Likely (L). There are no environmental risks that are likely to affect sustainability.

2 Introduction

The terminal evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project implemented in the Commonwealth of Dominica entitled 'Enabling Activities for the Preparation of the Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (PIMS 3340)' was conducted between November 10, 2011 and December 10, 2011. The mission to Dominica took place from November 15 to November 19, 2011. The terminal evaluation was conducted in accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy. The evaluation has four main aims:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and report on the extent of project accomplishments.
- To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF-funded activities.
- To contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefits.
- To document, provide feedback on and disseminate lessons learned.

The total budget for the project was US\$405,000.00. The main objective of the project was the preparation of the Second National Communication for submission to the Conference of the Parties (COP) of the UNFCCC. This Enabling Activity was also designed to build awareness and knowledge of Climate Change issues in Dominica and to mainstream Climate Change into the national planning and development framework. The approach to the development of the Second National Communication was to expand on the database developed in the Initial National Communication, strengthen the national capacity to respond to Climate Change issues and integrate these issues into the development planning process. This was done through four main activities that produced the following outputs:

- The National Circumstance Report
- The National Green House Gas (GHG) Inventory
- A Programme Containing Measures to Facilitate Adequate Adaptation to Climate Change
- A Programme Containing Measures to Mitigate Climate Change Impacts.

The extent to which these activities have been effectively implemented, and the extent to which the outputs have been integrated into national development programmes, is assessed in this Report in Section 4.3 Results.

The emphasis in this project was, appropriately, on the outputs stated at the onset of the project, and provided above, but other outcomes have also been achieved. Examples include the use of vulnerability data and predictive models in the design of new projects such as the

Pilot Project on Climate Resilience (PPCR) and the vulnerability atlas prepared under the Sustainable Land Management project.

This evaluation was conducted by a single independent evaluator who had no previous contact with the project but was familiar with the GEF, UNDP and the Commonwealth of Dominica. The evaluation employed a mixed methodology consisting of a desk review, interviews, small group discussions and questionnaires. The documents reviewed included the project document, the project annual work-plans, the project implementation reports (PIRs), quarterly operational reports, the INC Report, national legislation relevant to the project, the UNDP–GEF guidance policies on the evaluation process and the project outputs, including the GHG inventory, the National Circumstance Report, the Vulnerability, Adaptation and Risk Assessment Report and the Mitigation Measures Report.

During the evaluation the Project Manager provided an overview of the project execution and lessons learnt. Interviews were also conducted with the Director of the Environmental Coordinating Unit, the UNDP Programme Manager for Energy and the Environment, Members of the Steering Committee, the UNDP Focal Point and selected consultants who worked on the project.

All of the information collected was mapped and cross-referenced for verification. Data that could not be verified from notes and reports were subjected to telephone reviews in order to ensure accuracy and obtain clarity.

An exit interview was also conducted with the UNDP Project Manager and the Director of the Environmental Coordinating Unit. In the exit interview, the preliminary findings of the initial interviews were presented and clarity sought where there was uncertainty.

3 The Project and its Development Context

The project document states that the project was approved by the GEF in June 2006 and was to be of three years duration. The Government of Dominica officially signed off on the project on July 10, 2006 with a planned closing date of June, 2009. At the time of this terminal evaluation (November-December 2011), all elements of the project have been completed and the draft report is available. The final report is expected to be submitted to the UNFCCC Secretariat by March 2012, and to the Conference of Parties XVIII also in 2012. The project is expected to be operationally and financially closed by June, 2012.

Dominica ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in March 1994, and thereby joined the community of nations committed to combating global Climate Change. In December 2001, Dominica submitted its Initial National Communications to the UNFCCC, which included an initial Green House Gas Inventory, in fulfilment of its obligations under Article 12 of the Convention. The outputs and outcomes under the INC were not as comprehensive as had been anticipated due to data gaps and lack of awareness at the national level. These constraints were partially responsible for the limited progress towards advancing the country's commitment to reducing or managing its GHG emissions, beyond the INC exercise. This Second National Communication was intended to build on activities started in the INC, as well as in the Phase II Enabling Activities and other related Climate Change activities. It was also intended to address any new areas that may have arisen or need more emphasis. Moreover, preparation of the SNC is a legal obligation of the UNFCCC.

The SNC project contained four main components which culminated in four major outputs. These included the National Circumstance Report, the National Green House Gas Inventory, the Vulnerability, Adaptation and Risk Assessment Report, and the Mitigation Measures Report. A critical development outcome of the SNC project was to be the mainstreaming of Climate Change concerns into sectoral and national development priorities by strengthening the institutional and systemic capacity of the country to develop its technical capabilities and expand its knowledge base to support decision-making. It was also to contribute to the global objective of stabilizing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere by providing a greater understanding of sources and sinks of GHG. The project is also expected to help Dominica manage its GHG emissions by reducing fossil fuel consumption and increasing energy efficiency. In this context it should be noted that Dominica is a net sink for green house gases and that the country has an exploratory programme aimed at producing geothermal energy for local consumption and export in the future.

The main stakeholders of the project were the Environmental Coordinating Unit, the Fisheries Division, the Forestry and Wildlife Division, the Office of Disaster Preparedness, Physical Planning, the Division of Agriculture, the Meteorological Office, the Central Statistical Office, Communications and Public Works, Housing Division, Local Government Department, Environmental Health Department, National Development Cooperation, Dominica Water Authority (DOWASCO), Dominica Electricity Company (DOMLEC), Dominica Solid Waste Management Cooperation, Department of Carib Affairs (Indigenous people), Youth

Organizations, and NANGO (National Association of NGOs). About seventy percent of these organizations were represented on the Steering Committee and participated in the Steering Committee decision-making process at various stages of the project.

Working together, and assisted by selected international consultants, these Ministries and Agencies have produced the country's Second National Communication for submission to the UNFCCC. This evaluation report is an assessment of the project activities and outputs which have led to the production of the SNC report.

4 Findings

4.1 Project Formulation

The National Communication process as a Reporting Mechanism for the UNFCCC was a decision of the Conference of Parties. The Convention requires Non-Annex I Parties to prepare and submit national communications to the Conference of Parties. Dominica's Second National Communication is therefore in fulfilment of its obligations under the Convention. Given this, the project design was not specific to Dominica. Nevertheless, it contained elements critical to Dominica's development programme and its response to Climate Change issues. The logical framework speaks to the inputs, outputs, responsible parties and budget. The emphases in project design are on outputs rather than indicators, and indicators can therefore not be used for assessing project success. However, there are several activities identified under each output. The implementation of these activities is intended to achieve the project objectives. Evaluation of the implementation of these activities can therefore be used to assess project success.

The components of the SNC project have been briefly provided in Sections 2 and 3 and are reiterated here. They include:

- A Review and update of the National Circumstances
- The Green House Gas Inventory
- Programme containing measures to facilitate adequate adaptation to Climate Change
 - Preparation for Vulnerability and Risk Assessments
 - Adaptation Programmes
- Programme containing measures to mitigate Climate Change
- Other information considered relevant to achieving the objectives of the Convention.
 - Technology Transfer
 - Systematic Observation and Research.
 - Public Education Awareness and Training
- Constraints and Gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity needs.

These components are appropriate for meeting the expected goals of the project and the expectation of the Government and people of the Commonwealth of Dominica, providing that the components are effectively implemented.

Given all of the above comments, the project formulation can be considered Satisfactory (**S**).

The design of this project was developed by the COP and the basic project ideas did not therefore originate at the national level. However, more than 95% of the stakeholders listed in

the project document did involve themselves in the project. Although they had little opportunity to participate in project formulation *per se*, they did take every opportunity to subsequently shape activities for the benefit of Dominica. Given this, stakeholder participation can be seen as Satisfactory (S).

The successful execution of this project gave much insight to the project team and stakeholders. The experiences gained during the implementation of this project are being used to great advantage in the formulation and execution of other donor funded projects. Among these are:

- The USAID project on Climate Change Vulnerability Risk Assessment (2008) addresses coastal vulnerability resulting from wave action and storm surges. This project was built upon information gathered from the vulnerability and adaptation risk assessment of the SNC.
- The Sustainable Land Management Project utilized the vulnerability and adaptation studies from the SNC to identify the specific communities that are at risk from storm surge. Vulnerability Atlases were then prepared for these communities.
- The SIDS DOCK initiative which focuses on renewable energy and energy efficiency for Small Island Developing States with initial funding from the Danes is also using information generated under the technology needs assessment component for the SNC to guide its implementation.
- An Integrated Watershed Management Policy has been developed, which is supported by the IWCAM project and was conceived from the data generated by the SNC.
- An initiative funded by the Japanese which addresses livelihoods in the fishing sector with emphasis on underutilized species and the impacts of Climate Change on fishing communities, had its genesis in the information generated under the Constraints and Gaps of the SNC, and relevant financial and technical capacity needs.

The UNDP was instrumental in the development of the SNC project. In addition to providing technical support, through its Global Support Program, it facilitated stakeholder consultations in the country to ensure ownership and commitment by all parties. The fact that UNDP is implementing several projects in the Commonwealth of Dominica allows for cross-fertilization of activities and greater benefits for the country. The UNDP is implementing both the Second National Communication and the Capacity for Sustainable Land Management and Disaster Response Activities. The resulting synergies can exponentially increase the effectiveness of outputs and impacts from the various activities.

4.2 Project Implementation

Project implementation has been effective and efficient, marred only by delays caused by local contractual challenges. These challenges were eventually overcome through the use of the Direct Contract Modality provided by UNDP. There were no changes made to the project format or logical framework during the execution of the project. However, there were changes to the timeframe and delivery schedule occasioned by the contractual delays. The result is that the final output will be submitted by March 2012, instead of at COP 16 which was in early December 2011.

Effectiveness in project implementation was facilitated by the fact that the Environmental Coordinating Unit (ECU), which had principal responsibility for project implementation, has the mandate for implementing all environmental initiatives in Dominica. As such, the Second National Communication project, Sustainable Land Management project, Pilot Project on Climate Resilience and others now being developed all benefited from being implemented by the same agency, since this allowed project managers to share information and experiences, resulting in synergistic impacts on the implementation of all activities.

There was good use of Workplans in project implementation. The Project Manager routinely prepared Workplans with revised timelines and adjusted budget allocations. Since the project was delayed, it was subject to inflationary costs with no additional resources provided. The Project Manager therefore had to find creative ways of delivering the same output without additional funds to counter inflation. The Quarterly and Annual financial reports that were prepared allowed for joint implementation planning between the Project Manager and the UNDP Programme Manager. This working relationship was cordial and allowed for the necessary flexibility in budget line adjustments. In no case was there a need for a budget amendment as a result of inflation or over-expenditure. The fact that the project was executed within budget in itself speaks to the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation process.

Emails were the only form of electronic information technology used in project implementation and for information dissemination. The ECU is currently developing a website where all information relevant to Climate Change, including output of the SNC project, will be posted. Monitoring was effected through direct interactions and examination of documents, and hence did not require the use of electronic technology.

Operational relationships between the institutions involved in project implementation were excellent. The Steering Committee consisted of representatives from all Government Departments, NGOs and the private sector. Powerful Government Departments such as the Prime Minister's Office and the Ministry of Finance were actively involved. The members on the Committee were expected to share information and experiences of the project with their agencies and to provide feedback to the project from their agencies. In this way, the project did receive input from a wide cross-section of the Dominican public and the Departments of Government remain interconnected in this way. This relationship among institutions

contributed significantly to the successful implementation of the project. Indeed, the Steering Committee felt strongly that one of the great successes of the project was the inter-sectoral linkages that were developed and the consequent collaboration that strengthened planning and decision making but also enabled the stakeholders to look at their sectors through a wider lens. This in turn enhanced the execution of the mandates of their agencies. For example, the Water Sector is no longer viewed by stakeholders as merely the marine and river systems, but rather as a complex hydrological system that includes the effects of rainfall, the transport of potable water across the island and water as a revenue earner for export. This output of the project is quite remarkable and provides a model for inter-departmental coordination that will much more effectively address national concerns and contribute in a sustainable manner to the economic welfare of the community.

In terms of technical capacity, the Steering Committee felt that the project execution team was of a high calibre and performed creditably in all aspects of project implementation. In particular, they cited the training of local stakeholders and technical staff of Government by the international consultants as being very positive and contributing to overall national capacity development. It is clear that the ECU now has the technical competence to perform vulnerability assessments and GHG inventory exercises in the future.

Based on the successes reported by the Steering Committee, and by the observations of this evaluator, project implementation can be rated as Highly Satisfactory (**HS**).

The core of the Monitoring and Evaluation at the national level were monthly reports on the execution of the project provided to Government through the Public Sector Investment Programme. These documented project expenditures and delivery rates of the project on a monthly basis. Moreover, since the Ministry of Finance had oversight of the project's budget, it required background data and results in order to authorise project payments through UNDP. UNDP itself required quarterly and annual operational and financial reports. In addition to these routine procedures, the UNDP Programme Manager conducted two tripartite reviews during the project life time. In both cases, the Government of Dominica, civil society and UNDP were satisfied that the project was following standard procedures, and except for the delays previously referred to, was performing satisfactorily. The project has also been subject to a NIM Audit by an independent consulting firm, and the present terminal evaluation is again an assessment by an independent third party. Given all the above procedures and activities, it can be concluded that Monitoring and evaluation of the project was consistent with GEF/UNDP guidelines, and can be assessed as Satisfactory (**S**).

Stakeholder participation in the project is interesting to assess. The fact that more than 95% of the stakeholders listed in the project document were actually involved in the implementation process, shaping activities, taking part in data reviews and disseminating information, speaks well to the national ownership of the process. Policy makers often asked for additional information that could be obtained using outputs of the project, and this helped to drive the process and ensure that the project was very successful. This active involvement inspired the project team to go beyond just the reporting requirements to providing data that could guide

policy development. It is interesting that, although the project ideas did not originate at the national level, the stakeholders took advantage of the opportunity to maximise the benefits of the project for Dominica. The remarkable success achieved in the context of inter-sectoral linkages and collaboration has already been documented and discussed.

The enthusiasm of the stakeholders on the Steering Committee was evident at the evaluation workshop conducted as a component of this terminal evaluation. The stakeholders were willing to participate in the terminal evaluation at very short notice. They provided information readily, were willing to speak openly, and gave credit to the successful outcomes of the project while at the same time critiquing those elements they thought could have been better. For example, while they praised the collaborative efforts of the various implementing partners and stakeholders, including Government agencies they were very critical of the limited amount of funds provided by the project to address public education and awareness. They further stated that the outputs were too report-oriented and that no funds were provided for demonstration/pilot projects, even though they were aware that this was an enabling activity.

There were challenges with respect to information dissemination to the wider public. The ECU reported that, in order to get information in the local media, officers from the ECU had to write the article themselves and the Office had to pay for the costs of dissemination in the media. The staff complement at the ECU is small and there is a very limited operational budget, these factors therefore constrained the extent to which project outputs could be disseminated in the media. The consequence was that information dissemination took place via workshops and community consultations, both of which are also costly and time-consuming. To make the best use of limited resources, the ECU used strategic interventions such as calendars which could be placed in Government Offices and schools, and vulnerability atlases, which are excellent and which are displayed in libraries and resource centres. Radio broadcasts were few and usually occurred at the more significant junctures of the project cycle, such as project inception and certification of graduates following training, or at critical events such as natural disasters.

In terms of collaboration with external organisations, the project established partnerships with the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre in Belize (CCCCC; the authorized Climate Change Centre for CARICOM countries), the University of the West Indies and the UNDP National Communication Support Programme. The first two institutions provided technical and scientific support in the generation of climate models and scenarios, while the latter assisted in the review of the documents generated from the various components of the project.

Given all of the above, stakeholder participation in the project can be assessed as Highly Satisfactory (HS).

In terms of financial planning, it is important to note that the SNC project is an enabling activity funded by the Global Environmental Facility with a total GEF budget of US\$405,000.00. There was no requirement for co-financing in this project. Disbursement of funds by UNDP used the Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), which is the approach normally used with Partners that have satisfied the micro assessment are considered to be in good financial

standing. Most payments were made directly to the consultants and only limited sums were transferred to the Government account to offset other project expenses. As previously mentioned, the project was subjected to one financial audit which took place in March 2011. The audit was conducted according to international standards and concluded that the project funds were spent in accordance with the approved budget allocations.

The UNDP and the Government of Dominica interacted effectively in the execution of all aspects of this project. The Project Manager was selected through an open and transparent recruitment process in accordance with the rules of the Government of Dominica and UNDP. Other support staff were selected by the ECU and the Project Manager. All staff recruited were considered to have high technical capacity and to have been effective in project execution. This project was implemented at a cost comparable to similar activities in Dominica and the Eastern Caribbean and within budget. Value for money was therefore considered to have been achieved since all project activities have been implemented. The only challenges were created by administrative delays in the issuing of contracts. However, the Project Manager's creative and adaptive management skills enabled him to find mechanisms to address these delays primarily by using UNDP's focal point to develop and issue the contracts. The communication lines between the UNDP and project personnel were always clear, which paved the way for a flow of information that resulted in the successful implementation of the project. A substantial contributor to successful project implementation was the excellent stakeholder participation and inter-agency collaboration, which speak well to the sustainability of project outputs over time.

4.3 Results

The project was originally due to be completed in June 2009. However, delays resulting from local contractual challenges required that the completion date was reset for December 2011, and submission of the final SNC report to the COP is now expected to be in the first quarter of 2012. With the exception of finalisation of the SNC report and its submission to the COP, all major activities of the project have been completed to date, as indicated in the Table below.

Components	Status	Comments
National Circumstances Report	Completed	None
An Inventory of Greenhouse Gases (GHG)	Completed	Some relevant national data, such as those related to the LULUCF were not available. The inventory was therefore based on best expert judgment.
A Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment	Completed	This component effectively identified sectoral risks, stresses and adaptive capacity.
A Mitigation Assessment	Completed	This component has added much value to the SNC
Other Information Relevant to Achieving the Objectives of the Convention	Completed	None
Constraints, Gaps, Financial, Technical and Capacity Needs	Completed	These critical areas have been identified and recommendations made.
Preparation of the SNC & Submission to COP	Consultant is incorporating comments from NCSP after review of Draft SNC	The Final SNC Report will be completed on or about December 31, 2011. Upon completion, it will be submitted for Cabinet approval, followed by submission to the COP. This will be done during the first quarter of 2012.
Public Education Outreach	Completed	PEO is an ongoing activity of the ECU, as mandated by the Government of Dominica.

The assessment of documents and the interviews conducted during this terminal evaluation all indicated that the quality of work in all project activities has been very high, and that project implementation has been effective and efficient. Given this, the attainment of outcomes and the achievement of project objectives is assessed as Highly Satisfactory (**HS**).

Although there is no legal mandate, or Government-approved institutional arrangement to guarantee sustainability of project outcomes, several factors suggest that the outcomes of the project will continue to impact positively on Dominica in the future. Powerful Government Departments, including the Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Finance were actively involved in project implementation. The position of the Government of Dominica was initially advocated by the Prime Minister on June 01, 2011 in his address to the nation at the beginning of the hurricane season. On World Environment day on June 05, 2011 the Minister of Health of the Dominica also spoke to the nation on issues of Climate Change and Health. The Climate Change issue was further raised at the July 2011 budget debate. Such far-reaching pronouncements by Government have far-reaching implications for the sustainability of the Climate Change agenda in Dominica. Climate Change is being mainstreamed into Government planning initiatives across the sectors, as can be seen in the application of appropriate climate sensitive technology in the Agriculture sector, the popularization of solar-powered street lights, and the use of wind energy at one school. All of these initiatives speak to the sustainability of Climate Change mitigation and adaptation efforts. It was during project implementation that the Government conceptualised its Low Carbon Change Compatibility Development Pathway that speaks to the greening of Dominica and its becoming the Eco-Isle of the Caribbean.

In terms of financial sustainability of the Climate Change agenda, Dominica is currently developing the framework for the implementation of a World Bank funded Pilot Project on Climate Resilience (PPCR) which is building upon outputs of the SNC. The country is also preparing itself to access the Green Climate Fund in support of green development, again building on the outputs of the SNC. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that there is little financial risk associated with the sustainability of the project; conversely, the project has opened the door for additional funding to support low carbon/climate-friendly development. Sustainability with respect to financial resources is therefore rated as Moderately Likely (**ML**).

There are no sociopolitical risks associated with the sustainability of the project. Stakeholder participation in project implementation was active and enthusiastic. Stakeholders see their interests being protected through the various initiatives and outputs of the project and therefore willingly support the continuation of the process. While information dissemination to the general public through the local media was limited, there is a clear commitment by Government to mainstream Climate Change issues into the national development process. This will be facilitated by the strong and harmonious inter-sectoral and inter-departmental collaborative linkages that were developed during project implementation. There is a strong commitment that such linkages will remain and continue to be active. Sustainability with respect to sociopolitical risks is therefore rated as Likely (**L**).

There are no legal threats to the sustainability of project outputs. By contrast, several Departments of Government are involved in the development of policies to support the national response to Climate Change impacts. One example is that the Water Authority has developed an Integrated Watershed Management Policy that is soon to be presented to Parliament for adoption. Sustainability with respect to Governance risks is therefore rated as Likely (**L**).

There are no environmental threats created as a consequence of policy outputs. Environmental concerns in Dominica are rapidly gaining the attention of policy makers, since livelihoods are clearly threatened. There is therefore an imperative for Government to address these issues, which would encompass the sustainability of initiatives to address Climate Change. Sustainability with respect to environmental risks is therefore rated as Likely (L).

During project implementation, there was a concerted effort by the project management team to ensure that national staff received training in the various techniques of data collection and analysis required for the GHG inventory and the vulnerability studies and scenarios. As a result, two staff members from the ECU and several persons from the Youth Environmental Service and the National Association of Youth in Agriculture are now equipped with the skills necessary to conduct GHG Inventories and Coastal Vulnerability assessments.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

The assessment of documents and the interviews conducted during this terminal evaluation indicated that the technical capacity of persons implementing the project was strong, that the quality of work undertaken in all project activities has been high and that project implementation has been effective and efficient in both a technical and financial sense. All major activities of the project have been completed to date and it can be concluded that project outcomes and objectives have essentially been achieved. In terms of Financial Resources, Sociopolitical Issues, Governance, and Environmental Impacts, it is likely that project outcomes will be sustainable over time.

The project can be considered to be a great success to Dominica. Important indications of this are the synergies, links and networks built during and around the outputs of the project and the extent to which key stakeholders, including powerful Government Departments and the private sector, are now prepared to combat Climate Change impacts in Dominica. An interesting example of the latter is that the Ministry of Finance has appointed a point person to specifically address Climate Change issues, which is a clear example of the willingness of the Government to meet these challenges. This is a good example of the Government's commitment to mainstream Climate Change into the national development agenda, which was a major goal of the SNC. The inclusion of Climate Change considerations into the Workplans of the Fisheries Department, the Water Authority, and the Physical Planning Department is a further indication of the Government's attempt to mainstream Climate Change.

Despite the above successes, there remain some concerns. The Director of the ECU felt that mainstreaming of Climate Change issues could have received even fuller attention and be more fully integrated into the national development process during the time of project implementation. He regretted the fact that a wider public audience could not have been reached through the local media due to financial constraints, and felt that regional partners did not provide as much support as the project team expected. The main challenge to the GHG inventory in the INC was a technical constraint related to activity data gaps and the fact that the use of the IPCC default emission factors did not reflect the country situation. The SNC did improve on this both in the national data set and the emission factor used in the calculations, but further data gathering activities would be valuable. The Vulnerability and Mitigation Assessments benefitted from national skill sets developed under the project, and the result was a larger and more accurate data set and better analyses. Capacity development was a real success of the SNC project and will continue to impact positively on the development of Dominica.

Overall, the evaluator concluded that the project implementation process was highly satisfactory and that significant advances were made on Climate Change issues in Dominica. However, the Climate Change agenda can be further advanced by implementation of the following recommendations which emerged from the evaluator's interactions with the project management team and the Steering Committee:

- Climate Change increasingly needs to be viewed from an economic developmental perspective rather than purely environmental or scientific, and the Ministry of Finance therefore needs to be more intimately involved in Climate Change matters.
- As an extension of the recommendation above, Climate Change issues should be integrated into the national budgetary debate in order to attract the local funds necessary to support response mechanisms.
- There needs to be greater emphasis on environmental education which targets policy makers e.g. Heads of Departments, Cabinet, and the approach to stakeholder education needs to be decentralized by directly targeting stakeholder communities.
- Since environmental education and public awareness are costly undertakings for all projects being implemented in Dominica, funds should be set aside to specifically finance this in future projects.
- Data management systems to support science and technology development should be improved in Dominica.
- There is need for a professional communication body to address Climate Change issues in Dominica, given the bilingual nature of the island.
- A cost benefit analysis should be conducted as part of the project cycle to provide information that can influence Government interventions and attract additional donor resource.
- Closer attention needs to be paid to financial reporting and forecasting of project impacts during the formulation of projects.

6 Lessons learned

All aspects of the project were evaluated during this assessment with particular attention to the attainment of project objectives and results, the sustainability of project benefits, innovations, catalytic effects and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. During this evaluation, the following lessons relevant to future projects were identified:

- Institutional procedures for the issuing of contracts, payment of consultants and data dissemination and review should be streamlined effectively to avoid project delays.
- There are situations in which aspects of project implementation can benefit significantly from external support provided by Implementing Agencies, since this can enable the project team to overcome local bottlenecks, such as the delays associated with national contractual modalities in the present project.
- There is a need for Government to establish a special fund to address Natural Disasters associated with Climate Change. This fund could be catalytic, allowing the country to access additional funds from donor agencies.
- Significant data gaps exist, both at the sectoral and national level, which affected the execution of both the INC and SNC, as well as other national development initiatives. For example, the Water Authority was not aware of the gaps in its own data sets which constrained its contributions to forecasting as required under the SNC. This speaks to the need for a focused effort on the acquisition and management of data relevant to national development.
- Collaboration and cooperation between and among state agencies can facilitate planning and decision-making at the local level, improve the implementation of projects, and ensure responsiveness to international obligations.
- Public awareness programmes require a professional approach as well as a creative strategy to avoid consultation fatigue which can result from the same small group being targeted by several projects.
- Economic and social implications need to be at the forefront of public awareness programmes, rather than an emphasis on pure science, since this is more likely to attract the attention of the political directorate and reach a larger section of the general public.
- Project audits are demanding for the project management team but can provide significant benefit both to a current project and when dealing with other international financing entities.

- There needs to be strong emphasis on ensuring that senior Government officials understand the expectations and obligations of the project, thereby ensuring that services are provided when required to move the project forward.
- Projects such as the SNC can significantly increase environmental awareness and Climate Change consciousness, but efforts to achieve this should be maintained over time.

7 Annexes

7.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONDUCTING THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- to promote accountability for resource use;
- to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

1.2. The Project Objectives and its Context

This Second National Communication (SNC) will evaluate and build upon lessons learnt, skills developed and progress made in adapting to climate variability and change during the preparation of the Initial National Communication (INC) and the Technology Needs Assessment (TNA). It will also identify gaps in the national Climate Change response mechanism and develop appropriate responses.

Components of the SNC include (a) An inventory of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions for the year 2000, (b) A review and update of the measures to reduce GHG emissions, (c) An assessment of the potential impacts of Climate Change in a pilot community, (d) Examination of possible adaptation measures and, (e) Preparation of the SNC and submission to COP. Public education and awareness will be integrated into the SNC process from the MACC and through synergy with ongoing related programmes.

In an effort to efficiently utilise available resources and to ensure maximum and effective output, some priority areas have been identified for special attention during the development of the SNC. The areas include agriculture, water resources, health and adaptation options. The SNC process is expected to enhance St. Vincent and the Grenadines awareness and knowledge of Climate Change related issues and strengthen its mainstreaming into the national planning and development framework.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP CO in Barbados. It will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures for such evaluations established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility.

The overall objective of the TE is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results. The evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

The main stakeholders of this TE are the Ministries of Health and the Environment, Agriculture and Fisheries and Finance and Planning, the National Emergency Response Agency, the Meteorological Office, the Central Water and Sewerage Authority (CWSA) and the St. Vincent Electricity Company (VINLEC). Other stakeholders include the Steering committee and the NGO community.

The TE must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. TEs have four complementary purposes:

To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;

To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP-GEF activities;

To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues, for example in the mid term evaluation.

3. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following products:

Oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation: This should be presented to UNDP CO before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of evaluation findings.

Evaluation written report: This report will be submitted to the UNDP Country Office, the UNDP-GEF regional Coordination Unit (RCU) and project team electronically within 2 weeks after the evaluation mission has been concluded. These parties will review the document and provide feedback to the evaluation team within 1 month after the evaluation report draft has been submitted. The evaluator will address these comments and provide a final report within a period of 1 week. In case of discrepancy between parties and the evaluation team an annex should be included at the end of the document explaining the discrepancies.

General considerations of the report:

- Formatting: Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; paragraph numbering and table of content (automatic); page numbers (centered bottom); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.
- Length: Maximum 50 pages in total excluding annexes
- Timeframe of submission: first draft within 2 weeks of completion of the country mission

4. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of the evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in line with international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group²¹. Any change must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

- **Documentation review** (desk study): the list of documentation is included in Annex 2. All the documents will be provided in advance by the Project Team and by the UNDP Country Office. The evaluator should consult all relevant sources of information, including but not limited to the following list of documentation: UNDP and GEF evaluation policy, the project document, project reports, Project Steering Committee minutes and decisions, project budgets, project work plans, progress reports, PIRs, project files, UNDP guidance documents, national legislation relevant to the project and any other material that they may consider useful. The Project Manager will also provide a report of the project's accomplishments and lessons.
- **Interviews** will be held with the following organizations and persons as a minimum: The Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health and the Environment, The Director of Finance (UNDP's focal point), the Environmental Director/Coordinator, members from the project steering Committee and the Project Manager.
- **Field Visits** should be made to any site where there are demonstration activities.
- **Semi-structured interviews** – the team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews to ensure that different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team
- **Questionnaires**
- **Participatory Techniques and other approaches for the gather and analysis of data**

² www.uneval.org

5. EVALUATION TEAM

This evaluation will be undertaken by a single consultant who must be familiar with the subject matter as well as the local conditions in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

6. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

6.1. Management Arrangements

The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, led by UNDP Barbados and the OECS as project Implementing Agency. The UNDP Sub-regional Office for Barbados and the OECS has overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements. Briefing sessions will be scheduled as necessary.

Payment modalities and specifications: The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. Payment will be 50% at the submission of the first draft to the UNDP-CO, and the other 50% once the final report has been completed and cleared by UNDP Sub-regional office. The quality of the evaluator's work will be assessed by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF-RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations or UNDP-GEF requirements, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installments.

6.2. Timeframe, Resources, Logistical Support and Deadlines

The total duration of the evaluation will be 24 days according to the following plan:

Preparation before field work: (4 days including travel time)

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, TPR reports, Mid term Evaluation report and other evaluation report, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country).
- Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office and the Project team.

Mission: (10 days-)

- Meeting with UNDP Country office team;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in St. Vincent
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Visit to Project site

- Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities,(capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
- Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

Draft report (8 days-): To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

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

Final Report (2days-)

- Presentation of final evaluation report

7. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

The scope of a TE will depend upon project type, size, focal area, and country context. In all cases, the TE should properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. In most cases, the TE will include field visits to ascertain project accomplishments and interviews of the key stakeholders at national and, where appropriate, local levels. It also analyses the use of GEF and co-financing resources in the broader context of the country.

In general it is expected that evaluations in the GEF explore the following five major criteria²:

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- **Efficiency.** The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.
- **Results.** The positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.

- Sustainability. The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The following should be covered in the TE report:

General information about the evaluation.

The TE report will provide information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. More details are provided in the template of Terms of Reference (**ToR**) in Annex 2.

Assessment of Project Results

TEs will at the minimum assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and will provide ratings for outcomes. This assessment seeks to determine the extent to which the project outcomes were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes, the TE will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document, and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved and achieved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator- together with the Project Team- should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established. Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes in behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. For GEF 4 projects it is required, and for GEF 3 projects it is encouraged, that the evaluators assess the project results using indicators and relevant Tracking Tools.

To determine the level of achievement of project results and objectives following three criteria will be assessed in the TE:

- Relevance: Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The evaluators should also assess the extent outcomes specified in the project appraisal documents are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.
- Effectiveness: Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.

- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio, project outcomes will be rated as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes

The TE will assess, at a minimum, the "likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this." The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. More details on the sustainability assessment are provided in the Template for ToR provided in Annex 2.

Catalytic role

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems

The TE will assess whether the project met the requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan. GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the

M&E plan, and provide adequate resources for the implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project. Given the long duration of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans to measure results (such as environmental results) after project completion. The TE reports will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of these two types of M&E systems.

7.2 FINAL REPORT OUTLINE

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Table summarizing main ratings received

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

4. Findings

In addition to the Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency assessment described above, a descriptive assessment must be provided. All criteria marked with (R) should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Please see Annex 2 for an explanation on the GEF terminology.

4.2 Project Formulation

This section should describe the context of the problem the project seeks to address. It should describe how useful the project conceptualization and design has been for addressing the problem, placing emphasis on the logical consistency of the project and its Logical Framework. This section should seek to answer the following questions: Was the project well-formulated? Were any modifications made to the Project's LogFrame during implementation, and if so, have these modifications resulted or are expected to result in better and bigger impacts?

Conceptualization/Design (R): This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy was the best option to address the barriers in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also

assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership/Driveness: Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation (R): Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.

Replication approach: Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also relates to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

Other aspects: to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches, the comparative advantage of UNDP as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach (R): Independent from the issue of whether the project was well designed or not, the next question should be how well has the project been implemented? This section should include an assessment of the following aspects:

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M & E activities if required.

(ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management; and/or changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.

(iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.

(v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

- Monitoring and evaluation (R): Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports. For evaluating this, it is proposed that evaluators use the following criteria: i) to evaluate if the project has an appropriate M&E system to follow up the progress towards achieving the project result and objectives ii) to evaluate if appropriate M&E tools have been

used, i.e baselines, clear and practical indicators, data analysis, studies to evaluate the expected results for certain project stages (results and progress indicators). iii) to evaluate if resources and capacities to conduct an adequate monitoring are in place and also if the M&E system has been utilized for adaptive management

- Stakeholder participation (R): This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

(i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.

(ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this area.

(iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.

(iv) Involvement of Governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of Governmental support of the project.

- Financial Planning: includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE. See more details and explanation of concepts in Annex 3 This section should include:

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements (has the project been the cost effective?)

(iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

(iv) Co-financing Apart from co-financing analysis the evaluators should complete the co financing and leverages resources table provided in Annex 3.

Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and the Government and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project. This section should seek to answer questions such as: Was the project's implementation done in an efficient and effective manner? Was there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation? Were the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective (R): This TE seeks to determine the extent to which the project's outcomes and project objective were achieved and if there has been any positive or negative impact. For this it is important to determine achievements and shortfalls of the project in achieving outcomes and objectives. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators, with the Project Team, should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established. This analysis should be conducted based on specific project indicators.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed. Each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as shown in footnote below³:
 - Financial resources: Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
 - Sociopolitical: Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
 - Institutional framework and governance: Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

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

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

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

systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.

- Environmental: Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The MTE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

5. Conclusions and recommendations

This section must provide the concluding points to this evaluation and specific recommendations. Recommendations should be as specific as possible indicating to whom this are addresses. Please complete the relevant columns of the management response Table provided in Annex 4 with main recommendations made. This section should include:

- Final remarks or synthesis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project;
- Final remarks on the achievement of project outcomes and objective;
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project;
- Actions to follow up on to reinforce initial benefits from the project;
- Proposals for future directions that reinforce the main objectives.

6. Lessons learned

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

- Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned during project implementation this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?
- What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?
- How does this project contribute to technology transfer?
- To what extent have UNDP GEF projects been relevant to national / local efforts to reduce poverty / enhance democratic governance / strengthen crisis prevention and recovery capacity / promote gender equality and empowerment of women? Please explain.

- Has this project been able to generate global environmental benefits while also contributing to the achievement of national environmental management and sustainable development priorities? If yes, please elaborate.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
- Clearance and revision form from RCU and CO

Terms Used in the Report

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project’s logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable.

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project’s objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project’s collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation.

Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns
- Consultation and stakeholder participation
- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.)
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are

replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts). A benchmark approach in Climate Change and ozone projects measures cost-effectiveness using internationally accepted threshold such as 10\$/ton of carbon equivalent reduced, and thresholds for the phase out of specific ozone depleting substances measured in terms of dollars spent per kg (\$/kg) of each type of ODS reduced.

Monitoring & Evaluation: Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners

to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

7.3 ITINERARY

July 15, 2011

- 1:00 pm Meeting with MEA Project Manager – Ms. Kongit Haile-Gabriel
- 1:30 pm Meeting with the Director of the Environmental Coordinating Unit – Mr. Lloyd Pascal
- 2:00pm Meeting with Ms. Kimisha Thomas – Project Assistant

July 16, 2011

- 8:30 am Meeting with the Project Manager of the Second National Communication – Mr. Colin Guiste
- 10:30am Meeting with the Stakeholders for the Second National Communication
- 3:30pm Exit Interview with the Director of the Environmental Coordinating Unit

7.4 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

- Dr. Reynold Murray, Programme Manager (Energy and Environment), United Nations Development Programme
- Mr. Lloyd Pascal, Director of the Environmental Coordinating Unit
- Mr. Colin Guiste, Project Manager of the Second National Communication, Environmental Coordinating Unit
- Ms. Kimisha Thomas, Project Assistant, Environmental Coordinating Unit
- Mr. Anderson Parillon, Ministry of Finance
- Mr. Andrew Magloire, Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources, Physical Planning and Fisheries, Fisheries Development Department
- Ms. Annie Edwards, Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources, Physical Planning and Fisheries, Department of Physical Planning
- Adenauer Douglas
- Mr. Marcus Francis, Dominica Solid Waste Management Cooperation
- Ms. Gwennie Dickson, Dominica Water and Sewage Company Ltd. (DOWASCO)
- Ms. Lolita Raffoul, Discover Dominica Authority
- Mr. Delroy Williams, National Association of Youth in Agriculture
- Mr. Michael Savarin, Invest Dominica Authority
- Mr. Minchinton Burton, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Forestry Division
- Ms. Adisa Trotter, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Agriculture Division
- Mr. Osborne Riviere, National Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (NANGO)
- Mr. Ricky Brumant, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Agriculture Division
- Mr. Steve John, Dominica Bureau of Standards
- Mr. William McLawrence, Dominica Association of Local Community Authorities

7.5 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

- The Project Document of the Enabling Activity for the Preparation of the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC
- The Project Implementation Report
- Quarterly Operation Reports
- Project Steering Committee Minutes
- UNDP and GEF Guidance policies on the evaluation process
- Project Workplans
- Reports and Assessments generated by the Project:
 - Greenhouse Gas Inventory
 - National Circumstance Report
 - Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment
 - Mitigation Assessment
- The reports of the Initial National Communication
- National Legislation relevant to the Project
- National Capacity Self Assessment
- National Biodiversity and Action Plan
- National Hurricane and Disaster Preparedness Plan for the Agriculture Sector

7.6 QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR INTERVIEWS

Questions for Terminal Evaluation (TE)

1. What activities have been completed under the project to date?
2. What is the proposed date for the completion of other activities?
3. Which community organizations (NGOs) were involved in the project so far and what were their roles? Comment on Civil Society engagement.
4. How would you define mainstreaming?
5. To what extent has SNC been mainstreamed in Dominica?
6. What would you consider as the greatest achievement of the project to date?
7. Capacity development is a major component of the project. What capacity has been developed
 - a) At the national institutional level?
 - b) At the national policy level?
 - c) At the individual and community level?
8. What is the status of the National Climate Change Strategy document?
9. What impact has the SNC made at the national level? Is the public aware of the project?
10. What other national projects (specifically GEF projects) are being implemented jointly or in synergy with the SNC?
11. Have the GEF funds been used specifically to support this project? Are the GEF funds adequate?
12. How will the capacity developed under the SNC be maintained, used or further developed?
13. List all visible changes/impacts that are occurring in Dominica as a result of the implementation of the SNC.
14. How could the impacts of the SNC be improved?
15. Is the implementation methodology of the SNC effective? How could it be improved?
16. What are the main successes of the SNC? What are its greatest failures/weaknesses?

17. How will you rate the quality of work delivered by (a) the local consultants (b) the international consultants?
18. Has time management on the projects been an issue? Explain.
19. Has the steering committee functioned? Are there meeting reports/minutes?
20. Has UNDP been helpful? Explain
21. What are the lessons learnt from this project?

7.7 LIST OF CONSULTANTS ON SNC

- Ms. Camilla David - Local Lead for Vulnerability and Assessment
- Mr. Claude Davis - International Consultant- Mitigation on Greenhouse Gases
- Mr. Minchinton Burton - Systematic Research and Observation
- Mr. Brian Challenger- International Consultant- Vulnerability and Assessment
- Dr. Michael Taylor- Climate Scenarios
- Mr. Ted Serrant- Local Lead- Greenhouse Gases Inventory and Emissions
- Ms. Kimisha Thomas- Greenhouse Gases Inventory and Emissions
- Mr. Nigel Lawrence- National Circumstance
- Mr. Albert Bellot- Other Relevant Chapters/ Compilation of SNC Report

7.8 SAMPLE OF MISSION REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT

Report on Mission to Dominica, January 7 – 13, 2007 Claude S Davis

Below is a tabular report on activities during the mission to Dominica between January 7 and 13, 2007.

Activity (Day)	Purpose or Outcome
Met with the Second National Communication (SNC) National Project Coordinator (NPC) Mr Collin Guiste and with the local lead consultant, Mr Ted Serrant (Day 1 – January 8)	Reviewed the SNC project work plan activities and schedule for Task 5 (Implementation Arrangements and Project Initiation). Determined the methodology to be used for Inventory (Revised 2006 Guidelines). It was recommended that Mr Ted Serrant determine the computer needs for agencies that could supply data and also look at legislation and how it could affect reporting and collection of activity data needed for the current and future inventories.
Met with NPC (Day 2 - January 9)	Discussed training needs assessment and plans for inception workshop. Discussed and reviewed the Terms of Reference (TOR) for national public education and awareness programme and the optimum schedule. The NPC is to finalise the TOR and proceed with selection etc of Public Education Consultant/Team
Met with National Steering Committee (NSC) (Day 3 - January 10) Abeo Trotter (Physical Planning) Albert Bellot (GEF/GSP) Virginia Thomas (M of Education) Nathaniel Isaac (Snr. Met Officer) Collin Guiste (NPC, ECU) Rivera Sebastian (M of Fisheries)	Reviewed the project work plan and schedule and the Draft Terms of Reference NSC. Recommended changes were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the quorum 5 persons (instead of 50% of members) but decisions require 50% of members including agreement by email); Reworded item 9 to say “Assist in <i>facilitating</i>” instead of mobilising; • Item 10 – change actors to stakeholders; • Item 11 “Ensure that Climate Change related policies are fully reflected in the national Project documentation.
Meet with Project Coordinator (Day 4 - January 11)	Prepared for Workshop

Activity (Day)	Purpose or Outcome
Workshop with potential stakeholders (Day 5 - January 12)	<p>Conducted a workshop for stakeholders in order to introduce them to the GHG inventory component for Dominica's Second National Communication.</p> <p>The workshop was based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.</p> <p>The workshop was opened by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment Ms Claudia Bellot following the welcome and opening remarks by Mr Lloyd Pascal, Director of the Environmental Coordinating Unit (ECHU). The workshop was attended by over 40 stakeholders.</p> <p>Note that it was anticipated that accompanying software for the 2006 Guidelines would have been available by now. Since the software for the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is not available we recommend that the Revised 1996 Guidelines and the accompanying software be used. This is in fact more consistent with the Conference of Parties (COP) Decision 17/CP.8 at New Delhi in 2002. That decision - "Guidelines for the preparation of national communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention" - outlined the requirements for reporting the second, and where appropriate initial and or third, national communications for non-Annex 1 parties. These included the use of the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines.</p>