

237. The project began in January 1999 and should conclude by December 2000. The NCSP received US\$3.2 million of funding, of which US\$1.8 million was provided by GEF (including a PDF-B allocation), US\$0.8 million was provided by the European Commission, and US\$0.4 million from Denmark and Norway. The activities of the project were defined on the basis of the findings of a survey undertaken during a workshop involving African and Latin American representatives. The project included three main components:

- (a) A help guide;
- (b) Technical assistance; and
- (c) Regional exchange and thematic workshops.

238. Items (a) and (c) were to be managed by UNDP, with the collaboration and assistance of UNEP. The regional workshops for Africa, for instance, were to be organized by UNEP. Initially, item (b) was supposed to be managed by UNEP, with the relevant tasks to be sub-contracted to the UCCEE. However, the TORs for technical assistance (TA) in the agreed workplan state that UNDP manages the TA and that the UCCEE responds to the requests from the UNDP support unit. UNEP also had some information dissemination activities and the responsibility of providing UNDP with an updated status of its enabling activity portfolio.

239. The thematic regional workshops planned by the NCSP were meant to offer countries the opportunity to exchange their respective experiences and to present the results of the different studies undertaken by the national enabling activity projects. In response to the

needs expressed by the countries, the NCSP also organized a few training sessions.

240. Overall, during the past years, the participating countries widely recognized the positive results of the NCSP as having at least partly offset the gaps of national enabling activity projects in terms of technical assistance. While having achieved satisfactory results, it is unfortunate that the NCSP arrived somewhat late in the enabling activity process,<sup>98</sup> with most projects having been well underway, and some of the initial hurdles for which the assistance of the NCSP could have been the most relevant already over to a certain extent. For instance, the "Help Guide" was supposed to be useful primarily during the initiation workshops of the climate change enabling activity projects. Nonetheless, the help guide has been disseminated to UNDP project coordinators. The Caribbean region, in particular, has reported the guide to be beneficial. The guide is also part of a "starter package" of resources that is now sent to any enabling activity once it is in the pipeline.<sup>99</sup> It is also accessible through the NCSP website.

241. The NCSP has also improved the monitoring system of GEF enabling activity projects by establishing a database comprising an updated version of the status of the preparation of the national communication and other relevant documents. The inputs to this database are provided through a data collection system based on bi-annual surveys targeting all non-Annex I Parties that are preparing their national communications under their national enabling activity climate change projects. The data collection is also based on workshop consultations and regular telephone calls.

98 Program execution only started in 1999 while the national enabling activity projects started in 1995.

99 The help guide also contains information routinely requested by many project coordinators, such as draft Terms of References for consultants.

242. It is important to recall that each of the two Implementing Agencies involved in the NCSP, with its different strengths and assets, has an important role to play in the achievement of the project's objectives. In that respect, the review found that the collaboration between the UNDP and UNEP was not perfect, and that there is considerable room for improving the quality of the support provided to enabling activity projects through closer coordination of the activities of the project between the two agencies. The Project Steering Committee might play a leading role in establishing the appropriate collaborative spirits and enhancing the interactions between the two agencies.

243. It should also be noted that the NCSP is close to completion while the country needs for technical assistance and support, information exchange, networking, etc., are still increasing and evolving. Moreover, the NCSP has accumulated very valuable information and experience related to the crucial issues associated with the enabling activity projects, and with the preparation of the national communication. All this "capital" will be lost unless the project continues. While it is the role of the independent evaluation of the NCSP to provide a comprehensive assessment of the NCSP's performance, this review would support its continuation, given its critical contribution to the enabling activity program as a whole.

## COUNTRY LEVEL IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

### ☐ *STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION*

244. In assessing stakeholder participation at the national level, the review placed emphasis on the following issues:

- Institutional arrangements;
- Participation of representatives from various government agencies;

- Participation of other stakeholders such as members of academia, NGOs, private sector and other groups.

245. The pressure to prepare proposals rapidly and the generally weak tradition of broad institutional participation in many developing countries often limited participation by national stakeholders. This lack of consultation at the beginning of the process led not only to insufficient consideration of country concerns, but also to an inadequate evaluation of the resources necessary for the different activities necessary to prepare the national communication. While it is undeniable that a broad participatory approach could slow the project preparation phase, it is equally true that participation of different stakeholders during preparation minimizes the risk of institutional resistance or non-cooperation during implementation.

246. In contrast, during project implementation, the review finds that the level of stakeholder participation and cooperation was much higher than during the project formulation stage.

247. The first priority of the enabling activity projects was to establish appropriate institutional arrangements for project implementation. In countries that already had a National Climate Change Committee (NCCC), this did not represent a major problem, since most stakeholders were already known and identified and could be counted on to oversee the implementation of the enabling activity project. In countries where national level institutions such as an NCCC did not exist, however, the establishment of project steering committees presented some problems.

248. Some countries reported that major obstacles for the enabling activity projects were related to establishing effective co-ordination among the different ministries involved and raising awareness among policymakers. In general, those countries that included senior-level policymakers from a range of ministries

on their NCCC tended to report fewer institutional problems than those countries in which the NCCC was comprised of scientific or technical personnel only. However, the NCCC is not a panacea. Several projects were based on an optimistic assumption that the existence of the NCCC would facilitate the establishment of project committees. While this worked for some countries,<sup>100</sup> in general, NCCCs were neither active, nor operational, and were not granted the necessary legal and institutional legitimacy to effectively play their role.

249. There is a clear weakness in the process of appointing representatives to project committees. In most cases, representatives appointed because of their technical competencies did not have a decision-making role within their respective institutions, or were not required to report back to their institutions. As a result, the project steering committees often functioned in an isolated manner, and were unable to internalize the possible feedback within their native institutions.

250. In some cases, the appointment of the dead agency also led to disagreements between national institutions that often handicapped the projects, before and during implementation. Weak stakeholder involvement during project preparation contributed to increasing the risks related to such institutional disagreements. In general, disagreements about the leadership of projects often led to long negotiations within the countries, resulting in significant delays in signing the project documents.

251. Several cases of delays or suspensions of projects occurred because of institutional instability or a change in project leadership. This highlighted an excessive dependency of

projects on the specific institutional arrangements made by the countries. Projects could manage such risks by including in the project documents alternative institutional arrangements, in consultation with the Implementing Agencies, if needed. These project documents should include terms of reference of all the permanent and non-permanent staff of the project and clearly describe the background and experience required.

252. The review also notes the weaknesses of project documents regarding institutional strengthening. Although most projects included institutional strengthening as an objective, neither adequate resources—due to funding limitations—nor appropriate activities for achieving these goals were actually programmed.<sup>101</sup> As a result, institutional strengthening remains one of the major gaps of enabling activity projects, and in most cases, enabling activity projects did not succeed in creating the appropriate conditions for the sustainability of the institutional arrangements. Most of the time, additional financial resources to support institutional strengthening was still needed even in countries where the main objectives related to the preparation of the national communication were met in a very satisfactory manner.

253. On the part of the countries, there has seldom been any commitment to maintain staff working on climate change issues. In countries where such staff have been maintained, the climate change enabling activity process has been sustainable. It is important to stress that any effort by the GEF and Implementing Agencies will only be successful in the presence of strong commitments from the host countries.

100 This was the case, for instance, in the Philippines.

101 As illustration, only a single workshop was scheduled for institutional strengthening in Mali, which is obviously unrealistic.

254. A number of major recommendations can be made in order to strengthen the institutional arrangements that deal with climate change in general and to improve the effectiveness of enabling activity projects:

- Secure strong *involvement* (not simply an endorsement) at the highest ministerial and political level for enabling activities;
- Emphasize public-awareness activities in enabling activity projects, directed towards decision and policy makers, and provide adequate resources for them;
- Encourage the establishment of climate change departments or centers to ensure the continuity of climate change studies, as well as follow-up actions; and
- Encourage the establishment or the enhancement of NCCCs by providing them with official recognition and entrusting them with broad climate change-related responsibilities, including international negotiations and decision-making on investment opportunities.

255. The process of appointing a project coordinator often delayed project implementation. This was often due to disagreements between and within institutions regarding the most appropriate candidate. In some cases, fortunately, the extra time taken was due to the fact that the authorities wished to select the best possible candidate. Despite the resulting delays, these precautions often paid off, since the personality of the project coordinator was often a critical factor for project success.<sup>102</sup>

256. This indecisiveness regarding appointment of the project coordinator was more acute in cases where the coordinator's

position was financed by the project. Most often the appointment process was not sufficiently transparent. To safeguard the interest of projects, such decisions should be based on an open recruitment for candidates and involve the Implementing Agencies.

257. The contribution of project committees in the technical work was primarily done through participation in training workshops, reviews of documents prepared by consultants and strategic discussions related to the UNFCCC. While it was a "good practice" that national consultants were involved in these workshops, it was noted that in most cases, the participants from government were usually not motivated to practice the methodologies for which they had been trained and often lost the benefits of that training over time. It is, therefore, essential, that in order to have the capacity to review and endorse the outputs and to be able to launch concrete follow-up actions, government representatives ensure a minimum level of active participation and monitoring of these studies.

258. After the institutional arrangements were established, more technical activities were undertaken by the projects during the second stage of implementation. These included: (i) the organization of training workshops; (ii) the evaluation of studies carried out as part of previous projects to identify the complementary activities to be carried out by the enabling activity project; and (iii) the execution of studies. The review found that these activities were generally properly sequenced, and represent a substantial effort made by the countries to build on the results of the existing initiatives.

259. The experience with participation by civil society varied considerably. For instance, the involvement of experts from universities and

102 This was particularly the case in Lebanon. However, two other important factors also led to such notable success: the dynamism of the UNDP country office representatives and the high motivation and competence of the national consultants.

academic institutions was, in most cases, essential for project progress. In return, these experts were able to strengthen and broaden their skills and receive new collaborating opportunities through participation in international events and connection to existing networks. In the future, it is important that enabling activity projects put greater emphasis on involvement by these types of civil society experts.

260. In the regional/global enabling activity projects, NGOs often played a critical role in the steering committees, as well as in participating in the various activities of the projects. Regarding the national enabling activity projects, NGO involvement was mostly effective, however the review noted also a number of instances of weak or partial participation of the NGOs. In the latter cases this weak involvement of NGOs was due to weak consideration to the NGOs in the project documents, or to a rather restrictive perception of governmental institutions regarding participation of NGOs in the enabling activity project.

261. To date, enabling activity projects have focused primarily on the international obligations of countries rather than on concrete actions. Nevertheless, NGOs could provide positive contributions for a number of important issues, such as vulnerability and adaptation measures. In countries that rely heavily on woodfuel, for example, the contribution of NGOs in developing abatement measures, while at the same time targeting social and economic welfare, is critical, considering their experience and field involvement in woodfuel use and resource management.

262. Finally, the participation of NGOs could also be particularly important for strategic issues related to the preparation of the national communication. Several NGOs in developing countries have considerable experience and understanding of climate change issues. This

is due to their successive participation in the COP and other forums, as well as their numerous interactions with international NGOs and agencies focussing on climate change. It is obvious that the enabling activity climate change projects would have certainly benefited from greater involvement of NGOs on such issues.

263. With few exceptions, the participation of community-based groups was very limited. There, early and active involvement in the climate change process, in particular through enabling activity projects, would be an asset. In the Philippines, for instance, thematic workshops targeted to the provinces and dedicated to discussions on climate change issues and impacts were very much appreciated.

264. Participation of the private sector, with the exception of consulting firms, was weak and most often nonexistent. Even when some projects mentioned the participation of the private sector in their projects, it was essentially to note that this sector represented difficulties for providing information during the execution of some studies. While it should be recognized that the private sector in developing countries often operates under strong economic constraints and limited human resources and time, enabling activity projects should better engage this sector. For instance, in some countries, such as Bolivia and Zambia, a growing awareness and interest of industry in climate change issues was noted, and this resulted in a direct and positive dialogue between the government and private sector representatives.

265. Participation by the private sector is particularly important for the development of concrete actions such as abatement or adaptation projects. All sectors (industry, agriculture, forestry, etc.) that could benefit from the establishment of new financial mechanisms for developing abatement options should be involved.

□ **INTEGRATION OF CLIMATE  
CHANGE CONCERNS AND  
RESULTS INTO PLANNING  
ACTIVITIES**

266. In most cases, due to a limited emphasis and support for awareness raising activities and information exchange among and within the governmental agencies, enabling activity projects did not adequately meet the original expectations regarding integration of climate change concerns into national development policies. In the future, projects should pay more attention to this crucial issue, through a clear description of activities that are meant to support this objective and provision of adequate resources.

**ASSESSMENT OF REPORTING  
AND MANAGEMENT  
PROCEDURES**

267. Since UNDP and UNEP have the major shares of the portfolio, the assessment of reporting and management procedures is restricted to these two Implementing Agencies.

*United Nations Development  
Programme (UNDP)*

268. In the case of UNDP, the supervision of the implementation of enabling activity projects is delegated to the UNDP country offices. As a result, the major monitoring mechanism for UNDP is the Annual Programme/Project Report (APR), elaborated by the project coordinator and submitted to the UNDP office in the country in preparation for the annual Tripartite Review—a high policy-level meeting<sup>103</sup> to assess progress based on the APR and make management recommendations if necessary.

269. Generally, the APR contains two sections: Part I, a numerical rating on a set of project attributes, and Part II, Textual Assessment. Nevertheless, this review finds that as they are presently formulated, the APR and TPR reports cannot be considered relevant tools for technical oversight and supervision of the projects. In fact, the information provided in the APR is not substantive enough. Moreover, the APR is not provided on a regular basis to staff and regional coordinators at UNDP-GEF; its use is also uneven across the regional bureaus. This poses a crucial problem, as most UNDP staff in country offices are not well versed in environmental issues, and problems are not brought to the attention of UNDP-GEF until they become critical.

270. This review recommends that APRs be made available on a regular basis to the regional coordinators at UNDP-GEF to provide them with an oversight and pulse for implementation progress of the projects.

*United Nations Environment  
Programmes (UNEP)*

271. Since UNEP does not have any country offices, implementation supervision is centralized at the UNEP headquarters in Nairobi with the support of its regional offices. The major supervision mechanism for UNEP is continuous interaction with the national project coordinators through telephone, e-mail, fax and occasional field visits. In addition, quarterly progress reports are submitted by the project coordinator. However, this review finds that quarterly progress reports are not substantive and usually consist of a list of activities carried out during the preceding quarter. Clear identification of problems in project implementation is not carried out in the quarterly reports, though there is a section in the report titled “summary of problems encountered in project delivery.”

103 Involving the project executing agency, the government counterpart, and the UNDP representative.

272. While the project manager is often aware of problems in project implementation, given his span of control (22 projects), in addition to his other responsibilities, the manager is not able to respond to problems adequately as they develop during implementation. Furthermore, there are no systematic supervision visits. As a result, the review finds that critical implementation problems have developed in several UNEP implemented projects.

273. This review recommends that UNEP strengthen the use of the quarterly report for supervision purposes and develop a regular system of visits to countries where project implementation is not progressing satisfactorily in order to take corrective action.

### *Overall Management*

274. Currently there is no systematic process in place to obtain a GEF-wide understanding

of the implementation progress and results of enabling activities. These are not covered under the annual GEF-wide Project Implementation Review (PIR). The most consistent and accessible information regarding the progress of the enabling activities has been largely due to the National Communications Support Program (NCSP). The review recognizes, however, that the NCSP data (a) are unofficial, (b) collected for the program only, (c) originates directly from the project managers, and d) will not continue to be collected beyond the limited lifetime of the program.

275. This review recommends that the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies establish an annual stock-taking review of enabling activities, and obtain an institution-wide understanding of the performance of these projects.

## VI. PROJECT RESULTS

### TECHNICAL PRODUCTS

276. The climate change enabling activity projects in general included the following products: (i) GHG inventory; (ii) vulnerability and adaptation assessments; (iii) abatement assessments; and (iv) national communication.

277. The review observes that the enabling activity projects produced an impressive quantity of documents that directly related to the communication commitments under the Convention. Moreover, a large number of other documents, such as ones on methodology, manuals or studies about more specific aspects, were also produced. As of May 2000, 25 countries that benefited from GEF-supported enabling activities have transmitted their national communications to the UNFCCC Secretariat, and a large number of countries are progressing towards the completion of their communications for possible transmission by COP6.<sup>104</sup>

278. The review notes that, for the most part, the quality of the documents produced under the enabling activity projects was satisfactory. This demonstrates a significant enhancement of skills in the fields of inventories, mitigation, and vulnerability and adaptation, while at the same time providing substantial inputs to the national communication. In some cases, the quality of the documents was impressive, and provided not only national, but international

benefits as well. However, the impression is that they have not been disseminated widely enough, either within the countries or at regional or international levels. An appropriate mechanism, with adequate resource allocation, could be established by the GEF in order to enhance interactions between projects and promote the dissemination of these technical products. This will help improve exchange of information and experiences, an important Convention objective.

279. Technical work was not without difficulties in some cases. Among the various factors identified as affecting the quality of the documents are:<sup>105</sup>

- (a) Uncertainties associated with the quality of the basic data, or difficulties in obtaining them. It is worth noting that enabling activity projects did not provide resources for primary data collection;
- (b) Methodologies not yet finalized or not relevant to some national circumstances;
- (c) The contribution of training was insufficient or faded out. This might be due to the poor quality of tools used for training, the nomination of inappropriate persons for training, or a lack of commitment to maintaining staff stability in recipient countries and host governments.

104 In addition, as stated earlier, Kazakhstan also submitted its initial communication without implementing any GEF-supported enabling activity project.

105 The NCSP provided a very valuable synthesis and analysis of most of the points that are addressed in these sections. Inputs to these analyses were extracted from the frequent surveys that are undertaken by the NCSP, in particular during the regional workshops that are organized by this project. In addition, the review benefited from the information collected through the country visits and country studies, as well as the surveys that were distributed, to which 62 countries responded.



- (d) Lack of capacity (due to factors a, b and c above) in some countries to prepare higher quality products; or insufficient motivation, with work being looked upon as obligatory, with little emphasis on national benefits;
- (e) Absence of internal and external peer review of documents produced;
- (f) Various problems and obstacles, often institutional, encountered during the progress of the projects.

280. Most countries believe that reducing the uncertainty of national inventories is a critical issue for future studies and the second communication, and stress the need to improve activity data and emission factors. Towards this objective, many countries have expressed interest in participating in regional projects aimed at improving emission factors and activity data, and establishing an effective process for sharing experiences with other regions.

281. Many countries have suggested enhancement of data reliability through more systematic data collection efforts. Resource and time constraints, as well as weak institutional motivation, were the most critical barriers in undertaking these efforts during the implementation of enabling activity projects.<sup>106</sup> In addition, the countries generally required methodologies for managing and updating data, including software, and guidance on how to establish national systems. Most countries see the creation of a national database as essential to maintaining capacity and ensuring the continuity of the preparation of the national

communications. In that respect, a well established institutional framework, with appropriate regulatory tools and incentives, are among the most critical factors for sustaining the process that had been launched so far by climate change enabling activity projects.

282. Reducing uncertainties, in particular through improvement in the quality of data, provision of appropriate models for emission projections, along with training in their application, were also reported by the countries as essential for further improvement in **abatement analyses**. Other key difficulties are related to construction of appropriate baseline scenarios and development of abatement cost assessments—there is a demand here for good cost-assessment models.

## OTHER ACHIEVEMENTS

283. The development of projects for GHG abatement options is an obvious follow-up of the abatement analysis exercise. However, countries have few indications from the GEF regarding the follow-up actions that can be taken after completing the national communication "exercise," and are unsure of the extent to which the existing financial mechanisms will be able to provide financial assistance for the priorities mentioned in their initial communications.

284. In addition, because the GEF Guidelines do not allow for developing project proposals, the enabling activity projects did not explicitly address concrete investment activities, despite UNDP's arguments<sup>107</sup> in favor of developing abatement and adaptation project proposals as

106 The climate change enabling activities did not make a provision for such activities.

107 According to UNDP, this was one of the major points of disagreement during the formulation of the guidelines. The UNDP position was that to be meaningful, enabling activities should be allowed to proceed from sector-wide projections of abatement potential to the initial stages of project formulation. The GEF Secretariat disagreed, arguing that the enabling activity projects should not extend beyond studies directly related to the national communication.

a part of the enabling activity projects. The GEF has not made yet significant steps towards clarifying this issue, though many countries expressed greater expectations about this question to the SBI.<sup>108</sup> This is not to deny that there have been some good examples of investment actions emerging from enabling activities—ALGAS project outputs have been well received by donor agencies as well as the Implementing Agencies and the private sector; the PICCAP and the enabling activity projects in Lebanon, Philippines, and Thailand are other good examples. In this context, it is recommended that the GEF and its Implementing Agencies establish a closer dialogue process with the countries in order to identify their expectations and prepare the appropriate framework for responding to them.

285. For many countries, funding and time constraints have limited the scope of the national **vulnerability and adaptation studies**<sup>109</sup> and constrained them from conducting additional studies that were identified as of critical importance.” Integrated assessments, socio-economic studies, identification of adaptation options (phase I and II) and costing implications are frequently reported as priority areas for future work.

286. This issue was compounded by the fact that most climate change scenario development, at national levels, is undertaken using Global Climate Models that provide a relatively low level of spatial resolution for national impact studies. Some countries support the development of Regional Climate Models

(RCMs), but many others believe there is insufficient national data and/or expertise to develop them. It is important to reduce uncertainties related to vulnerability assessments, and the impacts of climate change, in order to improve the quality of remedial strategies.

287. Other common issues include unreliable or unavailable data, lack of long-term capacity building in appropriate institutions, and insufficient infrastructure such as monitoring stations for systematic observation and early warning systems. Provision of resources for developing climate modeling for improving data and involving experts from developing countries are among the most important priorities expressed by countries.

288. It is likely that the establishment of a permanent framework for improving and updating the quality of data in the various areas of climate change, for the purpose of meeting the UNFCCC communication requirements, would be one of the most critical issues that will have to be addressed by non-Annex 1 parties in the future. The question is whether this should be addressed through the enabling activity projects or through a parallel process.

289. Capacity building was obviously one of the core objectives of the enabling activity process. While the countries expressed higher expectations for capacity building than what the enabling activity projects could offer, there was undeniable evidence in the countries that the enabling activity projects have made

108 Refer to document FCCC/SBI/1999/8, pp. 14, statement ( c ).

109 For instance, emphasis was generally laid on sea level rise, while important needs were expressed in relation with impacts assessments for forestry, agriculture, water resources, food security, etc. In addition, Phase I-Adaptation assessments were rarely carried out, while Phase II-Adaptation was not addressed at all.

considerable progress in strengthening the capacities of countries to deal with climate change issues. There is also evidence that enabling activity projects have achieved indirect benefits. For instance, they have enhanced the participation of the non-Annex I parties in international fora, particularly the COP, and seems to have strengthened their presence and contribution in the decision making process.

290. The enabling activity projects have also contributed considerably towards enhancing the scientific and technical knowledge in recipient countries, and to developing new methodologies.<sup>111</sup> There is evidence that universities and academic institutions have significantly benefited from enabling activity projects, through participation in training and technical studies. In some cases, universities have even included specific courses on climate change, and involved students in their research on climate change.

291. Cross-sectoral analysis has also helped establish a new collaborative spirit among stakeholders involved in the process. This should help improve interactions and consultations between national institutions, even beyond the simple climate change process.

292. Moreover, in some cases, work related to climate change activities was used as a foundation for confirming or re-aligning development policies. The development of energy conservation strategies, the promotion of renewable energy, and the adoption of better forestry management practices figured in the list of the development priorities.

293. Despite these results, many countries have expressed concerns about the sustainability of the process that was launched by the enabling

activity projects—once the projects close, countries are not sure how to keep the teams in place for the preparation of the subsequent national communications. These concerns have already been noted by the Parties to the Convention, and decisions 2/CP.4 and 12/CP.4 brought a response requiring the GEF to support an ad-hoc “bridging” mechanism. As a response to this request, the GEF Council approved additional funding to further supporting climate change enabling activity projects, and issued *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Procedures-Part II* for enabling activity projects.

294. These guidelines were meant to respond to the capacity building needs of the countries beyond preparing initial national communication. Countries eligible for GEF assistance may select from the five following activities according to their needs and priorities:

- Identification/submission of technology needs, including the necessary capacity building to assess, acquire, design, implement and evaluate projects;
- Capacity building for participation in systematic observation networks;
- Improvement of emission factors;
- Maintenance and enhancement of national capacities to prepare national communications;
- Developing/strengthening/improving national activities for public awareness and education, and access to information.

295. It is clear that these are the main weaknesses encountered by the climate change enabling activity projects. While the financing

111 GHG inventories, costing assessments, vulnerability assessments, etc.

granted through top-up funding will certainly contribute to keeping the climate change process "alive," it represents only an interim solution until a more long term mechanism is defined. In addition, a longer term mechanism should also incorporate actions for improving national institutional arrangements and mechanisms to ensure integration of climate change issues into the regular planning process in recipient countries.

296. Several countries had the option to develop websites, although only a few projects made provisions for this purpose. Most of the sites designed include little information, and are

not maintained or enhanced. In most cases, the sites have been suspended at the end of the project. It is the opinion of the review that websites represent a cost-effective and efficient tool for meeting the convention requirements. The review recommends that enabling activity projects give better support to such initiatives in the future, by granting the necessary resources for (i) the development of websites; (ii) the enhancement of sites by including all climate change-related information (inventories, vulnerability, adaptation, attenuation, research, observation, project portfolio, etc.); and (iii) the regular updating of information contained in these sites.

## VII. GOOD PRACTICES

297. The review team identified a number of good practices that were adopted by the countries or the Implementing Agencies in order to improve the results and efficiency of the enabling activity projects and their effectiveness. Good practices were also adopted to overcome some obstacles by giving more flexibility to the implementation of enabling activity projects. These good practices are described in the following paragraphs, for illustrative purposes, on the basis of the specific experiences of the countries visited or studied during the review. Despite varying and changing country circumstances, it is useful for countries to take stock of these experiences, and to try to adapt these good practices to their specific needs in the future.

### ACHIEVING ADDITIONAL BENEFITS THAT SERVE REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONCERNS

298. The enabling activity project in Brazil is achieving impressive results that go beyond providing benefits only for the country, since Brazil has about one-third of all tropical forests. In fact, in addition to strengthening national capacity by developing more specific deforestation data, the enabling activity project is achieving a significant reduction of the uncertainty in calculating the emissions from tropical deforestation. It is likely that this methodology will provide significant contributions to the work of the IPCC and benefit many other countries.

299. Brazil has also established a solid base for monitoring land-use change and forestry through satellite imagery. The review found this GEF initiative very relevant as it serves the

climate change process as a whole, and is likely to promote the replicability and dissemination of this experience in other countries.

300. In Armenia, the enabling activity project highlighted the impact of climate change on forestry resources, and has also developed simulation models showing these impacts.

### ACHIEVING OUTREACH AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE BENEFITS THROUGH THE USE OF INTERNET

301. The Brazil climate change enabling activity project was also one of the first countries to have developed a climate change website in 1995. This innovative and interesting idea has contributed significantly to the development of the Brazilian National Communication and to raising public awareness. This constituted an important tool for the implementation of the Brazilian commitments under the UNFCCC. The importance of this idea has been recognized by the UNFCCC Secretariat, which has created the CC:INFOWEB program for the diffusion of the Brazilian model to other developing countries.

302. Reflecting the whole preparation process of the national communication, the site makes available all the information generated by the institutions and experts involved in the preparation of inventories and documents for the national communication, including the name and contact information of all the experts involved and responsible for the elaboration of each document. This enhances the quality and reliability of the work, ensuring transparency and allowing a greater participation of experts

not involved directly in the process but who wish to make comments and suggestions.

303. The internet has also made possible a forum for interaction and experience sharing among experts from different sectors, facilitating the collective development of the work, shortening distances, and decreasing costs and the need for meetings and trips. Thus the climate change internet site has strengthened the capacity of the coordination unit and helped to decentralize the preparation of the national communication, allowing a complete involvement of all relevant institutions, regardless of their geographical location.

304. As the website has been developed in three languages—Portuguese, Spanish and English—the Brazilian climate change site is rapidly becoming a reference site internationally and is enhancing Brazil's participation in the global climate change debate.

305. Although access to the internet in Brazil is still limited, network conditions are evolving rapidly, resulting in an exponential increase of the number of Brazilian internet users. In the long run, the effect of the extensive use of the internet in Brazil for climate change matters may be very significant, in particular for general awareness raising, dissemination of knowledge, and a better integration of the climate change concerns into the daily activities of Brazilians.

306. Some other countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Honduras, Lebanon, Philippines, etc.) had made similar attempts to establish websites with varying results and benefits. The main issue encountered related to maintenance of the website after the end of the enabling activity project. This required more human resources and relevant data resources to accomplish.

## INVOLVING THE MEDIA IN THE PUBLIC-AWARENESS EFFORT

307. Enabling activity projects have rarely utilized the media for information dissemination and public awareness. The media can be a useful actor in translating technical and scientific statements that are provided by the experts into more easily accessible communication material for the general public. It is recommended that enabling activity projects place more emphasis on involving journalists in the different workshops and meetings held by the projects.

308. Some projects used the media for wider information dissemination, with very positive impacts. In the CPACC project, for example, a public awareness strategy has been developed, including a suite of public education and awareness materials, such as briefing documents for decision-makers, teaching kits and video scripts. Additionally, journalists have been sensitized to climate change issues, with encouraging results. For example, one journalist from Saint Lucia who participated in this workshop, held in Trinidad and Tobago, has since been making frequent references to climate change in his newspaper columns.

309. Zambia has also tried to target the media sector through the organization of a workshop for awareness building among representatives of the print and electronic media, with a view towards encouraging the media to disseminate information on climate change issues. The PICCAP project has often complemented its outreach and public awareness campaigns with items prepared for the written media, radio and television.

## DEVELOPING INTERACTION BETWEEN PROJECTS

310. In some cases, the national enabling activity projects have developed relationships and synergies that allowed the countries to benefit from the exchange of information and experience. These also contributed to enhancing the technical capacities of the countries and to significantly reducing the level of uncertainty in the results.

311. In Azerbaijan, for instance, a regional workshop on greenhouse gas emissions was conducted in cooperation with the National Communications Support Program. Experts from several countries in the Central Asia Region participated in the workshop. The Azerbaijan team found the experience extremely valuable for cross-checking and validating their approach to the preparation of the inventory. Similar experiences have been also organized by the NCSP and proved very beneficial to the countries.

312. In West Africa, UNDP also initiated a similar regional workshop in Mali. The objective of this workshop was to allow participants from Benin and Chad, which were just at the beginning of the implementation of their enabling activity projects at that time, to benefit from the experience gained by Senegal and Mali, which were in a more advanced stage of developing their climate change studies and preparing their initial national communication.

313. PICAPP is also an outstanding example of regional cooperation. Through cooperative efforts with other institutions and programs, other countries (both within and outside the Pacific islands region) have been able to participate in, and hence benefit from, the capacity building activities of PICCAP. This has included participation in PICCAP's training workshops and the use of PICCAP's training and information resources. Countries that have benefited directly included the Maldives, Niue,

Papua New Guinea, Tonga, and many Caribbean countries, particularly those participating in the CPACC project.

314. In addition to the benefits to countries in taking stock of experience gained by their regional neighbors, regional interaction is also a cost-effective way for strengthening capacities and improving the quality of the studies prepared by the countries. Therefore, the review recommends that this initiative be developed in a more systematic way by providing for additional resources in the enabling activity projects, regardless of whether they have a national or regional/global approach.

## PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL TRAINING WORKSHOPS AND INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

315. As mentioned earlier, the enabling activity projects did not provide resources for travel and participation in international workshops and events. In Lesotho, for instance, the enabling activity project paid particular attention to capacity building through participation of different country experts in several relevant workshops and seminars outside Lesotho (seven in Africa and two outside Africa). These have considerably contributed to the success of the project, and to increasing the ability of Lesotho to meet the convention communication requirements.

316. Although such expenditures are normally not eligible under GEF enabling activities, the rationale for this practice is that these meetings provide country representatives with unique training opportunities and serve as important venues for updating their knowledge of climate change issues. In light of this result, the review recommends that this practice be more explicitly recognized and appropriately provisioned for in the future.

## ENHANCING POLITICAL SUPPORT FROM THE HIGHEST LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

317. In many countries, the enabling activity projects have suffered considerably from weak political support to the activities implemented by the project. It is the opinion of the review that strong political support is a crucial condition not only for the success of the enabling activity projects but also for the development of the climate change process as a whole in the countries. This strong support may be evidenced through the involvement of high level decision-makers and official establishment of climate change committees.

318. In Azerbaijan, for instance, a State Commission on Climate Change was established by Presidential order. This Committee is chaired by the First Deputy Prime Minister and meets once every two months. To implement the climate change enabling activity project, the National Center for Climate Change was established with the coordination of the State Hydrometeorology Committee. The high-level political attention to the issue has galvanized all the relevant government ministries and agencies and led them to contribute their best efforts to the implementation of the Project.

319. The Philippines also established an Inter-Agency Committee for Climate Change (IACCC) by Presidential order, and has involved high level representatives from the most important ministries and stakeholders in this IACCC.

320. In Lesotho, climate change has also received support from the Minister of Natural Resources, and this greatly contributed to the success of the project.

## WIDER PARTICIPATION OF THE STAKEHOLDERS

321. Stakeholder participation is undoubtedly an important factor for the success of enabling activity projects. The review observed that countries did not systematically stress the importance of such participation, particularly at the policymaking level. This resulted in an insufficient endorsement of the results and limited integration of climate change concerns into the planning activities, as put into question the sustainability of the climate change policy process as a whole.

322. In that respect, the review observed that the benefits of enabling activity projects were most effective in countries where emphasis was laid on widening stakeholder participation. In the Philippines, for instance, significant stakeholder participation has contributed to a satisfactory implementation of activities and a timely completion of the project. In Lesotho, an inter-agency team, which was in charge of the implementation of the project, involved highly skilled professionals from the relevant ministries, agencies, academic institutions and NGOs. In Zambia, the project has also promoted the participation of representatives from universities, NGOs, and most relevant government agencies at the national level. The Zambian Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry also advised the team that there is a growing awareness in industry on climate change issues, and that there is a need for direct dialogue with them. Thus, the private sector was fully involved in the activities of the project.

323. In Armenia, the composition of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and the role that it played in providing guidance and supervision to the project has contributed to the satisfactory implementation of the project. The PSC



comprises 16 members, including the Minister of Nature Protection (Chairman), five First Vice Ministers (Nature Protection, Energy, Economy, Agriculture and Industry) and representatives of international donor agencies, research institutions, academics and NGOs. The PSC, by its very composition and active participation in developing the Project's strategic agenda and in selection and appointment of the national consultants, underscore the importance of the project to the country.

### FLEXIBILITY IN REALLOCATING PROJECT FUNDING

324. While the resource allocations for enabling activity projects globally have adequately covered the activities aimed at achieving the main goal of preparing the national communication, flexibility in funding allocations, during the implementation of the projects were very much appreciated by the countries. In Zambia, for instance, reallocation of resources among budget categories, especially the increased outlays for training, education and awareness has contributed to a better response to country needs, and thus to improving the benefits and the results of the project.

325. Activities that were better supported in Zambia include an awareness building workshop for key stakeholders such as government planning officers and the private sector to promote climate change concerns in the planning process. Another workshop was organized for awareness building among representatives of the media.

### FLEXIBILITY IN REDESIGNING THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES

326. Effectively addressing climate change issues can be like shooting at a moving target because of the continuing evolution of information, needs and priorities. It is unfortunate that many projects have suffered from a lack of flexibility would help countries react to these changing circumstances. One good practice would be to allow for greater flexibility and a more pro-active approach from the Implementing Agencies and the project participants. This would contribute towards increasing effectiveness of projects in meeting evolving needs of countries.

327. Some projects were able to adopt this flexibility. For instance, the first Multipartite Project Review (MPR) of the PICAPP project suggested that identification of mitigation options be shifted from a national to a regional activity, on the grounds that such an approach was consistent with the lack of technical capacity at national level and that it would also be more cost effective. The Project committee supported this change, with agreement from all the Parties to endorse the regional report, with an adequate reference to national level implications. National level mitigation activities are now being captured in the National Implementation Strategies and through other initiatives such as the National Strategic Studies that facilitates national projects under the Clean Development Mechanism.

### PICAPP SUMMARY BOX

Few projects better exhibit the spirit behind the creation of climate change enabling activities than the one undertaken by ten Pacific Island nations in a regional effort aimed at fulfilling their obligations under the UNFCCC.

The Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP) is a three-year, \$2.4 million GEF project implemented in June 1997 by UNDP and executed by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). The project had six major capacity building objectives that led to the following outputs:

- Greenhouse gas inventory (sources and sinks);
- An evaluation of mitigation options;
- National vulnerability assessments;
- An evaluation of adaptation options;
- National implementation plans; and
- Submission of the Initial National Communication to the COP.

While these goals and outputs are common to many other projects, PICCAP is remarkable in its overall level of achievement, particularly in light of the limited human, institutional, and financial resources available at the outset only three years ago.<sup>2</sup> Not only have all but one of the formal project objectives been met, within the prescribed time frames and reportedly within budget, but a sustainable system of national assessment and reporting is now in place in the ten countries. This latter achievement can be measured in the form of officially recognized institutional structures, trained nationals, and nascent information management procedures. Moreover, integrated national policies and plans related to climate change are in an advanced stage of development in most countries.

PICCAP employed a country team approach which involved the national government designating an agency to host a team of sectoral representatives, national experts, and other stakeholders, including private sector and NGO interests, who in turn facilitate policy and decision-making on climate change issues. At the national level, PICCAP has been implemented in three phases: (i) establishment of a country team and enhancement of awareness regarding climate change issues; (ii) analyses of climate change issues and completion of activities specified in Article 12 of the UNFCCC, and (iii) policy development and enhanced public participation.

Despite the initial limitations, PICCAP was implemented predominantly through the effort of national consultants or national government employees, without the use of international consultants. When regional consultants were used, they were required to work with national counterparts and transfer knowledge and expertise in ways that enhance human resources in a sustainable manner. Another innovative example in capacity building was the creation of a course leading to a Certificate in Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment, which is further helping the Pacific nations secure long-term, home grown expertise.

The enhancement of capacity has not been limited to the project participants. Through cooperative efforts with other institutions and programs, other countries in and out of the region have been able to participate in, and benefit from, the capacity building activities of PICCAP. This has included participation in PICCAP's training workshops and the use of PICCAP's training and information resources.

The success of PICCAP can be partially attributed to the inherent recognition by the participants that capacity building is integral to fulfilling their obligations under the UNFCCC. It also reflects the application of the collective experience and wisdom of its partner organizations. UNDP, for instance, played a critical role in project design, implementation, and evaluation, while SPREP facilitated working relationships between the countries and provided contributions in terms of technical, administrative, and financial support. Other participants, including CC-TRAIN, provided vital roles as well.

1 These ten nations are the Cook Islands, Republic of Fiji, Republic of Kiribati, Republic of Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Republic of Vanuatu.

2 The existence of these limitations, in fact, was seen as one of the primary justifications for pursuing a regional approach.

## **ANNEXES**

# ANNEX 1

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### BACKGROUND

1. **Enabling activities** Enabling activities—which include preparation of inventories, compilation of information, policy analysis, and design of strategies and action plans—represent a basic building block of GEF assistance to countries. They either are a means of fulfilling essential communications requirements to a Convention, provide a basic and essential level of information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, or assist planning that identifies priority activities within a country. Countries thus enabled will have the ability to formulate and direct sectoral and economy-wide programs to address global environmental problems through a cost effective approach within the context of national sustainable development efforts.<sup>1</sup>

2. **Climate Change Enabling Activities** In the context of climate change, enabling activities were defined by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

as '[measures] such as planning and endogenous capacity building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures.'

3. The first Conference of the Parties (COP1) to the FCCC, requested the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the entity operating the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC on an interim basis, to give priority to the support of national communications:

"Priority should be given to the funding of agreed full costs (or agreed full incremental costs, as appropriate) incurred by developing country Parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12.1<sup>2</sup> and other relevant commitments under the Convention. In the initial period, emphasis should be placed on enabling activities undertaken by developing country Parties, such as planning and endogenous capacity-building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate

---

1 GEF Operational Strategy, 1996, page.9

2 Article 12.1 of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) requires that each Party, in accordance with Article 4.1, shall communicate to the Conference of the Parties, through the Convention Secretariat, the following elements of information:

- "(a) A national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, to the extent its capacities permit, using comparable methodologies to be promoted and agreed upon by the Conference of the Parties;
- (b) A general description of steps taken or envisaged by the Party to implement the Convention; and
- (c) Any other information that the Party considers relevant to the achievement of the objective of the Convention and suitable for inclusion in its communication, including, if feasible, material relevant for calculations of global emission trends".

implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures.”

4. At its second meeting, the Conference of the Parties (COP2) adopted detailed guidelines<sup>3</sup> for the content of the first national communications from non-Annex-I Parties. In its guidance to the GEF, COP2 confirmed that these guidelines and format shall form the basis for the funding of communications from non-Annex I Parties. The guidance also required the GEF to expedite the approval and disbursement of financial resources for this purpose and consider country-specific needs and other approaches which may be used for several countries with similar needs, upon request, and take into account that the preparation of national communications is a continuing process.<sup>4</sup>

5. At the Fourth Conference of Parties (COP4), guidance to the GEF emphasized the need for funding support for preparing initial and subsequent national communications “by maintaining and enhancing relevant national

capacity, so as to prepare the initial and second national communications which will take into account experiences, including gaps and problems identified in previous national communications, and guidelines established by the Conference of Parties.”<sup>5</sup> COP4 also decided “to ensure that issues and concerns identified by non-Annex I Parties in their initial communications are brought to the attention of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and through it, as appropriate, its implementing agencies when undertaking the comprehensive review of enabling activities projects.”<sup>6</sup>

6. **GEF Supported Enabling Activities<sup>7</sup>**  
Among the enabling activities, those that are specifically related to countries’ obligations to first national communications under Article 12.1 of the UNFCCC are eligible for GEF financing on the basis of “agreed full costs.” The GEF has prepared operational criteria, issued in Feb 1996 and revised in Feb 1997, to guide the preparation and scheduling of support for these activities, following expedited procedures.<sup>8</sup>

3 Decision 11/CP.1, item b(i) in document FCCC/CP/1995/7/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its First Session, held at Berlin from 28 March to 7 April, 1995, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its First Session.

4 Decision 10/CP.2, Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: guidelines, facilitation and process for consideration, in document FCCC/CP/1996/15/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Second Session, held at Geneva from 8 to 19 July 1996, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its Second Session.

5 Decision 11/CP.2, paras 1(c) and (d), Guidance to the Global Environment Facility, in document FCCC/CP/1996/15/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Second Session, held at Geneva from 8 to 19 July 1996, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its Second Session.

6 Decision 2/CP.4, para 1(d) Additional guidance to the operating entity of the financial mechanism, in document FCCC/CP/1998/16/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Fourth Session, held at Buenos Aires from 2 to 14 November 1998, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of Parties at its fourth session.

7 Decision 12/CP.4, para 1(d), Initial National Communications from Parties not included in Annex-I of the Convention in document FCCC/CP/1998/16/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Fourth Session, held at Buenos Aires from 2 to 14 November 1998, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of Parties at its fourth session.

8 GEF Operational Strategy, 1997, page 37

9 Operational Criteria for enabling activities: Climate Change, GEF/C.7/Inf.10, February 1996 Operational Criteria for Expedited Financing of Initial Communications from non-Annex-1 Parties, February 1997.

## STATUS OF THE CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES

7. The GEF has supported Climate Change Enabling Activities in a total of 128 countries amounting to a total GEF allocation of US\$72 million through:

- enabling activities processed through expedited procedures in 96 countries amounting to US\$24 million;
- enabling activities supported as full projects in 14 countries<sup>10</sup> amounting to US\$10 million;
- 10 global/regional projects in 18 countries<sup>11</sup> amounting to US\$36 million; and

8. In March 1998, the GEF approved a National Communications Support Programme amounting to US\$2 million, implemented jointly by the UNDP and UNEP. The project is geared towards enhancing the capacity of participating non-Annex I Parties to prepare their initial national communications to the UNFCCC. The activities of the project aim to improve the quality, comprehensiveness, and timeliness of the initial national communication from non-Annex I Parties to the Convention in accordance with the guidance provided by CoP-2 through the operation of a "Help" desk for climate change enabling activities, provision of additional technical assistance to countries preparing national communications

and through the organization of a number of thematic and regional exchange workshops.

## RATIONALE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

9. The Study of GEF's Overall Performance recommended a comprehensive review of enabling activities to "determine how successful the projects have been, analyze the reasons for those that have failed, and consider policy and programmatic responses to the problem".<sup>12</sup> The GEF Council, endorsed this recommendation at the October 1998 meeting.<sup>13</sup> Since a sizeable number of activities have been implemented (or are underway), it would be useful to understand the effectiveness of climate change enabling activities in participating countries. In addition, the outputs from this study are expected to provide useful inputs to the Capacity Building Initiative proposed under the Strategic Partnerships (GEF/C.13/9).

10. The overall purpose of the study will be to take stock of experience with GEF-supported climate change enabling activities and to extract lessons for future enabling activities. Specifically, the study is expected to examine: (i) the effectiveness of the enabling activity modality; (ii) the effectiveness and efficiency of the process—the GEF approval process and the national execution process; (iii) influence on broader capacity building and/or planning in countries through the process of preparation of initial communications; and (iv) best practices from country experiences.

10 Jordan received support both under full project and under expedited procedure.

11 Note that the global/regional projects also cover some of the countries listed in categories (a) and (b)

12 Study of GEF's Overall Performance, pp.57

13 Decision on Agenda Item 8, *Action Plan on Follow-up to the Overall Performance Study*, Joint Summary of the Chairs, GEF Council Meeting, October 14-16, 1998.

11. The review will cover items (a), (b), and (c) listed in para 7. The National Communications Support Programme will be considered in the review to examine how the program is covering gaps identified in the GEF-supported enabling activities. The specific activities to be conducted under the study are:

*Response to guidance from the COP*

- (a) Identify elements of COP guidance (from among those referenced in footnotes 3, 4, and 5) to which the GEF Operational Criteria on Climate Change Enabling Activities has responded.
- (b) Assess the responsiveness of operationalization of elements of COP guidance relevant to GEF Climate Change Enabling Activities in terms of: (i) timeliness of response; and (ii) reflection of the content and spirit of the guidance.
- (c) Describe the evolution of the consultation process between the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies, and the UNFCCC Secretariat in the operationalization of Convention guidance in terms of specific milestones of consultation.

*Effectiveness of the operational criteria*

- (d) Assess the appropriateness of the GEF Operational Criteria for Climate Change Enabling Activities in terms of: (i) ease of interpretation and operationalization by the IAs and participating countries; (ii) its

guidance on preparation of national communication; and (iii) applicability and flexibility to specific country needs.

- (e) Evaluate the effects of expedited procedures in terms of elapsed times for different stages of the project preparation, approval, and disbursement process.

*Portfolio overview*

- (f) Identify the status of various countries enabling activities, specifying the status of sub-components, and preparation/submission of first national communications.

*Project design and implementation*

- (g) Compare the activities of enabling activity projects against the GEF Operational Criteria for Climate Change Enabling Activities, and carry out a preliminary evaluation of adequacy of the GEF cost norms to facilitate the completion of each of the components of the enabling activities towards meeting the objective of preparing the first national communications!<sup>14</sup>
- (h) Assess the roles played by the countries, the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat in developing the portfolio of enabling activities, and the impact of enabling activities on the GEF portfolio as a whole. Assess the GEFSEC-IA review/dialogue process and its consistency with established timelines, quality and relevance of technical comments; and the impacts on project design and implementation.

<sup>14</sup> The comparison should be done in the context of evolution of procedures and norms of enabling activities, with reference to specific time periods when enabling activity projects were reviewed and approved.

- (i) Assess the adequacy of budgets made available to the Implementing Agencies to design and implement enabling activities; assess the adequacy of project implementation time and schedule.
- (j) Examine how the enabling activities complemented existing climate change related activities in country. Specifically examine the complementarity with enabling activities supported by other external sources of financing.
- (k) Identify the sources, and assess the quality of technical assistance available to design and implement the projects, with specific reference to: (i) advice and inputs from Implementing Agencies; (ii) manuals, guidelines or other relevant materials; and (iii) consultants, with particular attention to the use of national and regional consultants.
- (l) Assess the roles, level, and mode of participation of different stakeholders (governments, NGOs, private sector, academic/research institutions, etc) in project design and implementation.
- (m) Assess the contribution (complementary and supplementary) of the regional and global climate change enabling activity projects on country-level enabling activity projects and/or national communications. Assess possible synergies or overlaps between GEF-supported activities and bilateral programs.
- (n) Assess whether the National Communications Support Programme is providing adequate and appropriate additional assistance to countries to address identified gaps in the enabling activity project design.
- (o) Assess the reporting and management procedures on implementation of enabling activities.

- (p) Assess the relative merit and cost-effectiveness of capacity building through the three different approaches for enabling activities—full country projects, regional projects, projects under expedited procedures, as referenced in para. 7.

### *Project results*

- (q) In countries where implementation has been underway for a significant amount of time:
  - (i) assess, if possible, whether the contributions of enabling activities are progressing towards meeting objectives set forth in the project design, including preparation and submission of initial communications.
  - (ii) assess the early results and sustainability of capacity building activities—improvements to national institutional arrangements, training, data gathering and research, education, enhancement of human resources, and consideration in planning of response measures in accordance with the Convention and other issues, such as capacity to improve and prepare inventories— included in the enabling activity projects.
  - (iii) assess additional benefits, if any, that have resulted from enabling activities.

### *Best practices*

- (r) Describe remedial actions taken by IAs to early problems identified with the design and implementation of enabling activities.
- (s) Identify the best practices and lessons learned in the design and implementation of enabling activities.



### Recommendations

- (t) Recommend broadly what modifications, if any, should be undertaken in the future to respond to future guidance from the COPs regarding national communications.
- (u) Recommend possible improvements in design, budgeting, appraisal and approval procedures, stakeholder participation and other relevant elements of enabling activities.

## METHODOLOGY

12. The proposed methodology for the study will cover the following broad areas:

- (a) Review of relevant documentation at the GEF Secretariat, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, the World Bank, and the UNFCCC Secretariat.
- (b) Visits to the Implementing Agencies and discussions with GEF regional coordinators and task managers of enabling activities.
- (c) Consultation with relevant stakeholders such as the UNFCCC Secretariat, other relevant bilateral and multilateral agencies, international, regional and local NGOs, including academic institutions.
- (d) Views expressed by the Parties through the Convention process:<sup>15</sup>
- (e) Preparation of regional overviews (case studies) by consultants, focusing on

regional groups of countries which may have undertaken a common approach to enabling activities.

- (f) Preparation of country case studies on selected countries by local consultants.
- (g) Country visits by study team members.
- (h) Questionnaires to countries (to be carried out together with ongoing work under the National Communications Support Programme).

## STUDY TEAM

13. The study will be carried out by a team comprising of members from the implementing agencies, the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, an international consultant, and local in-country consultants. The identified members of the study team are as follows:

- Mr. Samir Amous, team leader/ international consultant.
- Ms. Bo Lim, Mr. Richard Hosier, and other members of the UNDP-GEF climate change team (with Mr. Martin Krause) UNDP
- Mr. Ravi Sharma, UNEP
- Mr. Mahesh Sharma, World Bank
- Mr. Avani Vaish, GEF Secretariat
- Messrs. Jarle Harstad, Ramesh Ramankutty, GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Team.

<sup>15</sup> FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.3, National Communication from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention; Provision of Technical and Financial Support, FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2, National Communication from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention. Preparation for Review of Enabling Activities. Views of Parties with regard to the review of the Global Environmental Facility enabling activities.

- Local consultants (to be identified depending on countries for case studies and field visits)

14. The team will participate in all stages of the study, including developing detailed plan and methodology for the study and participate in initial synthesis discussions on finding and conclusions following country visits. Local consultants will participate in the team visits to countries and preparation of selected country case studies.

15. The team leader (with inputs from the team) will prepare an Inception Report, which will contain an overview of the data sources, plans on how to address the various issues, outlines of questionnaires or structured interview guides, a list of countries proposed for case studies and country visits, as well as a schedule for the execution of the study.

#### *Country selection criteria*

16. The team members will visit a selected number of countries. The countries will be selected to broadly represent the following factors

- (a) projects approved under expedited procedures/projects that were approved under normal GEF procedures;

- (b) projects that are close to completion/ projects that are in early stages of implementation;

- (c) Large/small projects.

- (d) Large/small countries/island nations.

- (e) Countries with low emissions and high vulnerability/countries with high emissions and low vulnerability.

- (f) Geographical balance.

- (g) Implementing Agency representation

## OUTPUT

17. The team leader will be responsible for preparing the first draft of the report, based on country visit reports and on inputs provided by the team members.<sup>16</sup> Based on feedback received, a second draft will be prepared for management review at the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies. Following management review, a third draft will be prepared and forwarded to countries covered under visits and case studies for their comments. Based on feedback, the final report will be prepared for submission to the GEF Council. The final report will consist of 30-50 pages plus appendices, including, inter-alia, a list of all interviewees and data sources.

---

16 Team members will be requested to provide specific inputs.

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE

1. Identification of independent consultant	January 4, 2000
2. Finalization of Terms of Reference for review	February 7, 2000
3. Team Meeting to go over TOR and finalize methodology	February 7, 2000
4. Finalization of countries for visits and case studies	February 7, 2000
5. Consultation with IAs, GEFSec, UNFCCC Secretariat and Desk Review	February 2000
6. Inception Report	February 25, 2000
7. Country Visits and Country Case Studies	March-April 2000
8. First Draft Report—to team for review	June 15, 2000
9. Second Draft Report—for GEFSEC-IA management review	July 15, 2000
10. Third Draft Report—for country comments	August 15, 2000
11. Final Report	September 31, 2000
12. Desktopping and Publishing	October 1, 2000

## ANNEX 2

### THE REVIEW APPROACH

The review was managed by the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation team at the GEF Secretariat. It involved an inter-agency taskforce comprised of staff members from the UNDP, UNEP, The World Bank, and the GEF Secretariat, and led by Mr. Samir Amous, an international consultant.

The review collected information from a variety of sources, including desk review of project documents and other relevant documentation, consultations with the Implementing Agencies and UNFCCC Secretariat, views expressed by the Parties through the UNFCCC, country visits, country and regional case studies, and questionnaire surveys. In addition, the review will benefit from the large information framework developed by the National Communication Support Programme.

#### THE REVIEW AGENDA

The initial phase of the review started on February 2, 2000, with the first visit of the Team leader to the GEF Secretariat at Washington D.C. The aim of this first visit was to organize meetings with all concerned Parties including the Team members, and to finalize the implementing framework of the review :

- Finalization of the terms of reference of the review;
- Finalization of the reviewing approach;
- Finalization of the Guidelines for country visits/country studies;
- Selection of the countries to be included in the review;

- Finalization of the review schedule;
- Task assignments to Team members;
- Finalization of the questionnaires to be addressed to country coordinators for a broader review of enabling activity project;
- Identification of national/Regional consultants for country visits and country/regional studies

#### FINALIZATION OF THE REVIEWING APPROACH

The information gathering started in March 2000 with the country visits, country studies and transmission of the questionnaires to the project coordinators. Country visits were completed in April 2000 except for Armenia, which was completed in May 2000.

#### THE REVIEW TEAM

The core review team comprised of following 10 experts:

- ✓ Samir Amous (team leader)
- ✓ Jarle Harstad (GEF-M&E team)
- ✓ Martin Krause (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Bo Lim (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Ramesh Ramankutty (GEF-M&E team)
- ✓ Ademola Salau (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Mahesh Sharma (The World Bank)
- ✓ Ravi Sharma (UNEP)
- ✓ Miguel Torralba, (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Avani Vaish (GEF Secretariat)

Country Visits	
Armenia	Ms. Aida Iskoyan
Azerbaijan	Mr. Imran Behbudov
Bolivia	Mr. Mauricio Meza Caestro
Brazil	Mr. Emilio La Rovere
Cameroon	Dr. J.H. Chendjou
Lebanon	Dr. Riad Chedid
Lesotho	Ms. Lucy Khalema Redeby
Mali	Dr. Arona Coulibaly
Philippines	Ms. Marisol Portal
South Africa	Mr. Khorombi Matibe
Vietnam	Dr. Nguyen Duc Minh
Zambia	Mr. David Mbewe
Country Studies	
Egypt	Mohamed El Sobki, Associate Prof., Cairo University
Honduras	Mr. Jaime J. Bustillo Pon, independent consultant
India	Prof. P.R. Shukla, Prof. Indian Institute of Mgmt.
Malaysia	Dr. G. Sivalingam, Prof. University of Malaya
Regional Studies	
Caribbean	Mr. Cletus Springer, Impact Consultancy Services
Pacific	Prof. John Hays, Waikato University

In addition, regional and national consultants were hired to assist with country visits or to undertake country/regional studies. Team members, implementing agencies and their country offices, as well as the UNFCCC Secretariat assisted in the identification of consultants. The list of the consultants involved in the review is as listed above.

## DOCUMENTS CONSULTED FOR THE REVIEW

The review had also relied on the existing documentation available at GEF-SEC as well as at Implementing Agencies Headquarters, Regional Bureaus and country offices. The types of documents that were reviewed had included:

- any relevant technical document related to the Enabling Activity projects (e.g. National Communications, GHG Inventories, etc.);
- views expressed by the Parties through the UNFCCC;
- project Briefs and project documents;

- project evaluations (mid-evaluation, Final evaluation, Tripartite review, etc.);
- project status reports including PIMS (where relevant);
- Annual Project Report (APR);
- quarterly operational reports;
- project status reports;
- any document relevant for the review;
- UNDP and UNEP databases for EA projects.

## COUNTRY VISITS AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL STUDIES

Eighteen enabling activity projects were included in the review. Twelve of them were visited by the review core team, four others national projects have been concerned by country studies, and two regional projects were reviewed by regional consultants. In addition a special attention was be paid to National Communication Support Programme and

where applicable, a broad assessment of the potential enabling contribution/benefits of Global/Regional projects was made in the countries concerned by the review.

The team members visited a selected number of countries. The countries were selected according to the following parameters:

- projects approved under expedited procedures/projects that were approved under normal GEF procedures;
- projects that are close to completion/projects that are in early stages of implementation;
- large/small projects;

- large/small countries/island nations;
- countries with low emissions and high vulnerability/countries with high emissions and low vulnerability;
- geographical balance;
- implementing agency representation.

The nineteen reviewed projects represent around 14% of the total number of GEF climate change enabling activity projects. The total budget of these projects amounts to US \$15.7 million, which represents around 22% of the total budget allocated to climate change enabling activities. In addition, the good regional balance and IA

**LIST OF COUNTRIES INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW OF THE GEF  
CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS**

	IA	Region	Procedure	Budget (US Dollars)
<b>COUNTRY VISITS</b>				
Mali	UNDP	SSA	EP	94,760
South Africa	UNEP	SSA	EP	321,000
Lesotho	UNEP	SSA	EP	350,000
Zambia	UNEP	SSA	EP	256,000
Cameroon	UNEP	SSA	EP	265,000
Vietnam	UNEP	EAP	EP	212,500
Armenia	UNDP	ECA	FP	350,000
Azerbaijan	UNDP	ECA	EP	324,500
Brazil	UNDP	LAC	FP	1,500,000
Bolivia	UNDP	LAC	EP	185,220
Lebanon	UNDP	MENA	EP	292,600
<b>COUNTRY STUDIES</b>				
India	UNDP	EAP	FP	1,500,000
Egypt	UNDP	MENA	FP	402,000
Honduras	UNDP	LAC	EP	325,000
Malaysia	UNDP	EAP	FP	470,000
<b>REGIONAL CASE STUDIES</b>				
PICAPP	UNDP	EAP	FP	2,440,000
CPACC	WB	LAC	FP	6,300,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>15,743,080</b>

IA : Implementing Agency

EP : Expedited Project

FP : Full Projects

CPACC includes Antigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago)

PICAPP includes Pacific Islands : Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu.

representativeness of the sampled projects will give a correct overview of the reality of the enabling activity portfolio as a whole.

In general, the country visits included two core team members and a national consultant. The national consultant was responsible for:

- preparing the contacts and schedule for the meetings with stakeholders;
- collecting all relevant information and documentation;
- making a first analysis of the enabling activity project on the basis of the terms of reference of the review;
- accompanying and assisting the country visit teams; and
- providing follow-up activities after country visit completion where needed.

Country studies included 4 countries. National consultants were commissioned to undertake these country studies and to provide a country report to the core team. Regional studies included 2 projects. Regional consultants were commissioned to undertake these regional studies and to provide reports to the core team. The regional review required the consultant to travel to a number of countries that were covered by the regional projects.

## BROADER ASSESSMENT

### *Review survey*

In addition to the 18 projects specifically concerned by the review, a survey was conducted in order to get broader inputs

from enabling activity projects. A questionnaire was prepared for that purpose (ref. Annex 12), and transmitted to the project coordinators. The questionnaire included 5 main modules corresponding to the items in the terms of reference for the review:

- project details (project name, project coordinator, dates, telephone, email, etc.);
- project design-related questions;
- project implementation-related questions;
- project results;
- overall project experience.

### *Information gathering through the National Communication Support Programme*

Since its commencement, the National Communication Support Programme has made an important effort to gather and maintain information regarding the enabling activity projects. The review team had the opportunity to look to the files that are maintained by NCSP and incorporate that information into the review.

### *Interactions between national EA projects and regional/global projects*

During the country visits and country/Regional studies, the team members also sought information on the Global/Regional projects that directly concerned the country, and tried to assess the interaction between the national enabling activity projects and these Global/Regional projects.

## ANNEX 3

### LIST OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS

#### Enabling Activities Supported Under Expedited Procedures

No.	Country	IA	Amount (US \$)	Date of CEO Approval	Date of Project Start (signing of prodoc)	Date of First Disbursement (By Quarter for UNDP*)
1	Albania	UNDP	\$278,000	30-Jul-96	4-Jun-98	(3) 1996
2	Algeria	UNDP	\$194,670	22-Jan-98	11-Feb-98	(1) 1998
3	Antigua & Barbuda	UNDP	\$161,500	21-Jul-97	22-Dec-97	(1) 1998
4	Azerbaijan	UNDP	\$324,500	16-Jul-97	25-Dec-97	(1) 1998
5	Bahamas	UNDP	\$185,300	26-Aug-97	10-Sep-98	(2) 1998
6	Barbados	UNDP	\$189,417	31-Oct-97	26-Sep-98	(3) 1999
7	Belize	UNDP	\$185,100	8-Jan-98	9-Jun-98	(3) 1998
8	Benin	UNDP	\$100,425	3-Sep-98	24-Mar-99	(2) 1998
9	Bhutan	UNDP	\$296,000	26-Jun-96	13-Aug-96	(2) 1997
10	Bolivia	UNDP	\$185,220	7-Jul-98	1-Sep-99	(3) 1998
11	Burkina Faso	UNDP	\$233,810	19-May-97	27-Jan-98	(3) 1997
12	Burundi	UNDP	\$319,450	18-Sep-98	19-Jan-99	(2) 1999
13	Cambodia	UNDP	\$325,480	24-Mar-97	24-Aug-98	(2) 1998
14	Cape Verde	UNDP	\$319,300	18-Mar-97	21-Aug-97	(3) 1997
15	Chad	UNDP	\$100,425	23-Aug-99	1-Feb-00	pending
16	Chile	UNDP	\$350,000	30-Aug-96	11-Apr-97	(3) 1997
17	Colombia	UNDP	\$345,000	24-Jun-99	28-Aug-99	pending
18	Congo	UNDP	\$319,450	18-Sep-98	15-Feb-99	pending
19	Congo DR	UNDP	\$345,000	7-Mar-97	17-Jul-97	(3) 1997
20	Croatia	UNDP	\$345,600	29-May-98	17-Mar-99	(1) 1999
21	Cuba	UNDP	\$153,500	18-Aug-98	5-Mar-99	(3) 1999
22	Dominica	UNDP	\$168,700	6-Jan-96	26-Oct-98	(3) 1998
23	Dominican Rep.	UNDP	\$350,000	29-Mar-99	4-May-99	(2) 1998
24	Ecuador	UNDP	\$220,000	29-Mar-99	Pending	(3) 1999
25	El Salvador	UNDP	\$320,000	24-Mar-97	9-Sep-97	(2) 1997
26	Eritrea	UNDP	\$303,850	4-Sep-96	13-Feb-98	(3) 1996
27	Ethiopia	UNDP	\$213,210	19-May-97	31-Jul-98	(2) 1997
28	Gabon	UNDP	\$319,450	10-Sep-98	4-Mar-99	(3) 1999
29	Gambia	UNDP	\$137,900	24-Mar-97	17-Nov-97	(1) 1997
30	Georgia	UNDP	\$325,000	4-Sep-96	20-Jan-97	(1) 1997
31	Ghana	UNDP	\$94,760	16-Jul-97	15-Jan-98	(2) 1997
32	Grenada	UNDP	\$184,370	26-Aug-98	11-Dec-98	(1) 1998
33	Guatemala	UNDP	\$326,000	24-Mar-97	13-Jan-98	(1) 1998
34	Guinea	UNDP	\$345,600	19-May-97	9-Feb-98	(2) 1998
35	Guinea Bissau	UNDP	\$345,600	5-Jun-97	Pending	
36	Guyana	UNDP	\$196,730	27-Oct-97	5-Jun-98	(3) 1998
37	Honduras	UNDP	\$325,000	24-Mar-97	7-Nov-97	(3) 1997
38	Indonesia	UNDP	\$228,200	13-Nov-97	28-Jul-98	(3) 1998
39	Iran	UNDP	\$349,995	24-Jun-97	29-Oct-97	(1) 1998
40	Jamaica	UNDP	\$232,780	9-Jan-98	28-Apr-98	(1) 1999
41	Jordan	UNDP	\$87,550	15-Dec-97	16-May-98	(1) 1998
42	Korea DPR	UNDP	\$154,200	23-Jan-97	3-Apr-97	(3) 1997
43	Lao PDR	UNDP	\$313,000	29-Jul-96	22-Oct-96	(2) 1997
44	Lebanon	UNDP	\$292,600	11-Jul-96	16-Dec-96	(3) 1996
45	Macedonia	UNDP	\$345,000	5-Feb-99	4-Aug-99	(3) 1999
46	Madagascar	UNDP	\$350,000	24-Jun-99	Pending	
47	Malawi	UNDP	\$193,640	18-Mar-97	22-May-98	(1) 1997
48	Mali	UNDP	\$94,760	16-Jul-97	9-Jan-98	(1) 1998
49	Malta	UNDP	\$265,000	9-Nov-99	31-Dec-99	pending
50	Moldova	UNDP	\$325,000	15-Aug-97	22-Dec-97	(1) 1998
51	Morocco	UNDP	\$144,220	6-Oct-99	22-Feb-00	pending
52	Mozambique	UNDP	\$216,000	16-Jul-97	10-Feb-98	(2) 1997
53	Nicaragua	UNDP	\$299,100	3-Feb-98	14-Jul-98	(2) 1998
54	Niger	UNDP	\$345,600	25-Aug-97	1-Apr-98	(3) 1997



## Review of Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects

No.	Country	IA	Amount (US \$)	Date of CEO Approval	Date of Project Start (signing of prodoc)	Date of First Disbursement (By Quarter for UNDP*)
55	Nigeria	UNDP	\$259,560	18-Mar-97	23-Oct-97	(3) 1997
56	Panama	UNDP	\$298,700	25-Aug-97	11-Aug-98	(3) 1998
57	Paraguay	UNDP	\$190,550	27-Jul-98	22-Feb-99	(3) 1999
58	Peru	UNDP	\$195,700	18-Jul-97	4-Feb-98	(1) 1998
59	Philippines	UNDP	\$154,500	24-Jul-97	27-Nov-97	(3) 1997
60	Senegal	UNDP	\$67,100	25-Aug-97	28-Nov-97	(3) 1997
61	Seychelles	UNDP	\$250,290	30-Jul-96	3-Dec-96	(2) 1997
62	Sierra Leone	UNDP	\$309,000	11-Sep-96		
63	Slovenia	UNDP	\$345,000	5-Aug-97	24-Nov-97	(1) 1998
64	Sri Lanka	UNDP	\$110,000	21-Mar-97	4-Nov-97	(3) 1997
65	St. Kitts & Nevis	UNDP	\$158,620	3-Feb-98	8-Oct-98	(1) 1999
66	St. Lucia	UNDP	\$169,900	6-Aug-97	16-Jul-98	(3) 1998
67	Sudan	UNDP	\$290,000	3-Oct-96	4-Feb-97	(1) 1997
68	Suriname	UNDP	\$350,000	10-Sep-98	19-Oct-98	(3) 1999
69	Swaziland	UNDP	\$303,850	18-Mar-97	28-Nov-97	(3) 1997
70	Tajikistan	UNDP	\$32,700		pending	
71	Thailand	UNDP	\$189,500	13-Nov-97	5-Jun-98	(3) 1998
72	Togo	UNDP	\$338,040	18-Jun-97	10-Apr-98	(2) 1997
73	Tonga	UNDP	\$325,000	27-Oct-99		
74	Trinidad & Tobago	UNDP	\$218,870	22-Jan-98	18-May-98	(1) 1999
75	Uganda	UNDP	\$83,340	30-Jul-96	28-Dec-97	(1) 1997
76	Uzbekistan	UNDP	\$325,500	2-Jan-97	4-Feb-97	(3) 1996
77	Yemen	UNDP	\$195,700	19-May-97	13-Aug-97	(2) 1998
78	Bahrain	UNEP	\$335,000	1-Oct-97	9-Nov-97	13-Nov-97
79	Bangladesh	UNEP	\$175,000	16-Mar-99	3-Aug-99	15-Mar-00
80	Cameroon	UNEP	\$265,000	16-Jul-97	13-Aug-97	16-Sep-97
81	Central African Republic	UNEP	\$350,000	26-Aug-97	20-Nov-97	15-Dec-97
82	Comoros	UNEP	\$310,000	6-Nov-98	13-Jan-99	15-Feb-99
83	Cote d'Ivoire	UNEP	\$327,000	26-Mar-98	4-May-98	29-May-98
84	Dibout	UNEP	\$310,000	23-Nov-98	14-Mar-99	27-Apr-99
85	Haiti	UNEP	\$350,000	26-Jan-98	23-Apr-98	15-May-00
86	Kenya	UNEP	\$172,800	27-Oct-98	25-Mar-99	15-Jul-99
87	Lesotho	UNEP	\$350,000	4-Sep-96	30-Oct-96	3-Dec-96
88	Mauritania	UNEP	\$350,000	22-Jul-97	2-Feb-98	6-Feb-98
89	Mauritius	UNEP	\$140,000	17-Jul-97	7-Aug-97	4-Sep-97
90	Mongolia	UNEP	\$239,500	5-Oct-98	26-Oct-98	16-Nov-98
91	Nepal	UNEP	\$310,000	4-Mar-98	22-Jun-99	15-Apr-00
92	Niue	UNEP	\$296,000	29-Sep-97	12-Nov-97	26-Nov-97
93	Pakistan	UNEP	\$274,000	2-Dec-98	7-Jan-99	2-Feb-99
94	South Africa	UNEP	\$321,000	1-Jun-98	14-Oct-98	16-Oct-98
95	Tanzania	UNEP	\$254,000	17-Jul-97	25-Aug-97	18-Sep-97
96	Turkmenistan	UNEP	\$350,000	17-Jun-97	8-Aug-97	19-Sep-97
97	Vietnam	UNEP	\$212,500	6-Nov-98	3-Mar-99	8-Mar-99
98	Zambia	UNEP	\$256,000	24-Apr-97	23-Jun-97	4-Jul-97
99	Zimbabwe	UNEP	\$93,600	7-Feb-97	6-Mar-97	18-Mar-97
100	St. Vincent & Grenadines	World Bank	\$349,500			

Total \$25,222,282

\* The UNDP calendar year is broken into three quarters. The first lasts from Jan.-June and the second two are each three months long.

### Enabling Activity Projects Supported Under Non-Expedited Procedures

No	Country	IA	Amount (US \$)	Date of CEO Endorsement	Date of Project Start (signing of prodoc)	Date of First Disbursement	Date of Submission of First National Communication
1	Argentina	UNDP	\$1,000,000	17-Jan-96	16-Feb-96	(1) 1996	25-Jul-97
2	Armenia	UNDP	\$350,000	15-Dec-95	7-May-96	(3) 1996	4-Nov-98
3	Botswana	UNDP	\$350,000	14-Aug-96	5-Sep-96	(1) 1997	
4	Brazil	UNDP	\$1,500,000	14-Jun-96	5-Aug-96	(1) 1997	
5	China	World Bank	\$2,000,000	PILOT PHASE			
6	Costa Rica	UNDP	\$467,200	7-Jun-96	7-Aug-96	(3) 1996	19-Jul-99
7	Egypt	UNDP	\$402,000	22-Apr-96	12-Jun-96	(1) 1997	
8	India	UNDP	\$1,500,000	PILOT PHASE			8-Mar-97
9	Jordan	UNDP	\$242,000	17-Oct-95	21-Mar-96	(1) 1996	
10	Malaysia	UNDP	\$470,000	13-Sep-96	30-Oct-96	(1) 1997	
11	Maldives	UNDP	\$863,600	4-Oct-96	16-Jan-97	(1) 1996	9-Dec-97
12	Mexico	UNDP	\$306,600	7-Jun-96	29-Oct-96	(1) 1997	
13	Papua N Guinea	UNDP	\$345,600	30-Dec-96	30-Dec-96	(2) 1998	15-Oct-97
14	Tunisia	UNDP	\$565,000	4-Aug-96	6-Sep-96	(1) 1997	
15	Uruguay	UNDP	\$700,000	13-Nov-95	19-Dec-95	(3) 1995	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$11,062,000</b>				

### Regional/Global Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects

	Project	IA	Amount	Date of CEO Approval
1	Asia Least-Cost Greenhouse Gas Abatement Strategy (ALGAS)	UNDP	\$9,500,000	PILOT PHASE
2	CARICOM: Planning for Adaptation to Climate Change	World Bank	\$6,300,000	10-Feb-97
3	Climate Change Training Phase I (CCTRAIN 1)	UNDP	\$900,000	PILOT PHASE
4	Climate Change Training Phase II (CCTRAIN2)	UNDP	\$2,700,000	26-Mar-96
5	Country Case Studies on Sources and Sinks of Greenhouse Gases	UNEP	\$4,700,000	PILOT PHASE
6	Economics of Greenhouse Gas Limitation - Phase I	UNEP	\$3,000,000	18-Jan-96
7	Economics of Greenhouse Gas Limitation - Phase II	UNEP	\$2,000,000	
8	Building Capacity in the Maghreb	UNDP	\$2,500,000	PILOT PHASE
9	Pacific Island Climate Change Assistance Project (PICCAP)	UNDP	\$2,440,000	20-Mar-97
10	Building Capacity in sub-Saharan Africa	UNDP	\$2,000,000	PILOT PHASE
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$36,040,000</b>	

## ANNEX 4

### DOCUMENTS AND REFERENCES CONSULTED

#### GEF DOCUMENTS

1. Operational Report On GEF Programs, June 30, 1999
2. Operational Strategy, February 1996
3. The World Bank and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, Environment Department Papers, March 1995
4. Capacity Building Requirements for Global Environmental Protection, UNEP
5. The Costs of Adapting to Climate Change, GEF
6. Biodiversity, International Waters and the GEF, IUCN
7. Study of GEF's Overall Performance, GEF, 1997

#### UNFCCC DOCUMENTS

1. FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.3, National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: Provision of Technical and Financial Support
2. FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2, National Communication from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, Preparation for the Review of Enabling Activities, Views of Parties with regard to the review of the Global Environment Facility

#### NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

1. The Philippine's Initial National Communication on Climate Change, December 1999
2. Republic of Nauru Response, First National Communication under UNFCCC, October 1999
3. Lebanon's First National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Republic of Lebanon, Ministry of Environment, 1999
4. Arab Republic of Egypt, Initial National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC, July 1999
5. The Federated States of Micronesia, National Communication prepared Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, October 1999
6. Cook Islands, Initial National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, October 1999
7. Kiribati Government, Initial National Communication under United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, September 1999
8. Revision of the First National communication Argentine Republic, October 1999
9. Vanuatu National Communication to the Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC, July 1999
10. Tuvalu Initial Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, October 1999
11. Chile 1999, Primera Comunicacion Nacional, CONAMA
12. Republic of Mauritius, Initial National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, April 1999
13. Republic of Zambia, Initial National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, April 2000

## UNEP

1. Enabling Activities for the preparation of the Initial Communication related to the UNFCCC – Draft Evaluation Report, UNEP, Mauritius, Todd Ngara, January 2000
2. Preparation of the Initial National Communication related for the implementation of the UNFCCC – Final Evaluation Report, UNEP, Zimbabwe, December 1998
3. Country Case Studies on Climate Change impacts and adaptation assessments, GF/2200-96-09, UNEP, Michael H. Glantz, May 1998
4. Country Case Studies on emissions and sinks of GHG, Project GF/4102-92-01, Desk Evaluation Report, UNEP, July 1995
5. Economics of Greenhouse Gas Limitations – Phase I : establishment of a methodological framework for Climate Change Mitigation Assessment, Evaluation Report, Emilio LaRovere, February 2000

## UNDP

1. Building capacity in Sub-saharan Africa to respond to the UNFCCC, report on the final evaluation mission, November 1998
2. First Draft Report on Mid-term Evaluation of the project “Capacity Building in Maghreb Region to respond to and take advantage of the opportunities offered by national Responses to UNFCCC, April 2000
3. External Evaluation of the concurrent phase of RETA 5592, “A study of Least-Cost GHG Abatement strategy (ALGAS),” July 1999
4. Report on Mid-term Evaluation of the project “Training Programme to support the implementation of the UNFCCC, CC:TRAIN II, March 1999
5. Terminal Report of the project “Training Programme to support the implementation of the UNFCCC, CC:TRAIN II, October 1999

## REVIEW

1. 12 country-visit reports, March-June 2000
2. 4 country-study reports, March-June 2000
3. Meeting notes: GEFSEC, The World Bank, UNDP New York, UNEP, UNFCCC Secretariat, February 2000
4. Meeting notes from the 3-days team – retreat, May 2000
5. Parties’ views on the review of EA CC process (communications and compilation reports published by the UNFCCC Secretariat)
6. Data bases established by UNDP and UNEP relating to EA CC projects
7. Synthesis Report on NCSP files and database, April 2000
8. Analysis of the survey undertaken by the review, May 2000

## ANNEX 5

### 1996 CRITERIA AND 1997 GUIDELINES: COST NORMS

1999 Criteria		1997 Guidelines	
Activity	Typical Cost Range	Activity	Typical Cost Range
<b>Inventories/Stocktaking</b> - greenhouse gas inventory - vulnerability assessment	\$ 30,000 – 80,000 \$ 25,000 – 45,000	<b>National Circumstances</b>	
<b>Identification of Options</b> - mitigation options - stage 1 adaptation	\$ 25,000 - 40,000 \$ 25,000 - 40,000	<b>Greenhouse gas inventories</b>	\$ 50,000 – 100,000
Preparation of Plan, including public awareness building	\$ 30,000 - 40,000	<b>General Description of Steps</b> (a) programs related to sustainable development, research, public awareness, etc. (b) policy options for monitoring systems and response strategies for impacts. (c) policy frameworks for implementing adaptation measures and response strategies. (d) building capacity to integrate climate change concerns into planning (e) programs to address climate change adverse impacts, incl. Abatement, sink enhancement.	up to \$ 135,000
		<b>Other Information</b> (a) Material relevant for global emission trends (b) financial, technological needs and constraints	up to \$ 10,000
<b>Preparation of national Communication</b>	\$ 15,000 - 20,000	Compilation and Production of Initial National Communication	\$ 15,000-20,000
<b>Fixed Project Cost</b> - Project Management - Monitoring/Evaluation	\$ 45,000 – 70,000 \$ 5,000 – 15,000	<b>Project Management</b> Monitoring/Evaluation	up to \$ 70,000 up to \$ 15,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 200,000 - \$ 350,000</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>up to \$350,000</b>

---

## **ANNEX 6**

### **CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS AS INCLUDED IN OPERATIONAL CRITERIA FOR ENABLING ACTIVITIES - 1996**

#### **1. COVERAGE WITHOUT DUPLICATION:**

In assessing a country's needs, past, ongoing, planned and committed activities—bilateral activities, multilateral programs, as well as activities undertaken by other agencies—are fully taken into account to ensure that GEF enabling activity projects fill any remaining gaps.

#### **2. APPROPRIATE OVERALL SEQUENCING OF ACTIVITIES:**

Projects should be embedded in an overall strategy that leads towards sufficient capacity.

#### **3. GOOD PRACTICE:**

Enabling activity projects should follow good practice, and observe established guidelines, using existing tools whenever available.

#### **4. COST EFFECTIVENESS:**

Projects adopt the least-cost means of providing assistance to countries.

## **ANNEX 7**

### **ANNEXES INCLUDED IN OPERATIONAL CRITERIA FOR ENABLING ACTIVITIES - 1996**

- ANNEX A**      The Activity Matrix, to be included in each project proposal to summarize, in a concise way, the already existing capabilities in a country, the improvement envisaged through the proposed project, and the gaps remaining after project completion
- ANNEX B**      Enablement Plan and Appropriate Sequencing, containing guidelines on appropriate sequencing of activities
- ANNEX C**      Indicative list of Enabling Activity guidelines
- ANNEX D**      Cost and activity norms used for communication-related enabling activity
- ANNEX E**      Standard format for proposals for communications-related enabling activities
- ANNEX F**      Enabling activities and related measures – glossary of terms

---

---

## **ANNEX 8**

### **ANNEXES INCLUDED IN OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR EXPEDITED FINANCING OF INITIAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM NON-ANNEX 1 PARTIES - 1997**

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| <b>ANNEX A</b> | Guidelines for Non-Annex-I Communications   |
| <b>ANNEX B</b> | Expedited GEF Procedures for Enabling Activities  |
| <b>ANNEX C</b> | The Activity Matrix   |
| <b>ANNEX D</b> | Typical Cost Ranges for Proposals for Initial Communications<br>Processed by Expedited Procedures |
| <b>ANNEX E</b> | Standard Format for Proposals for Communication -Related Enabling Activities                      |
| <b>ANNEX F</b> | Enabling Activities and Related Measures - a Glossary of Terms                                    |



## ANNEX 9

### PARAGRAPHS OF DECISION 11/CP.2 THAT ARE RELEVANT TO ENABLING ACTIVITIES

Para (a)(ii)

Projects funded through the financial mechanisms should be country driven and in conformity with, and supportive of, the national development priorities of each country.

Para.b (i)

“Priority should be given to the funding of agreed full costs (or agreed full incremental costs, as appropriate) incurred by developing country Parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12.1 and other relevant commitments under the Convention. In the initial period, emphasis should be placed on enabling activities undertaken by developing country Parties, such as planning and endogenous capacity building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures.”

Para (b)(ii)

“In this context...institutional development.”

Para (b)(iii)

Emphasis should also....responses measures.”

Para (b)(iv)

The operating entity... which should, as far as possible, be comprehensive.

---

## ANNEX 10

### NEEDS AND MAJOR PRIORITIES EXPRESSED BY THE BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FUTURE EA PROJECTS

The current review had the opportunity to consult with a great number of stakeholders during the 12 country visits, the 5 country studies, and the 2 regional studies. In addition, 60 countries have responded to the survey that was launched by the review, and the National Communication Support Programme (NCSP) had previously launched a similar consultation during the last two years, in particular through surveys or evaluation undertaken at the regional workshops held by the NCSP. In particular, countries were asked to identify the CC-related issues that are of priority for them and the gaps that they would hope to fill in the future. The following issues are among the most commonly listed:<sup>1</sup>

- Improvement of the quality of the information related mainly to the GHG inventory, to the vulnerability, to the mitigation options, through the implementation of adequate updating systems within the beneficiary countries (e.g. development of emission factors, etc.);
- Assistance for the establishment of a permanent framework for information and data collection that allow an effective implementation of the UNFCCC;
- Development of more comprehensive and complete Vulnerability and Adaptation assessments;
- Enhancing the countries' capacities to undertake relevant modeling exercises of vulnerability and adaptation;
- Enhancing the countries' capacities to undertake relevant forecasting and modeling exercises for the purpose of developing various emission projections and scenarios;
- Supporting wider dissemination of the technical studies (including internationally) through translation of documents into other relevant languages according to the countries' needs;
- Enhancing the networking and information exchange activities;
- Encouraging the enhancement and/or establishment of regional centers of excellence;
- Enhancing the national and regional expertise through better participation to major international events;

---

<sup>1</sup> Issues are simply listed without reference to any order of priority.

- Meeting the international consultancy needs where requested by the countries;
- Enhancing institutional arrangements for CC (e.g. National Climate Change Committee);
- Enhancing the public, as well as decision-making and political level awareness;
- Better integration of CC concerns into the day-by-day planning activities;
- Prepare the national capacities to deal with the new financial mechanisms (e.g. CDM); Development of project proposals;
- Enhancing the national capacities to formulate project proposals and direct them to the existing financial mechanisms.

---

---

# ANNEX 11

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SURVEY UNDERTAKEN BY THE REVIEW



Global Environment Facility

1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433 USA  
Tel: (202) 473-0508 - Fax: (202) 522-3240 / (202) 522-3245

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Sub: GEF REVIEW OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES:  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT MANAGERS/ COORDINATORS**

I am writing to seek your cooperation to respond to this questionnaire being distributed to collect information on climate change enabling activities as part of a review being undertaken by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF).

The GEF is undertaking a review of climate change enabling activities supported by the Facility. This review is being undertaken at the request of the GEF Council. The Conference of the Parties (COP) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has specifically requested the GEF review to take into consideration views expressed by the Parties (FCCC/CP/1998/16/Add.1, FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2, and FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.5).

The main objective of the review is to take stock of the past and ongoing experience with the enabling activity projects, assess their effectiveness and extract lessons for the future. The review, managed by the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, is being undertaken by an inter-agency taskforce comprised of staff members from the UNDP, UNEP, the World Bank, and the GEF Secretariat, and led by an international consultant, Dr. Samir Amous. The review proposes to collect as much information as possible from a variety of sources, including desk review of project documents, country visits, country and regional case studies, and questionnaire surveys.

Please answer the questions fully, according to your best knowledge and return the questionnaire to us in electronic format if possible, otherwise by any convenient means, such as fax, or mail. If you need to make further comments, please do so on the space provided underneath the questions, or attach an additional sheet if necessary.

When completing this questionnaire, we also suggest that you consult closely with the project director and other persons who have been involved with the project. This is particularly important if you are not familiar with the issues on all sections of the questionnaire.

The National Communications Support Program (NCSP), being implemented by the UNDP and UNEP, has kindly volunteered to manage the survey on behalf of the review. Please return completed questionnaires to:

Ms. Bo Lim, Ph.D.  
Chief Technical Advisor  
National Communications Support Programme  
UNDP-GEF  
Room 1607, 16 Floor  
304 East 45th Street  
New York, NY 10017  
Email: [bo.lim@undp.org](mailto:bo.lim@undp.org) Tel: 1 212 906 5730, Fax: 1 212 906 6568

We would like to thank you in advance for your support and cooperation .

Sincerely Yours,

Jarle Harstad  
Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator

---

**REVIEW OF GEF'S CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES:  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT MANAGERS/ COORDINATORS**

Country:

Project Name:

GEF Implementing Agency (UNEP, World Bank or UNDP):

Country Executing or Lead Agency:

Brief approval date : .....

Date of signature of the Project Document : .....

Date of the first disbursement to the project account:.....

Date of the implementation of the first activity of the project: .....

Expected Completion Date : .....

**Name of the Project Manager/Coordinator :** .....

**Duty Station Address:** .....

**Tel :** .....

**Fax :** .....

**Email :** .....

**PROJECT DESIGN**

1. Are/were you familiar with the GEF *Operational Guidelines for expedited financing of initial Communications from Non-Annex 1 Parties*?

a Yes

b No

2. If yes, did you apply these guidelines during project design?

a Yes

b No

3. In your opinion how does the standard activity matrix reflect the generic needs of your country to prepare the Initial Communication?

a Fully

b Partly \_\_\_\_\_

Additions needed .....

.....

.....

4. Cost Benchmarks of Enabling Activities (Table D1 of the Operational Guidelines) provided:

a Clear guidance

b Needed further details

What could be added to further guide the budget process? .....

.....

.....



10. Are/were you able to have an easy access to materials, such as :

IPCC GHG Inventory Guidelines  a Yes  b No

Any specific comments?.....

GHG mitigation materials  a Yes  b No

Any specific comments?.....

Vulnerability/Adaptation materials, etc.):  a Yes  b No

Any specific comments?.....

In your opinion, what additional materials would have been useful or have to be developed ?

.....

11. Please assess the level of participation of the following stakeholder groups (please feel free to add any institution that is not in the list):

11.1. Main governmental departments

- |                           |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Department of Energy      | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| Department of Environment | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| Department of Forestry    | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| Department of Agriculture | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| Department of Transport   | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| Department of Industry    | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| Department of Planning    | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| Department of Meteorology | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| .....                     | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| .....                     | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |

11.2 Academic and Scientific Community Full \_\_\_ Partly \_\_\_ None \_\_\_

11.3 Local NGOs Full \_\_\_ Partly \_\_\_ None \_\_\_

11.4 Private Sector Full \_\_\_ Partly \_\_\_ None \_\_\_

11.5 Other stakeholders (Pls. Specify)

- |       |                              |
|-------|------------------------------|
| ..... | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |
| ..... | Full ___ Partly ___ None ___ |

Please add any comment where relevant .....



12. What was the experience in the utilization of consultants? (please answer Yes or No on the box):

	Local/regional Consultants	International Consultan
Easy availability?		
Expensive?		
Highly capable?		
Needed training in order to address specific climate change issues		
Please specify, on what?		

13. Did the use of international consultants help in developing local capacity?

a Yes  b No

14. If Yes, please outline how : .....

.....

15. Assistance of the GEF Implementing Agency

How is/was the implementation support provided by the Implementing Agency ?

a Highly satisfactory  b Satisfactory

c Unsatisfactory  d Highly unsatisfactory

Please outline any additional comment : .....

16. Have you :  
Requested any assistance provided by the National Communication Support Programme (NCSP) ?

a Yes  b No

Benefitted from any assistance from the National Communication Support Programme (NCSP) ?

a Yes  b No

17. If yes, what is your opinion on the assistance provided by this Programme (NCSP)

.....

.....

18. As project coordinator for CC enabling activities in this particular country, what kind of additional assistance you would have hoped to obtain in order to better meet the Enabling Activity objectives?

.....

.....

19. Was there complementary between Climate Change enabling activities and the following related projects/programs? (Please say Yes or No or put NA if the project or program is not present in the country):

- Regular GEF project(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- Climate Change Projects of Bilateral Agencies \_\_\_\_\_
- Climate Change Projects of Multilateral Agencies \_\_\_\_\_
- Government-Funded Climate Change Projects \_\_\_\_\_
- NGO-managed/supported Climate Change Projects \_\_\_\_\_
- Others (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT RESULTS**

20. What were the contributions of Regional/Global enabling activity projects to country level enabling activities? (Put a check on those items below that applies):

	Regional Projects	Global Projects
Provided scientific data		
Helped prepare local experts		
Created wide awareness		
Lowered cost of stocktaking		
Other contributions .....		

21. Was there a "spill-over" of the benefits of your Enabling Activity Project to other countries ?

a Yes  b

If yes, please specify : .....

.....

22. To what extent have enabling activities progressed towards contributing to:

22.1 Establishment of national institutional arrangements to address Climate Change issues

Full \_\_\_\_ Process still on-going \_\_\_\_ No progress at all \_\_\_\_

Problems encountered? .....

.....

22.2 Enhancement of local capacities

Full \_\_\_\_ Partly \_\_\_\_ Minimal \_\_\_\_ None at all \_\_\_\_

Reasons for less than full progress? .....

.....

22.3 Strengthening of public awareness and development of network of constituencies on climate change

Full \_\_\_\_ Partly \_\_\_\_ Minimal \_\_\_\_ None at all \_\_\_\_

Reasons for less than full progress? .....

.....

23. To what degree are climate change issues being integrated into sectorial and national priorities as they are/were identified during preparation of initial national communications.

a Well integrated

b Partly integrated

c Not integrated at all

Reason for the above? .....

.....

.....

.....

**OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE**

24. What were the most serious problems encountered by your project?:

24.1 proposal development \_\_\_\_\_

24.2 proposal review \_\_\_\_\_

24.3 start up \_\_\_\_\_

24.4 implementation \_\_\_\_\_

24.5 disbursement issues? \_\_\_\_\_

Please specify where relevant : .....

.....

.....

.....

25. Please list at least two most important lessons learned or/and any Good practice that helped you to address some difficulties during the project implementation (best if you can relate these to the problems in question above).

25.1 .....

25.2 .....

## ANNEX 12

### SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS OF THE PARTIES REGARDING THE REVIEW OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS

#### 1. Parties that submitted their views

	First round of submissions (FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2)	Second round of submissions (FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.5)
Mexico	Yes	
Philippines	Yes	
Switzerland	Yes	
USA	Yes	
Chile		Yes
Kenya		Yes
Sudan		Yes
Uzbekistan		Yes

#### 2. Compilation of the main issues addressed by the submissions and that directly relate to the Review of the existing EA projects:

- 2.1 The review should to report transparently on :
- Participating agencies to the review
  - Timing and location of the review
  - The review approach
  - Parties participation
- 2.2 The review should cover all Enabling Activity projects, including those that don't directly relate to the preparation of the National Communication
- 2.3 The review should lead to a clearer understanding of the past project performance and help identify measures to increase the effectiveness of EA in the future.
- The issues that should be covered include :
- The actual EA project cycle (from official request to the effective availability of funds and the effects of the EP procedure)
  - Functionality of the guidance process (COP to GEF)
    - How and in which conditions the revision of the operational programmes is handled by the GEF as to meet the COP guidance
    - How the process could be improved

- Operational effectiveness of the implementation of EA projects
  - Adequacy of the IA management support (including mid-term evaluation, monitoring, tripartite review, etc.)
  - Clarity of the guidelines on the expected products and timetables for implementation
  - Quality of the project management within the recipient countries
  - Adequacy of the financial control
  - Which aspects of project management are found most important for achieving the project objectives and completing the project activities in a timely manner
- Problems related to national level implementation by the implementing agencies which might have posed difficulty for Non Annex I Parties in the implementation of their commitment under the UNFCCC :
  - Consistency of actions taken by the IAs with the UNFCCC and COP decisions (with some relevant examples)
  - Effectiveness of taking the Annex-1 Parties priorities into account
  - Effectiveness of encouraging the use of national experts/consultants
  - Issues related to the effective availability of funds
  - Issues related to the amounts available VS. the amounts requested and the reason for any difference
- Consideration of any additional issue or concern identified by Non-Annex I Party in the implementation of EA
- Example of the application of the concept of "Agreed full cost"
- Flexibility of the funds
- The review should also take other-than-GEF contributions to the elaboration of National Communications into account (multilateral, bilateral)
- The review should identify any needs for enabling activities as they might have been defined by the National Communications that were published so far
- Quality of the outputs produced by the EA projects, including the activities that relate to National communications
- Interaction between Enabling Activities and Economic Development Programmes of the recipient countries
- Effectiveness of the integration of the policies and measures that were identified into the general development policies of the recipient countries

---

3. Compilation of the main issues addressed by the submissions that relate to the recommendations for the future EA projects<sup>1</sup>:

- Issues to be address in the future by the Enabling Activity projects
  - Updating the GHG inventory
  - Social, Economic and Environmental Impact Assessment of mitigation options
  - Mitigation options
  - Energy technology assessments
  - Regional studies on vulnerability and adaptation, climate variability and climate change
  - Building capacity of the Non-Annex I Parties for participating in the process of design and implementation of the mechanisms under the Kyoto protocol and for increasing their capabilities to create new investment partnerships
  - Capacity building needed in validation, monitoring, verification, auditing, certification and registration of CDM projects
  - Development of Information Systems
  - Building capacity of the Non-Annex I Parties for participating in systematic observation networks
  - Develop, strengthen and improve national activities for public awareness and education on climate change
  - Maintaining and enhancing relevant national capacities
  - Translating, reproducing, disseminating and making the National Communications available electronically
  - Providing Support to institutional activities (e.g. national CC centres)

---

<sup>1</sup> Also extracted from FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.10