

Validated Terminal Review of the UNEP-GEF Project

**“Strengthening Ghana's national capacity for
transparency and ambitious climate reporting”**

GEF ID 9820

2019 - 2023



UNEP INDUSTRY AND ECONOMY DIVISION

September 2023



This report has been prepared by an external consultant as part of a Terminal Review, which is a management-led process to assess performance at the project's operational completion. The UNEP Evaluation Office provides templates and tools to support the review process and provides a formal assessment of the quality of the Review report, which is provided within this report's annexed material. In addition, the Evaluation Office formally validates the report by ensuring that the performance judgments made are consistent with evidence presented in the Review report and in-line with the performance standards set out for independent evaluations. As such the project performance ratings presented in the Review report may be adjusted by the Evaluation Office. The findings and conclusions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of Member States or the UN Environment Programme Senior Management.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Julien LHEUREUX
UNEP Industry and Economy Division
Climate Change Mitigation Unit
Nairobi, Kenya
julien.lheureux@un.org
+254 (0) 207625452

Strengthening Ghana's national capacity
for transparency and ambitious climate reporting
GEF ID 9820
September 2023
All rights reserved.
©2023 UNEP

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Terminal Review was prepared for UNEP's Industry and Economy Division by Giacomo Morelli.

A deep thanks to all the people who have taken the time to provide the author with information utilized for the formulation of this review report. A special thanks to Mr. Daniel Akwetey Lamptey for his support in organizing the entire process of on-line interviews and the mission in Accra that made the review exercise possible.

The review consultant(s) hopes that the findings, conclusions and recommendations will contribute to the successful finalisation of the current project, formulation of a next phase and to the continuous improvement of similar projects in other countries and regions.

BRIEF CONSULTANT BIOGRAPHY

The consultant, Giacomo Morelli, is a professional with proven experience in the development sector. He holds an MSc in Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture and Certificate of Advanced Studies in Evaluation and has vast experience in evaluation, which he has accrued first-hand by conducting around 40 evaluation/review assignments worldwide. Since 2012, he has been engaging mainly with evaluations for United Nations entities and international NGOs. He has a broad experience in evaluating GEF and EU funded projects. Prior to his work as Evaluator, he worked as consultant for a broad spectrum of organizations such as UN agencies, private companies, research institutes and international NGOs.

ABOUT THE REVIEW

Joint Review: No

Report Language(s): English.

Review Type: Terminal Review

Brief Description: This report is a management-led Terminal Review of a UNEP/GEF project implemented between 2019 and 2022. The project's overall development goal was to assist Ghana strengthen its national system to be able to effectively and regularly plan, implement, track and report on its NDC to respond to the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. The review sought to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The review has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, the GEF and the relevant agencies of the project participating countries.

Key words: Climate Change, NDC, MRV, Capacity Development, Ghana, Climate Reporting, CBIT

Primary data collection period: April to July 2023

Field mission dates: 3 to 7 July 2023

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	9
INTRODUCTION	13
REVIEW METHODS.....	14
THE PROJECT.....	16
1.1 Context	16
1.2 Results Framework.....	17
1.3 Stakeholders.....	17
1.4 Project implementation structure and partners	19
1.5 Changes in design during implementation.....	20
1.6 Project financing.....	20
THEORY OF CHANGE AT REVIEW	21
REVIEW FINDINGS.....	23
1.7 Strategic Relevance	23
1.8 Quality of Project Design.....	24
1.9 Nature of the External Context	25
1.10 Effectiveness.....	26
1.11 Financial Management.....	31
1.12 Efficiency	32
1.13 Monitoring and Reporting.....	32
1.14 Sustainability.....	33
1.15 Factors Affecting Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues	34
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	38
1.16 Conclusions	38
1.17 Summary of project findings and ratings	40
1.18 Lessons learned.....	47
1.19 Recommendations	48
ANNEX I. TORS OF THE REVIEW (WITHOUT ANNEXES)	50
ANNEX II. REVIEW FRAMEWORK.....	70
ANNEX III. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN QUALITY	80
ANNEX IV. PEOPLE INTERVIEWED DURING THE REVIEW	86
ANNEX V. KEY DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	88
ANNEX VI. IN-COUNTRY MISSION'S ITINERARY.....	90
ANNEX VII. BRIEF CV OF THE REVIEWER	91
ANNEX VIII. RESPONSE TO STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	93
ANNEX IX. GEF PORTAL INPUTS	95
ANNEX X. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.....	97
ANNEX XI. QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF THE REVIEW REPORT	98

ABBREVIATIONS

APR	Annual Progress Reporting
BAP	Bali Action Plan
BUR	Biennial Update report
COVID-19	Corona Virus Disease 2019
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EA	Executing Agency
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ETF	Enhanced Transparency Framework
G-CARP	Ghana Climate Ambitious Reporting Program
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
IA	Implementing Agency
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MESTI	Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation
MRV	Measurement, Reporting and Verification
NC	National Communication
NCCC	National Climate Change Committee (NCCC)
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NDPC	National Development Planning Commission
NFP	UNFCCC National Focal Point
PA	Paris Agreement
PMU	Project Management Unit
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
TR	Terminal Review
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

UNEP Sub-programme:	Climate Change	UNEP Division/Branch	Economy Division, Climate Mitigation, Energy and Climate Branch
Expected Accomplishment(s):	<u>Climate stability:</u> Countries increasingly transition to low-emission economic development pathways and enhance their adaptation and resilience to climate change	Programme of Work output(s):	Outcome 1C: State and non-State actors adopt the enhanced transparency framework arrangements under the Paris Agreement. Indicator (iii) Number of national, subnational and private sector actors reporting under the enhanced transparency arrangements of the Paris Agreement with UNEP support
SDG(s) and indicator(s) UNEP Division/Branch	SDG-13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts. Target 13.3: Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning; Indicator 13.3.2: Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions.		
GEF Core Indicator Targets (identify these for projects approved prior to GEF-7)	N/A – this GEF-6 project was designed without any indicators corresponding to the GEF -7 Core Indicator Worksheet.		
Dates of previous project phases:	Not Applicable	Status of future project phases:	Not Applicable

Project Title:	Strengthening Ghana's national capacity for transparency and ambitious climate reporting
-----------------------	--

Executing Agency:	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
--------------------------	---------------------------------------

Project partners:	Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology, and Innovation (MESTI) Ghana Statistical Services (GSS) Ministry of Energy (MoE) Ministry of Transport Forestry Commission The University of Ghana – Department of Statistics Ministry of Food and Agriculture Energy Commission Ministry of Sanitation and Resources Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development KASA NGO Platform Volta River Authority Hatof Foundation National Development Planning Commission
--------------------------	---

Geographical Scope:	National
----------------------------	----------

Countries:	Ghana
-------------------	-------

GEF project ID:	9820	IMIS number:	SB-011329.02/P1-33CBL-000020
Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Mitigation	GEF OP #:	
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	Strengthen Ghana's national capacity for transparency and ambitious reporting by improving on the functionality of the national system and integrate into national M&E framework having identified institutional capacities, opportunities and gaps.	GEF approval date:	19 November 2018
UNEP approval date:	14 February 2019	Date of first disbursement*:	15 July 2019
Actual start date:	4 March 2019	Planned duration:	36 months
Intended completion date*:	31 January 2022	Actual or Expected completion date:	31 December 2022
Project Type:	Medium Size Project	GEF Allocation:	US\$ 1,100,000
PPG GEF cost:	US\$ 30,000	PPG co-financing:	N/A
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing:	US\$ 1,177,500	Total Cost*:	\$ 2,277,500
Mid-term Review/eval. (Planned date):	Not Applicable	Terminal Review (planned date):	1 March 2023
Mid-term Review/eval. (Actual date):	Not Applicable	No. of revisions:	1
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	8 August 2022	Date of last Revision:	11 May 2021
Disbursement as of 31 December 2022:	\$ 1,000,000	Date of planned financial closure:	31 December 2023
Date of planned completion:	31 December 2022	Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2023:	US\$ 1,055,000
Total co-financing realized as of 31 December 2022:	US\$ 1,177,500	Actual expenditures entered in Umoja as of 30 June 2023:	US\$ 995,534
Leveraged financing:	US\$ 0		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project background

1. The CBIT project aimed at building on existing MRV of GHG structures expanding its scope to include additional MRV tasks in the NDCs as well as anchoring into the national M&E framework. It was envisaged that having gained the requisite capacities from implementing the CBIT project, Ghana would be in a better position to (a) plan and execute its NDCs regularly; (b) track progress of implementation of climate actions and support received, (c) track progress of achievement of NDC goals at a given time and (d) compile and report on implementation of NDCs in a transparent and sustainable manner.

Review objectives

2. The Terminal Review was undertaken at operational completion of the project to assess project performance and determine outcomes and impacts stemming from the project, including their sustainability. It had two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, EPA and project partners.

Key findings

3. The project originated from Ghana's political interests and was well-suited to its objective. It aligned with the priorities of the Ghanaian government, the GEF Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), UNEP MTS, POW and strategic priorities.
4. The Results Framework was redundant. The objective and outcome statements, while differently formulated, essentially conveyed the same meaning—establishing a better mechanism to monitor and report Ghana's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to meet the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. The specific outputs (1, 2, and 3) provided more detailed expressions of the same concept found in the project's outcome and objective statements.
5. The project's financial management was timely, transparent, and in line with UNEP's policies, ensuring efficient fund allocation for smooth implementation.
6. The project's implementation was noteworthy, demonstrating relevance and conduciveness to achieving its intended outcomes. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) showed proactive leadership, and all stakeholders collaborated in a spirit of cooperation. The partnership between EPA and UNEP was effective, and the management of project resources remained transparent.
7. The no-cost extension was a well-justified and strategic choice that contributed to the project's success.
8. Notably, gender issues were not addressed in any project activity. However, this omission should not be seen as negative since the project's nature did not allow for their inclusion.

Conclusions

9. The project originated from Ghana's political interests and was well-suited to its goals. It aligned with the priorities of the Ghanaian government, the GEF Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), UNEP MTS, POW, and strategic objectives.
10. Despite its redundancy, the Results Framework could still serve as a guiding tool to monitor the project's implementation. This is mainly because the project's focus was not on field-level activities but rather on institutional and normative aspects.

11. Effectively, the project enabled Ghana to participate in the ETF regime for climate action and support under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. The project established an enhanced MRV system, now nationally adopted for reporting on Ghana's NDC implementation. This system is expected to support the country's efforts in fulfilling its commitments under the Paris Agreement. Key NDC sectors have integrated the project's newly developed tools.
12. The project arrangement, including internal staff in the Project Management Unit, bolstered institutional buy-in, national ownership, and long-term institutional memory.
13. The project effectively raised awareness about climate reporting among stakeholders, ensuring their participation in activities tailored to their specific needs and interests. The EPA led all initiatives, and stakeholders were keen to engage due to their genuine interest in the project. The project achievements are solid and sustainable. Both the design and implementation of the project were characterized by participation of involved stakeholders, that eventually led to a high degree of national ownership.

Rating for the Overall Project Performance: Satisfactory

Lessons Learned

<p>Lesson Learned #1: <i>Political and institutional support throughout all project phases.</i></p>	<p>Political and institutional support is a key condition for a GEF/CBIT project to be successful since this kind of projects are implemented within the institutional space of the beneficiary country. Political will to move towards the project objective is reflected on the acceptance of project activities by all governmental institutions, which, consequently, are available to participate pro-actively in the implementation.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>The good and effective collaboration between stakeholders in the project implementation could not happen without an unambiguous political support. As a matter of fact, UNFCCC reporting is first and foremost a political commitment. In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide. Broadly, it applies to all kind of capacity building initiatives, not only those related to climate reporting.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #2: <i>Building on existing procedures and structures / Maximization of efforts.</i></p>	<p>Whenever it is possible, CBIT projects should build on existing procedures and structures, i.e., they should aim at improving existing institutional mechanisms to reduce redundancy and to ensure the sustainability of project achievement. Involvement of relevant climate change focal person in each institution, targeted capacity building of those officers in charge of relevant activities, upgrading and enhancement of existing MRV structures, and generally the avoidance of any double efforts that may constitute a burden on the government administration, represent key elements for both the effectiveness and, to a larger extent, to the sustainability of the achievement.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>The utilization of excel files as tracking tools (an instrument that all public officers can manage properly), the coordination through climate change focal persons, the possibility of calculation of indicators with existing data collection procedures represent the elements that the review has identified to support the formulation of the lesson learned.</p> <p>In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide. Broadly, it applies to all kind of capacity building initiatives, not only those related to climate reporting.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #3: <i>Promote professional growth</i></p>	<p>Creation of awareness of the importance of climate reporting amongst the public officers as a means for career development is, as well, an opportunity to create enthusiasm amongst them.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>Individuals trained on MRV system interviewed on the matter expressed their satisfaction with their involvement in the project and specifically in the trainings. Being recognized as an MRV expert may represent a real career development</p>

	<p>opportunity that is worth to be explored. This perception is a factor that promote their level of engagement in being part of the MRV system established.</p> <p>In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #4: <i>Internal staff in charge of project management</i></p>	<p>CBIT projects for their very nature entail the involvement of many institutional stakeholders. They represent a means for stakeholders to come together and strengthen institutional relationships. Having internal staff in charge of project management is important because they can tailor the project according to their way of doing business, get to know all stakeholders, that later will inform their MRV efforts and will have the recognition of leading agency on the issues at stake.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>During the review, the capacities of the PMU to deal with respect and competence with the variety of actors involved was highlighted by all those interviewed on the matter. The project contributed to the creation of an institutional networks of colleagues that will collaborate in the future.</p> <p>In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide. Broadly, it applies to all kind of capacity building initiatives, not only those related to climate reporting.</p>

Recommendations

<p>Recommendation #1: <i>Data collection and management</i></p>	<p>Data collection and management should be the focus of a potential successor CBIT project.</p>
<p>Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation:</p>	<p>Data collection and data management persist as main problem at the terminal level, i.e., those organizations in charge of collecting primary data from the field. These organizations (ministry agencies at district level, NGOs and CSOs and private companies) do not always have in place reliable and standardized procedures for data collection and management.</p> <p>Note: it is important to note that data collection and management at district level were not included in the scope of the CBIT.</p>
<p>Priority Level:</p>	<p>Critical</p>
<p>Type of Recommendation</p>	<p>Project</p>
<p>Responsibility:</p>	<p>Environmental Protection Agency and UNEP</p>
<p>Proposed implementation time-frame:</p>	<p>During the design and implementation phase of a potential successor CBIT project.</p>
<p>Recommendation #2: <i>Actual dissemination and uptake of Lessons Learned</i></p>	<p>Lessons learned n.2 "<i>Building on existing procedures and structures / Maximization of efforts</i>" and n 3. "<i>Promote professional growth</i>" should not be only disseminated within UNEP and the dedicated CBIT portal https://www.cbitplatform.org. UNEP should make sure that they are up taken during the design phase of CBIT projects in other countries worldwide.</p>
<p>Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation:</p>	<p>The review identifies the two lessons learned as the two most important elements for the success of the project. It is, then, worthwhile to pursue this kind of approach in other CBIT projects.</p>
<p>Priority Level:</p>	<p>Low (opportunity for improvement)</p>
<p>Type of Recommendation</p>	<p>Project level</p>
<p>Responsibility:</p>	<p>UNEP</p>
<p>Proposed implementation time-frame:</p>	<p>During the design and implementation phases of CBIT projects in other countries worldwide.</p>

Recommendation #3: <i>Learning by doing exercise</i>	Activities related to a learning by doing exercise about the correct compilation of the NDC tracking tool within each NDC sector should be included in a potential successor CBIT project.
Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation:	The NDC tracking tool represents a novelty mainstreamed into the workstream of NDC sectors. A learning by doing exercise may be needed to improve the overall quality of the process, from data collection to data upload in the Climate Data Hub.
Priority Level:	Low (opportunity for improvement)
Type of Recommendation	Project level
Responsibility:	Environmental Protection Agency and UNEP
Proposed implementation time-frame:	During all 2023 and during the design and implementation phase of a potential successor CBIT project.

Validation

- The report has been subject to an independent validation exercise performed by UNEP's Evaluation Office. The performance ratings for the project: '*Strengthening Ghana's national capacity for transparency and ambitious climate reporting*', set out in the Conclusions and Recommendations section, have been adjusted as a result. The overall project performance is validated at the **Satisfactory** level.

INTRODUCTION

15. Institutional context

16. The project was funded under the 6th Global Environment Facility (GEF) Operational Programme. It was a Medium Size Project funded by the GEF Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Trust Fund and fell under Climate Change Mitigation GEF Focal Area.

17. The Implementing Agency (IA) was the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), specifically its Climate Change Mitigation Unit, which is part of the Energy and Climate Branch of the UNEP Industry and Economy Division¹. The Executing Agency (EA) was Environmental Protection Agency of Ghana, who led the project execution in the country. The project also counted with numerous project partners. Finally, the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI) as the host ministry for the GEF Political Focal Point, provided policy guidance to the project to meet the national priorities.

18. The project was intended to contribute to Expected Accomplishment(s):

19. Climate stability: Countries increasingly transition to low-emission economic development pathways and enhance their adaptation and resilience to climate change, being its Programme of Work output(s): Outcome 1C: State and non-State actors adopt the enhanced transparency framework arrangements under the Paris Agreement.

20. The GEF's CEO approved the project on 19 November 2018, and UNEP approved it on 14 February 2019. The original planned duration was 36 months. An extension of 11 months was granted; therefore, the actual duration of the project is 47 months.

21. The planned project budget was USD 2,277,500. GEF funding was USD 1,100,000 while planned co-financing contributions accounted for USD 1,177,500.

22. Purpose of the Terminal Review

23. In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy² and the UNEP Programme Manual³, the Terminal Review (TR) was undertaken at operational completion of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The TR had two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, EPA and project partners.

24. The TR is the first review exercise the project underwent. No Mid Term Review was conducted during the implementation.

25. Target audience for the review findings

26. The main intended users of the TR are the GEF Secretariat, i.e., the funding partner; UNEP, i.e., the Implementing Agency, specifically its Climate Change Unit of the Energy and Climate Branch of the Industry and Economy Division, EPA, i.e. the Executing Agency and the project partners.

¹ Previously called "Economy Division".

² <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation-office/policies-and-strategies>

³ <https://wecollaborate.unep.org>

REVIEW METHODS

27. The review was conducted by an external consultant (herein after referred to as the Reviewer). It took place between April and September 2023 under the management of the Climate Change Mitigation Unit, based in Nairobi.
28. In line with UNEP guidance and as per the Terms of Reference, the project was assessed against nine review criteria: (A) Strategic Relevance; (B) Quality of Project Design; (C) Nature of External Context; (D) Effectiveness, which comprises assessments of the availability of outputs, achievement of outcomes and likelihood of impact; (E) Financial Management; (F) Efficiency; (G) Monitoring and Reporting; (H) Sustainability; and (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance. The Terminal Review was requested to rate each criterion on a six point scale as per UNEP guidance.
29. The Quality of Project Design (Annex III) criterion was assessed during the Inception Phase of the Review.
30. The Theory of Change reconstructed utilized during the project preparation phase, was slightly modified during the Inception Phase of the review. The modifications were discussed by the Reviewer with officers belonging to UNEP (Climate Change Mitigation Unit) and the Project Management Unit (PMU) at EPA, i.e. the implementing and executing agencies of the project.
31. In addition to the questions related to the above-mentioned criteria, the Terminal Review answered a set of five additional questions required by the GEF portal. The review framework (Annex II) provides a comprehensive list of questions that the Terminal Review considered during the review organised per review criterion, proposed review indicators, source of data, and methods to answer each of them.
32. The review was theory-based and made use of a utilization-focused and participatory approach. A theory-based review focuses on analysing a project's underlying logic and causal linkages. Projects are built on assumptions on how and why they are supposed to achieve the agreed results through the selected strategy; this set of assumptions constitutes the 'project theory' or 'theory of change'. The review analysed the project theory underpinning the project. In such a way, it was possible to recognize that a multitude of factors and interactions influences a project's effectiveness and seeks to identify those causal factors judged to be most critical to a project's overall success. A utilization-focused approach is based on the principle that reviews should be judged on their usefulness to their intended users. Therefore, they should be planned and conducted in ways that enhance the likely utilization of both the findings and recommendations to inform decisions.
33. The TR process followed a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key project stakeholders. The Reviewer maintained close communication with the PMU and exchange information throughout the terminal review implementation phase in order to increase their ownership of the review findings.
34. The design of the TR included the following tools to collect relevant data: desk review of project documents and reports; and interviews.
35. The MTR was carried out in three phases:
36. **Inception phase – Desk Review**
Dates: 18 April - 22 May 2023
37. The Reviewer consulted the Project documentation and delivered the inception report that was approved by UNEP. The data collection exercise was based on this report, as well as this TR Report.

38. Data collection phase

Dates: 19 June – 7 July 2023

39. To carry out the data collection phase, the Reviewer worked closely with the PMU to define the schedule of meetings with the stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project. Data collection phase included two weeks dedicated to on-line interviews and an in-country mission in Accra.

On-line interviews	Monday 19 – Friday 23 June
On-line interviews	Monday 26 – Friday 30 June
Review Mission in Accra	Monday 3 – Friday 7 July

40. Reporting phase

Dates: 7 July – 15 September 2023

41. The Reviewer delivered the TR Draft Report (21 July) and the TR Report and the TR Comments Table (15 September). The TR Comments Table displays how the TR addressed the comments received (31 August) on the TR Draft Report from UNEP and its partners.

42. Annex IV and Annex V present respectively the list of people interviewed, and the list of documents consulted during the TR.

43. The Reviewer ensured anonymity and confidentiality by not directly mentioning the names of respondents while making quotes. In addition, all responses are reported as aggregate findings without mentioning the source.

44. The TR made use of a "purposeful sampling" to identify stakeholders to interviewed. The sampling was designed in consultation with the project management. The sampling and the consequent schedule of meetings for interviews and focus group discussions took necessarily into account the willingness and availability of stakeholders to meet the Reviewer. The "purposeful sampling" met the needs for the TR. This involved identifying and selecting individuals or groups of individuals who are especially knowledgeable or experienced with a phenomenon of interest. Studying information-rich cases, that is, interviewing people who are well informed about the project and who have a link with it, generates knowledge and deep understanding instead of empirical generalizations, which are typical of statically representative probability sampling.

45. The design of the terminal review does not present any specific limitations in terms of validity to fulfil the review requirements. It is sound and fit the requirements of the terminal review.

46. The Reviewer proposed a design based on qualitative methods there is no relevant quantitative baseline data on indicators of relevance to the stated results. A quantitative approach is consequently neither not needed nor feasible. Finally, because of the nature of the project, mainly normative and institutional, interviews represented an adequate means for the purposes of the review.

THE PROJECT

1.1 Context

47. In 2013, EPA launched the Ghana Climate Ambitious Reporting Program (G-CARP) following the Conference of Parties (COP) to the decision of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate change (UNFCCC) to enhance climate reporting. G-CARP aimed to facilitate the establishment of an integrated climate data management system to support national and international reporting such as GHG and climate policies and measures.
48. The G-CARP has four functional components including (i) institutional arrangement and engagement, (ii) data management (iii) methods and tools (iv) continuous training and capacity development of new and existing teams. The G-CARP has seen progressive improvements through the introduction of reforms such as decentralisation of measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) tasks to line ministries, establishment of online climate change data hub, memorandum of understanding governing collaboration among institutions, continuous training programme, development of Greenhouse Gases (GHG) inventory manual, GHG Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) plan and corporate GHG accounting programme.
49. Ghana actively participates in the international MRV programmes managed by the UNFCCC secretariat. In line with the programmes, Ghana has prepared three National Communications, one Biennial Update Report, its first International Consultation and Analysis process in 2016 and it is currently undertaking a technical assessment of its REDD+ forest reference level. Participating in the international MRV processes has generated a great deal of interest, capacity and in-country experience. Additionally, over the past years, the functionality of the G-CARP has been enhanced in the following areas:
- Data management (adoption of data collection template, climate data hub);
 - Capacity and skills improvement (continuous training, UNFCCC expert review training);
 - Tools development (adoption of national GHG manual and QA/QC guidance)
 - Institutional arrangement (decentralization of tasks, memorandum of understanding).
50. Regardless of the progressive improvements in the G-CARP the system is still facing challenges such as (a) difficulty and slow pace in establishing data sharing platform; (b) poor data access and cost associated with data generation and (c) inadequate awareness on the MRV processes among important line ministries. As every effort to make the G-CARP function efficiently must seek to address the identified challenges. It is also important that the scope of operation of the G-CARP must be expanded alongside to include the new transparency activities such as how to: (a) regularly plan and implement NDC, (b) tracking progress of implementation and effectiveness of climate actions, and (c) tracking the progress of achievement of NDC goals. Also, the new version of the G-CARP system must be integrated into APR system as a way of ensuring its long-term sustainability. In this regard, four areas have been identified for improvements. These areas have the potential to transform the existing MRVs structure into a desirable version that is durable and robust enough to respond to the new reporting regime. The areas related to (a) better data management; (b) choose useful accounting metrics (c) monitoring system and (d) reporting framework.
51. Even though the implementation of various support initiatives has contributed to enabling Ghana to build a strong foundation of its domestic MRV, a lot more is needed to be done to strengthen it further to become formidable, durable and functional in the long-term. This is partly because the existing G-CARP system is biased towards GHG and does not have direct operational linkage with the APR system coordinated by the NDPC. Another challenge is that the information generated from the GHG MRV is not adequately utilised in decision-making

and policy formulation processes. This has come about because of the combined effects of factors such as lack of capacity, poor data systems, poor messaging and communication, systemic institutional inertia and limited political will.

52. Ghana's CBIT proposal was thought as an instrument to contribute to realising the alternative scenario where status quo of the limited scope of the G-CARP is avoided or reduced. By this approach, the CBIT proposal sought to contribute to Ghana's agenda to institute an integrated domestic MRV system capable of efficiently delivering multiple MRV tasks (MRV of GHG, MRV of Actions, MRV of support, adaptation M&E and tracking of progress of NDC goals) as required by the Paris Agreement. The CBIT project, therefore, aimed at building on existing MRV of GHG structures expanding its scope to include additional MRV tasks in the NDCs as well as anchoring into the national M & E framework. It was envisaged that having gained the requisite capacities from implementing the CBIT project, Ghana would be in a better position to (a) plan and execute its NDCs regularly; (b) track progress of implementation of climate actions and support received, (c) track progress of achievement of NDC goals at a given time and (d) compile and report on implementation of NDCs in a transparent and sustainable manner. The CBIT project also sought to entrench the culture of climate reporting within the line ministries so that it is seen as part of the routine work of the ministries. When this is achieved, funding and functionality of the G-CARP will become more sustainable and serve a useful purpose in the country.

1.2 Results Framework

53. The Project Objective was "to strengthen Ghana national capacity for transparency and ambitious reporting by improving on the functionality of the national system and integrate into national M&E framework having identified institutional capacities, opportunities and gaps".

54. The Project Outcome was "NDC targets become a central part of Ghana's system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development framework".

- *Output 1:* An effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions established.
- *Output 2:* A centralized national infrastructure for improved data access and information management established.
- *Output 3:* Five climate change indicators mainstreamed into the medium-term development framework (Yr. 2018-2022)
- *Output 4:* Testing and piloting of domestic transparency framework in Energy and Transport sectors.

1.3 Stakeholders

55. Table 1 presents the stakeholder groups involved in the project.

Table 1: List of institutions and their roles in the project

Category of stakeholders	Ministries, Agencies	Description of roles and functions at the national level	Role in CBIT Project
Public sector - Strategic level climate change institutions	Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation, Office of Vice-President, Finance, Lands and Natural Resources and, Development Partners.	To provide overall policy guidance and determines strategic directions on how climate change integration into broad national development framework should be pursued. Ensure inter-ministry coordination of climate change and facilitate financial and technical resource mobilization to support implementation of climate change activities, as well as provide political authority in order to	Membership of project advisory board will be selected from strategic level institutions to provide oversight of the project progress and implementation of Outputs.

		mobilize efforts at the sectoral level to combat climate change.	
Public sector – Policy Planning, budgeting and coordination institutions	National Development Planning Commission; Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation	These institutions are responsible for development, planning, coordination, monitoring, evaluation and mainstreaming of climate change; Coordination of budget preparation; and formulation of climate change policies.	Membership of project advisory board will be selected from strategic level institutions to provide oversight of the project progress and implementation of Outputs. <i>National Development Planning Commission</i> in particular will be instrumental in Output 3 where climate change indicators are to be mainstreamed into APR system. <i>Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation</i> - Ensuring policy coordination and uptake of the CBIT project results. <i>Ministry of Finance</i> (Real Sector Division which is also the GCF NDA) will also join the Project Advisory Board
Public sector - Implementing institutions Climate change implementation coordination institutions - constitutes the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC)	Parliament, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Works and Housing, Ministry of Finance, Environmental Protection Agency, Energy Commission, Ministry of Transport, Forestry Commission, Water Resources Commission, Ghana Meteorological Agency, National Disaster Management Organization, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Friends of the Earth, Conservation Alliance, Institute for Statistical Social and Economic Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources, National Development Planning Commission etc.	Evolve harmonized climate change programmes from all sectors especially in the key sectors of finance and economic planning, forestry, agriculture, land and water, health, energy and coastal zones management to ensure coherence and building of synergies among these sectors. Source and utilize funding for the implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation activities, Strengthen financial mechanisms for sustainable implementation; Prepare a common Ghanaian position in relation to the on-going Climate Change negotiations. Such a position should as far as possible be consistent and feed adequately into the overall African position, and ultimately the Group of 77 and China but highlighting national areas of difference; Offer strong technical backstopping to the political leadership, Cabinet and Parliament in particular, to share the common African vision on efforts made to combat Climate Change in general and on the African climate platform in particular.	Members of the inter-ministerial committee shall be drawn from this list of stakeholders. There will be three sub-committee on MRV Governance, Data Management, MRV & M&E Integration
Public Sector Monitoring and reporting Institutions	National Development Planning Commission (NDPC)	Monitoring and evaluation of implementation of national development policies and programmes.	Instrumental in output 3 where climate change indicators are to be mainstreamed into APR system.


	Ministry of Environment Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI)/ Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Monitoring and evaluation of implementation of national climate change policy. International reporting and review: National Communications; National GHG Inventory; Biennial Update Reports: International Consultation and Analysis.	Project Executing Agency
	Ministry of Finance	Tracking and reporting domestic and international climate finance.	MRV system for tracking finance and other support under Output 2 of the CBIT project
	KASA (Speak out) Initiative	Kasa has over 100 networks, coalition and partners that are working in 7 thematic areas including environment and climate change. The advantage KASA has is that it has wide variety of membership that represents different interest in the CSO advocacy and media community.	Members of CSOs will be selected to join the project advisory board and the inter-ministerial committee.
	Climate Action Network (CAN), Ghana	CAN, Ghana is a representative of CAN International in Ghana, CAN-Ghana has some experience and insight in the international climate negotiation processes as well as development policy advocacy at the national level.	
	Abantu for Development	Abantu is actively involved in the advocacy for gender dimension of climate change and sustainable development at the international and national levels.	
	Ghana Alliance for clean stoves and fuels	GHACCO aims to influence policies and actions that contribute to vibrant Cookstove industry and sustainable utilization of energy.	
Academia	University of Ghana, University of Development Studies	Under skills and capacity development relevant to climate change and sustainable development in general. They also conduct research into areas where data can be generated to support climate change planning.	

1.4 Project implementation structure and partners

56. The project Implementing Agency (IA) was UNEP, specifically the Climate Change Mitigation unit, which is part of the Energy and Climate Branch of the UNEP Industry and Economy Division. The Executing Agency (EA) was the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which serves as UNFCCC National Focal Point (NFP), under the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI), which is the GEF Focal Point.

57. The institutional arrangement for the implementation of the project is described in figure 1.

Figure 1 - Project institutional arrangements



1.5 Changes in design during implementation

58. The project did not undergo any changes in its design during implementation. A no-cost extension of 11 months was requested to recover the delays in implementation created by the sanitary restrictions put in place by the Government of Ghana to reduce the spread of the COVID-19 in the country.

1.6 Project financing

Table 2 - Expenditure by Outcome

OUTCOME 1	Estimated cost at design	Last budget revision (2021)	Actual Cost/ expenditure (Jun. 2023)	Expenditure ratio (actual/planned)
Output 1	USD 219,500	USD 219,500	USD 208,251	94.5%
Output 2	USD 381,500	USD 381,500	USD 370,251	97.1%
Output 3	USD 289,500	USD 289,500	USD 278,250	96.1%
Output 4	USD 109,500	USD 109,500	USD 98,251	89.7%
Project Management	USD 100,000	USD 100,000	USD 99,998	99.9%
TOTAL	USD 1,100,00	1,100,000	USD 1,055,000	95.9%


Table 3 – Co-financing table

Co-financing (Type/Source)	UNDP and ICAT (UNEP-CCC.) Financing		Government		Total	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grant	927,500 USD	927,500 USD	---	---	927,500 USD	927,500 USD
In-kind	---	---	250,000 USD	250,000 USD	250,000 USD	250,000 USD
Total	927,500 USD	927,500 USD	250,000 USD	250,000 USD	1,177,500 USD	1,177,500 USD

THEORY OF CHANGE AT REVIEW

59. The project intended to change the way monitoring and reporting is conducted. As such, the project does not intend to contribute to any specific changes in any region of the country. It is an institutional project, without any implication on the Ghana's territory and its environment. It is understood that it may contribute to the better management of environmental aspects of development of the country, however such contribution is not assessable by the present review exercise. The Theory of Change (ToC) developed, starting from the ToC formulated during the project preparation phase, by the review exercise is, therefore, limited to the core business of the project, i.e. environmental / climate monitoring and reporting.
60. The ToC of the project illustrates the steps to set up an effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions. The arrangement must have at its core the NDC targets because ultimately it should serve the purpose of tracking the progress of Ghana towards achieving its NDC, to inform the global stock under Article 14 of Paris Agreement.
61. Being a process, led by the national institutions, it is evident that the drivers that may lead to project outcomes and objective have very much to do with the government's will to support centralized reporting and a good collaboration between institutions. Public Private Partnership may also be part of this effort.

Figure 2- Project Theory of Change (reconstructed)⁴



⁴ The Evaluation Office of UNEP notes that this Theory of Change has been amended from the project version and has therefore added the term 'reconstructed'.

62. * This outcome is included as output in the Results Framework of the project. The Review considers that, instead, it is as an outcome.
63. ** This output is not included in the Results Framework of the project.

REVIEW FINDINGS

1.7 Strategic Relevance

1.7.1. Alignment to UNEP MTS, POW and Strategic Priorities

64. The project resulted to be aligned with the UNEP MTS (2022-2025); specifically with its sub-programme on climate action stating that "keeping a clear focus on the Paris Agreement is essential for guiding collective climate action in line with sustainable development" and its Outcome 3: "State and non-state actors adopt the enhanced transparency framework arrangements under the Paris Agreement".
65. The project is also expected to contribute to the achievement of the indicator "number of national, subnational and private-sector actors reporting under the enhanced transparency arrangements of the Paris Agreement with UNEP support" of the climate action sub-programme of the UNEP Programme of work and budget for the biennium 2022–2023.
66. Alignment to UNEP MTS, POW is rated Highly Satisfactory.

1.7.2 Alignment to UNEP/GEF/Donor Strategic Priorities

67. The alignment of the project with the GEF Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) is full. In fact, the project The CBIT has three dimensions: (1) Strengthen national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities; (2) Provide relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement; (3) Assist in the improvement of transparency over time. All three dimensions have been considered during both the design and the implementation phase of the project.
68. The project is as well fully aligned with the UNEP's work on climate action, which is focused on helping countries transition to low-carbon and resource-efficient economies, strengthening environmental governance and law, safeguarding ecosystems, and providing evidence-based data to inform policy decisions.
69. Alignment to UNEP/GEF/Donor Strategic Priorities is rated Highly Satisfactory.

1.7.3 Complementarity with Existing Interventions/ Coherence

70. The project per-se did not present any direct complementarity with other projects implemented at country level in the course of its implementation. However, project achievements are essential to accompany the efforts of Ghana to meet its international commitment towards climate action. Moreover, the project aimed at improving an existing initiative of the country, i.e., the G-CARP.
71. Complementarity with Existing Interventions/ Coherence is rated Highly Satisfactory.

1.7.4 Relevance to Global, Regional, Sub-regional and National Priorities

72. The project was thought, designed and implemented within national institutions. Its national relevance is very high. It intended and (managed to) improve the G-CARP, following a clear political decision made by the Government of Ghana in the frame of its commitment towards UNFCCC.
73. It is commonly understood by stakeholders that an improved national capacity to monitor and report against its own NDC may also be reflected in improvements in the overall decision-making process and implementation of environment / climate related policies.

74. Finally, its noteworthy to mention that the project achievements are also relevant for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of Agenda 2030, specifically to SDGs 13 "Climate Action" and 17 "Partnerships for the Goals".

<p>SDG 13 - Climate Action</p> <p>Target 13.3: Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning;</p> <p>Indicator 13.3.2: Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions.</p>	<p>SDG 17 – Partnerships for the Goals</p> <p>Target 17.14: Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development</p> <p>Indicator 17.14.1: Number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development</p> <p>Target 17.15: Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development</p> <p>17.15.1: Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation</p>
--	---

75. Relevance to Global, Regional, Sub-regional and National Priorities is rated Highly Satisfactory.

Rating for Strategic Relevance: Highly Satisfactory

1.8 Quality of Project Design

76. This section presents a summary of the Project Design Quality. The full assessment is included in annex III.
77. The operating context criterion is rated as Satisfactory. The project document does not identify any likelihood of conflict. Instead, several relevant risks (inertia on institutional buy-in, insufficient institutional coordination, insufficient high –level political will and commitment, data availability and accessibility constraint, limited skill-set, possibility of not finishing the project within 3 years) are identified.
78. The project preparation criterion is rated as Highly Satisfactory. The project document has dedicated and articulated sections to problem and situation analyses. The reasons behind the necessity to implement the project are clear. It has a section dedicated to stakeholder analysis, which, due to the nature of the project, has a focus on institutions. Therefore, gender and minority groupings are not included in that analysis. Finally, it is clearly stated that that most of the stakeholders have been consulted to solicit their views on the project design.
79. The strategic relevance criterion is rated as Satisfactory. The alignment and relevance of the project to the UNEP relevant MTS and POW, to the GEF Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) is clear. The project is relevant for the national environmental priorities and builds on existing governmental institutions.
80. The intended results and causality criterion is rated as Satisfactory. it is easily understandable that the project aims at setting up an effective institutional arrangement that ultimately should serve the purpose of tracking the progress of Ghana towards achieving its NDC, to inform the global stock under Article 14 of Paris Agreement. The project does not foresee impacts on the ground, i.e., on the environmental status of the country.
81. The logical framework and monitoring criterion is rated as Moderately Satisfactory. The intervention logic has some elements of redundancy: (1) The objective and outcome statements, although formulated differently, have the same meaning, i.e. Ghana has a better mechanism in place for monitoring and reporting its NDC to respond to the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement; (2) the set of outputs 1, 2 and 3 is a more articulated

and detailed form to express the same concept conveyed by the formulations of the outcome and objective of the project.

82. The governance and supervision arrangements criterion is rated as Highly Satisfactory. Project Implementation Arrangements of the project document is well-articulated and defines the roles of the Project Advisory Board, UNEP, the Project Management Unit (PMU) and the Inter-ministerial Committee.
83. The partnerships criterion is rated as Highly Satisfactory. List of institutions and their roles in the CBIT project included in the project document. The roles and responsibilities of partners are properly specified and appropriate to their capacities.
84. The learning, communication and outreach criterion is rated as Satisfactory. The project has a clear and adequate knowledge management approach and appropriate methods for communication with key stakeholders.
85. The financial planning criterion is rated as Satisfactory. The budget was adequate at the design stage.
86. The efficiency criterion is rated as Satisfactory. The project was appropriately designed and adapted in relation to the duration. At its core, it is a project that supports directly the government ministries.
87. The risk identification and safeguards criterion is rated as Satisfactory. All risks identified in the project design relate to the institutional nature of the project itself.
88. The sustainability/replication and catalytic effects criterion is effect is rated as Satisfactory. The project design does not entail strategies for scaling up or replication. This is coherent with the nature of the project. It does not implement activities on the ground. It is about setting up a central system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development framework.
89. The identified project design weaknesses/gaps criterion is rated as Satisfactory.

Rating for Quality of Project Design: Satisfactory

1.9 Nature of the External Context

90. No need for any modification to the project design emerged during the implementation. The management of its activities, however, had to deal with two major situations that occurred in Ghana: the outbreak of the worldwide COVID-19 (2020/2022) pandemic and the general elections (December 2020).
91. During the COVID-19 pandemic the Government of Ghana put in place some sanitary restrictions that had an impact on the project, since large gatherings were not allowed too contained the spread of the pandemic. The project switched to an on-line modality to coordinate and implement certain activities. However, implementation of workshops and training sessions that entail the participation of large number of people were not possible.
92. A few months before and after the general elections, activities of ministries faced some slowdowns, as well as it generally happens during electoral period in the country and in other many countries worldwide.

93. The request of the no-cost extension to complete the implementation of project activities is considered as an adequate choice that eventually allow the project achievements.

Rating for Nature of the external context: Satisfactory

1.10 Effectiveness

1.10.1 Availability of Outputs

94. Output 1: Institutional assessment and trainings.⁵

An indicator is not included because the output was not included in the original results framework of the project.

95. *Output 1 was delivered.*

96. A thorough assessment was carried out on the MRV structure to identify strategies for improvement. As a result, new institutions were assigned additional responsibilities and functions within the enhanced architecture. In total, 25-line ministries and their agencies were assessed. Representatives from these institutions, as well as experienced MRV professionals, received training on the updated transparency framework.

97. Specifically, the assessment covered the level of involvement or engagement of the selected institutions in climate change activities; roles and responsibilities of the selected institutions; the processes for policymaking and implementation; data handling and information technology setup, existing capacities (human, institutional) to inform the identification of key gaps and strengths of the institutions.

98. Two tailor-made trainings programmes were organised for 65 newly identified experts in the workings of the MRV system in April 2021. And a four-day refresher training programme for 20 experienced experts on the new requirements introduced by the ETF was conducted virtually in August 2021.

99. Output 2: A centralized national infrastructure for improved data access and information management established.

Indicator: a centralized national infrastructure for improved data access and information management established.

Target: yes

100. *Output 2 was delivered.*

101. The project has effectively created and put into operation a centralized data sharing network, which facilitates prompt and comprehensive climate reporting. Additionally, templates (NDC tracking tools) have been developed with guidance notes for the various sectors responsible for implementing Ghana's Updated NDC, allowing for progress tracking. A verification manual has been established and utilized to verify the information submitted via the templates. The templates and guidance notes have been incorporated into the online climate data hub (<https://climatedatahub.com.gh/>). The NDC tracking tool represents a novelty mainstreamed into the workstream of NDC sectors. The overall quality of its compilation by the sectors has not been yet fully verified.

⁵ Effectiveness is evaluated against the reconstructed Theory of Change. The review considers that *the original output 1 - An effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions established is not an actual output but an outcome* (please refer to section "Theory of Change at Evaluation"). The *reformulated output 1 - institutional assessment and trainings* reflects the actual activities implemented by the project.

102. Output 3: Five climate change indicators mainstreamed into the medium-term development framework (2018-2022).

Indicator: number of climate change indicators mainstreamed into the medium-term development framework (2018-2022)
Target: five (5)

103. *Output 3 was delivered.*

104. In collaboration with the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) and various Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs), the project has created eight climate change indicators for the regular monitoring and reporting of NDC measures. These indicators have been incorporated into the Annual Progress Reporting (APR) system, which is part of the national monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system run by the NDPC. The APR system tracks the progress of Ghana's development agenda through its Metropolitan, Municipal, and District Assemblies. Consultation workshops were held for selected ministries and agencies with 20 participants to develop indicators for the updated NDC. In addition, consultative meetings were organized to promote the visibility and use of the NDC by coordinating key stakeholders in the NDC sectors. Workshops were also conducted for Regional Economic Planning Officers, their assistants, EPA Regional Officers, and Metropolitan Planning Officers in the Northern and Southern regions of Ghana to improve their use of the NDC templates and guidance notes.

105. Instead of 5 indicators, the project developed 8 climate change outcome indicators and, also, 59 outcome/output indicators to respond to 47 climate change actions within the context of the NDC and based on 10 sectors and 19 policies.

106. There were 8 outcome indicators (5 mitigation and 3 adaptation) selected to provide overall progress of Ghana's efforts at achieving its NDCs (table 4).

Table 4 - Outcome indicators developed by the project

Mitigation indicators	Adaptation indicators
- Change in Renewable Energy penetration	- Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected person attributed to disasters per 100,000 population
- Proportion of solid waste properly disposed of major towns/cities	- Proportion of bodies of water with good ambient water quality (water quality index)
- Area of degraded forests restored or rehabilitated	- Average productivity of selected crop (Mt/Ha) (Crop productivity)
- Share of efficient appliances	
- Greenhouse gas emissions	

107. These have been integrated into the national results framework with the alignment clearly defined and are expected to be reported on in the national annual progress report prepared by NDPC. A set of 58 outcome/output indicators (table 5) have been developed to track the implementation of the 47 programme actions in Ghana's updated NDCs document. These outcome/output indicators are expected to be reported on by the 10 sectors involved in the implementation of Ghana's NDCs.

Outcome indicator: Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population
1. Number of districts with functional climatic condition surveillance systems
2. Proportion of prioritised indicators for climate sensitive conditions
3. Number of districts with completeness of reporting on climate sensitive conditions
4. Number of districts with climate change strategies in their plans
5. Number of MMDAs with drainage master plans
6. Length of coastline protected
7. Number of synoptic automatic stations established
8. Number of functional emergency operation centres

Outcome indicator: Proportion of bodies of water with good ambient water quality (Water quality index)
9. Number of basins with integrated water resource management (IWRM) plan
Outcome indicator: Proportion of solid waste properly disposed-off (major towns/cities)
10. Proportion of bodies of water with good ambient water quality (Water quality index)
11. Volume of waste to compost plants
Outcome indicator: Average productivity of selected crop (Mt/Ha) (Crop productivity)
12. Number of districts practicing climate smart agriculture
13. Number of farmers adopting climate smart cropping systems
14. Percentage of Climate-smart technologies deployed
15. Number of farmers adopting climate smart livestock and fisheries production
Outcome indicator: Area of degraded forests restored or rehabilitated
16. Hectares of degraded woodlands restored
17. Hectares of degraded forest restored
18. Hectares of trees planted on farms lands
19. Number of CREMAs established
Outcome indicator: Share of efficient appliances
20. Number of efficient residential refrigerators
21. Number of efficient ACs in Public and Commercial buildings
22. Number of efficient light bulbs/lamps in homes
23. Number of efficient light bulbs in public and commercial buildings
24. Number of residential efficient air conditioners
Outcome indicator: Change in Renewable Energy (RE) penetration
25. Amount of nuclear energy in electricity generation mix
26. Total installed capacity of distributed solar PV
27. Number of solar mini grids established
28. Total installed utility-scale solar electricity capacity
29. Total installed hydro capacity
30. Total utility scale wind power capacity
Outcome indicator: Greenhouse gas emissions
31. Number of institutional biogas facilities
32. Number of policy and regulatory framework for green and resilient infrastructure
33. Percentage of gas flared in the oil and gas fields
34. Number of Districts implementing post-harvest storage and food and forest products processing systems
35. Number of post-harvest management interventions in a district
36. Hectares of avoided forest burning
37. Amount of emission from REDD+ programme
38. Length of boundaries of wildlife protected areas and GSBA secured and maintained
39. Hectares of wildlife corridor protected
40. Number of visitors to ecotourism sites
41. Number of ecotourism infrastructure developed within protected areas, zoos and Ramsar sites
42. Hectares of PAs and GSBA's earmarked for avoided emissions and biodiversity / carbon trading programs
43. Length of rail lines constructed
44. Number of operational locomotives
45. Number of buses with efficient diesel engines
46. Length of non-motorized transports lanes constructed
47. Number of overaged import cars restricted
48. Number electric vehicles in use
49. Amount of energy intensity used in producing and distributing water
50. Total emissions savings from use of green cooling systems
51. Change in energy demand by steel industry
52. Percentage of thermal plants that run on natural gas as primary fuel
53. Total capacity of converted combined thermal plants
54. Percentage of households adopting LPG
55. Number of households adopting improved biomass stoves
56. Percentage of commercial charcoal production individuals using innovative and efficient wood carbonization kilns
57. Hectares of woodlots established
58. Number of solar lanterns distributed to households

108. Output 4: Testing and piloting of domestic transparency framework in Energy and Transport sectors.

Indicator: domestic transparency framework in Energy and Transport sectors tested and piloted
Target: yes

109. *Output 4 was delivered.*

110. The project completed the piloting of the enhanced MRV system in the energy, agriculture and transport sectors. The project is currently, as per the review, implementing the use of the NDC templates and other monitoring tools to track and report the progress of implementing the actions in the agriculture energy and transport sectors. The project also piloted the use of MRV tools in the solar, compost, oil palm, rice cultivation and independent power plants.

111. Availability of outputs is rated Satisfactory.

1.10.2 Achievement of Project Outcomes

112. Outcome 1: NDC targets become a central part of Ghana's system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development.

Indicator 1: number of climate change indicators for tracking progress of NDC goals included in the national M&E result framework of the medium-term development being used by line ministries.
Target: 5

113. The target of the indicator has been achieved. However, as mentioned in the Annex III "Quality of project design", the indicator is already used to define the achievement of project output 3. Consequently, the achievement of the target is not considered as a relevant element for the achievement at outcome level.

Indicator 2: Number of ministries/regulators piloting the full-package of MRV of GHG, Action and Support
Target: 2 Ministries and 1 Regulator

114. The Ministry of Energy and the Regulator (Energy Commission) are piloting/piloted the MRV package on rooftop solar PV installation for selected commerce and households. The Ministry of Sanitation is piloting/piloted the MRV package on 4 composting plants in 4 different regions.

115. *Outcome 1 was achieved.* In fact, the institutional and technical arrangements put in place with the support of the project and the interviews done during the data collection phase demonstrated that NDC target are fully integrated in the Ghana's system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development.

116. Outcome 2: An effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions is established⁶.

An indicator is not included because the outcome was not included in the original results framework of the project.

117. The review of project deliverables, and the interviews conducted by the Reviewer, demonstrated that an effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions is established. Relevant sectors are working in a collaborative way, under the

⁶ An indicator is not included because the output was not included in the original results framework of the project.

sector leadership of relevant Ministries of the Government of Ghana and under the technical coordination of EPA.

118. *Outcome 2 was achieved.* The Ghana Climate Ambitious Reporting Program has been effectively improved and upgraded.

119. Achievement of project outcomes is rated as Satisfactory.

1.10.2 Achievement of Likelihood of Impact

120. Project objective: to strengthen Ghana national capacity for transparency and ambitious reporting by improving on the functionality of the national system and integrate into national M&E framework having identified institutional capacities, opportunities, and gaps.

Indicator 1: Domestic MRV system integrated to M&E framework established and in operation.

Target: A Domestic MRV system integrated to M&E framework established and in operation.

A domestic MRV system (the improved and upgraded C-GARP) has been integrated into M&E framework it is in operation, run by the NDPC. The C-GARP now informs the Annual Progress Report of the Implementation of the Medium-Term National Development.

Indicator 2: Number of public and private organizations that have adopted and use MRV template to report progress of sector NDC actions.

Target: 7 inline ministries and 3 private organizations.

121. The templates for tracking of NDC actions have been developed and shared with 7 ministries (Energy and Industry, Transport, Agriculture, Climate services and Early Warning System, Health, Forestry, and Gender), and 3 private organisations (Volta River Authority, Ghana Water Company and Bui Power Authority). Additionally, the guidance notes accompanying the use of the data templates have been prepared and published. These institutions have been trained on how to make use of the data template.

122. *The project demonstrated to have achieved its main objective.* It has actually supported clarity and tracking of Ghana's progress towards achieving its NDC, to inform the global stock take under Article 14 of the Paris Agreement. According to the stakeholders interviewed on the matter, the project has achieved its objective, and no specific gaps or problems related to the system established emerged.

123. Although the efforts of the project, there are problems that may be referred to as structural problems that characterized the work of data collection and data management within the terminals of the sectors that operate at field level (public and private companies, municipalities, public agencies, and district directorates of Government ministries). Their capacities, in terms of M&E skills and knowledge and in terms of availability of resources, may not always be there, data may not be always collected and managed in a systematic way. These problems may affect the quality of data that informs the MRV efforts of each sector. Addressing these problems was beyond the scope of the project: the project did not deal with primary data collection and management at field level.

124. Achievement of Likelihood of Impact is rated Satisfactory.

Rating for Effectiveness: Satisfactory

1.11 Financial Management

1.11.1 Adherence to UNEP's Financial Policies and Procedures

125. Quarterly financial reports were produced regularly: the review of project documents and records showed that regular expenditure reports were submitted in a timely manner and the expenditures were within the approved budget lines.
126. The review found that the procurement of goods and services was done through transparent tendering processes. In those cases, when tenders were not announced for service providers, the justification was given and relevant permissions were obtained from the PSC and UNEP.
127. The project undergone two independent financial audits respectively in 2021 and 2022. Both recognized the financial reports give a true and fair view of the financial position of the project implementation.
128. Adherence to UNEP's Financial Policies and Procedures is rated Satisfactory.

1.11.2 Completeness of Financial Information

129. The project's financial management is complete. The detailed project budget was developed per output thus reporting was following expenditure per output, too.
130. Financial management did not have any negative influence on the actual implementation of project activities. The flow of funds between UNEP, EPA and Contractors did not encounter any problem and allowed for a smooth implementation of project activities.

Table 5 - Expenditure by Outcome (as per June 30, 2023)

OUTCOME 1	Estimated cost at design	Last budget revision (2021)	Actual Cost/ expenditure	Expenditure ratio (actual/planned)
Output 1	USD 219,500	USD 219,500	USD 208,251	94.5%
Output 2	USD 381,500	USD 381,500	USD 370,251	97.1%
Output 3	USD 289,500	USD 289,500	USD 278,250	96.1%
Output 4	USD 109,500	USD 109,500	USD 98,251	89.7%
Project Management	USD 100,000	USD 100,000	USD 99,998	99.9%
TOTAL	USD 1,100,00	USD 1,100,000	USD 1,055,000	95.9%

Table 6 – Co-financing table

Co-financing (Type/Source)	UNDP and ICAT (UNEP-CCC.) Financing		Government		Total	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grant	927,500 USD	927,500 USD	---	---	927,500 USD	927,500 USD
In-kind	---	---	250,000 USD	250,000 USD	250,000 USD	250,000 USD
Total	927,500 USD	927,500 USD	250,000 USD	250,000 USD	1,177,500 USD	1,177,500 USD

131. The secured co-financing equalled the level of planned co-financing.
132. Completeness of Financial Information is rated Satisfactory.

1.11.3 Communication between Finance and Project Management Staff

133. Communication between the UNEP Climate Change Mitigation Unit and EPA PMU was regular with mutual respect for the respective roles. Financial reports and advance requests were submitted by EPA timely so that activities could be financial without any impediment.
134. Communication between Finance and Project Management Staff is rated Satisfactory.

Rating for Financial Management: Satisfactory

1.12 Efficiency

135. The project arrangement as outlined in the project document demonstrated to be effective in delivering the expected outputs: the project was managed by EPA permanent staff and involved in its Project Steering Committee officers of relevant institutions to make sure that implementation was always adherent to the overall objective of the project. Satisfaction about the work of the Project Steering Committee has been expressed by all stakeholders interviewed on the matter. It is important to note that originally the project document foresaw that a dedicated project manager should have been appointed to run the project.
136. The project was implemented in an efficient way. Activities were led by the EPA. The agency was in charge of contracting consultants who later who have worked in a consultative way with all relevant stakeholders. In this way, the PMU made sure that deliverables of the project were robust from the technical point of view and accepted by all those involved.
137. The decision to appoint internal staff to work within the Project Management Unit is regarded by the review as an element of efficiency: it boosted the institutional buy-in of project activities and results, strengthen the national ownership and created institutional memory that remain after project completion.
138. Project funds and activities were delivered smoothly. Implementation did not incur in any substantial problem according to project available reports and interviews.
139. The breakout of the COVID-19 pandemic did not make necessary to change any part of the project design. To deal with the pandemic, the project moved to an on-line modality to coordinate and implement certain activities. However, implementation of workshops and training sessions were not possible: the request for a no-cost extension was necessary.

Rating for Efficiency: Satisfactory

1.13 Monitoring and Reporting

1.13.1 Monitoring Design and Budgeting

140. Dedicate budget and work plan to M&E was included as annex in the project document. Most of M&E activities included fell under the responsibility of the PMU. Consultants are requested only the audits and, the Mid Term Review (marked as facultative) the Terminal Review. The M&E budget and work plan demonstrated to be sufficient for the M&E needs of the project.
141. Monitoring Design and Budgeting is rated as Satisfactory.

1.13.2 Monitoring of Project Implementation

142. Project implementation was well monitored. Actually, because of its nature, the project did not present any challenges in terms of M&E. In general terms, project activities entailed the delivery of project outputs through a participatory process with project stakeholders, that in occasions were led by consultant recruited on an *ad-hoc* basis. The process was therefore easily monitored.
143. The results framework, although characterized by certain flaws represented an effective tool to guide the monitoring of project implementation.

144. *GEF Portal question 1: What was the performance at the project's completion against Core Indicator Targets? (For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided).*

145. The question is not applicable to the project under review because it was approved under the GEF-6 cycle, which did not include Core Indicators. In fact, the CBIT initiative funds projects with the aim at (1) strengthening national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities; (2) providing relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Agreement; and (3) assist in the improvement of transparency over time. Instead, the GEF Core Indicators are related to global environmental benefits, i.e. actual changes on the environment (e.g. Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (million metric tons of CO₂e), etc.)

146. Monitoring of Project Implementation is rated as Satisfactory.

1.13.3 Project Reporting

147. The project formulated four Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), which were informed by two progress reports per year. It also produced a final summary report. The reports were based on UNEP templates.
148. The PIRs provide a clear, honest and transparent overview of the project status at the different stages of its implementation. The progress of project implementation is described against the results framework. However, there would have been room for more details related to each output so for a reader to have a more comprehensive view on the project status. Information on gender mainstreaming, co-finance, stakeholder engagement, environmental and social safeguards management, and knowledge management is also well presented. The well-compiled PIRs represent an element that promotes transparency and accountability. Through reading the PIRs the history of the project can be reconstructed.

149. Reporting is rated as Satisfactory.

Rating for Monitoring and Reporting: Satisfactory

1.14 Sustainability

1.14.1 Socio-political Sustainability

150. The review did not identify an there any social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project results and the progress towards impact.
151. The system is being utilized by the various stakeholders who participated in the project and who are involved in the NDC reporting inter-institutional mechanism.
152. Socio-political Sustainability is rated as Highly Likely.

1.14.2 Financial Sustainability

153. The results of the project are mainstreamed in the routine work of the stakeholders involved. Data collection and reporting mechanisms exist within each institution involved in the project. No concerns about the financial sustainability of project s results have been raised by any of the stakeholders interviewed on the matter.
154. Some concerns related to the possibility to check on the ground the raw data coming from the different entities that belong to each sector. Governmental agencies may not have at their disposal the necessary financial resources to perform the ground proof of raw data. However, addressing this problem was not in scope of the project, which had a clear focus on data reporting.
155. Finally, it is important to highlight that the project paid for the fees to have the Climate Data Hub hosted in a server on a cloud. The Data Hub is built with an open-source software. Therefore, EPA will have only to pay annual fees to the server provider after 2026: it does not represent a financial concern for the project sustainability.
156. Financial Sustainability is rated as High Likely

1.14.3 Institutional Sustainability

157. The project strengthened an existing system, which included many relevant new features, to support Ghana in its climate-related reporting. The system promotes for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge.
158. All interviews on the matter demonstrated that all institutions are committed in pursued a better climate reporting and they already using the tools that constitute the system.
159. The two tailor-made trainings programmes organised for 65 newly identified experts in the workings of the MRV system generated enthusiasm within the participants. In their views, getting knowledgeable about climate change reporting constitute a way to improve their overall professional status. Being recognized as an MRV expert may represent a real career development opportunity that is worth to be explored. This perception is a factor that promote their level of engagement in being part of the MRV system established.
160. The project was an institutional project stemming from real needs identified by the Government of Ghana. There is consensus amongst all interviewees that the achievements of the project will be sustained in the short, medium, and long term.
161. Institutional Sustainability is rated as Highly Likely.

Rating for Sustainability: Highly Likely

1.15 Factors Affecting Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues

1.15.1 Preparation and Readiness

162. No major measures were taken neither to address weaknesses in the project design nor to respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In fact, the design does not present any major weaknesses and no changes occurred between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation.
163. Preparation and Readiness is rated Satisfactory.

1.15.2 Quality of Project Management and Supervision

164. The PMU managed the flow of information to UNEP, the Project Steering Committee and project partners. According to all PSC member interviewed on the matter, the information was timely provided by the PMU: members participated in Project Steering Committee well informed about the project progress status and, consequently, they were able to take well-informed decisions. The Project Steering Committee could provide its leadership effectively. However, the project implementation adhered substantially to the project document, with the exception of the no-cost extension, no other adaptive decisions were made.
165. Finally, UNEP supported the PMU mainly through the revision of the narrative and financial reports that allowed the disbursement of cash advances for project implementation. As already mentioned, the flow of funds from UNEP to EPA occurred without any problems.
166. Quality of Project Management and Supervision is rated Satisfactory.

1.15.3 Stakeholders Participation and Cooperation

167. The initiative was an institutional project that foresaw the participation of different ministries, public organizations and few non-governmental organizations. All activities were led by the EPA and the collaboration with stakeholders was made possible by their own interest in participating in the project, whenever their participation was judged relevant. In fact, the Paris Agreement is an international commitment and the necessity to comply with the NDC reporting requirements is well understood by all stakeholders interviewed during the review.
168. The Project Steering Committee included members from key ministries and the targeting of public officers for training focused on those officers in charge of data collecting, management and reporting. Their involvement fit naturally well with the requirements of the reporting system the project established. The idea was to target those officers already tasked with climate reporting responsibilities.

169. *GEF Portal question 2: What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR?*

170. A Mid Term Review was not conducted (it was marked as optional in the project document). The necessity for the PMU to work with key stakeholders that were already working in the climate change space and where possible to expand participation to engage with new actors was already included in the project document, specifically in its section dedicated to stakeholders' engagement. The project also created awareness on climate reporting among stakeholders in the line ministries and the private sector, specifically within some units and departments of institutions that previous were not dealing with climate change issues.

171. Stakeholders Participation and Cooperation is rated Satisfactorily.

1.15.4 Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity

172. The nature of the project did not leave much room to EPA for mainstreaming human rights and gender equity in the implementation and in the results of the project.
173. The project did work with staff belonging to the institutions / organizations involved in the climate reporting space in Ghana. The participation of men and women in the implementation of the initiative was conditional on their roles in the respective institutions. The PMU could plan otherwise; a different targeting, which was not based on the actual roles of the employees of the institutions involved, would not have made sense.

174. Finally, the nature of the project outputs and outcome is gender neutral.

175. *GEF Portal question 3: Were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas*

176. Not apply.

177. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity is rated Satisfactory.

1.15.5. Environmental and Social Safeguards

178. The project adhered to the environmental and social safeguards laid out in UNEP policy. It was correctly rated at the "Low" safeguard risk category as it mainly focused on normative issues, i.e., institutional capacity building toward improved reporting on NDC.

179. *GEF Portal question 4: What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval?*

180. The Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note screening exercise performed by UNEP's Safeguards Unit rated this project at "Low" risk. It was reported to the Reviewer that this is the case for all UNEP CBIT projects, since they focus mainly on normative work and capacity building. The review agrees with such consideration.

181. Environmental and Social Safeguards is rated Satisfactory.

1.15.6 Country Ownership and Driven-ness

182. The project stemmed from an institutional need of the Ghana and was implemented within its government institutions. The project set up an improved system for MRV purposes that is adopted at national level to report against the implementation of the Ghanaian NDC. The system is expected to accompany the national efforts related to its commitments in relation to the Paris Agreement.

183. Country Ownership and Driven-ness is rated as Highly Satisfactory.

1.15.7 Communication and Public Awareness

184. The project employed a media outreach specialist, who assisted a communication specialist to develop knowledge products such as publications, stories, videos and reels which have been shared on various platforms both locally and internationally. The idea behind the recruitment of a media outreach specialist was to promote transparency by informing the general public about the project. This kind of activity is judged as positive in terms of accountability and transparency, however it did not play any role in delivering project outputs and achieving its outcomes.

185. Instead, according to the interviews, the work done by the communication specialist, who support the actual dissemination of the assessment on Ghana's Climate Ambitious Reporting Programme was a key element for the project success as it promoted a common understanding of its findings and an actual uptake of its recommendations.

186. *GEF Portal question 5: What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions?*

187. The project at its core is about knowledge management. The Climate Data Hub, the manual and the NDC tracking tools represent the main tool developed by the project to system

for MRV purposes that is adopted at national level to report against the implementation of the Ghanaian NDC. The project did not face any major challenge in deliver these tools.

188. Communication and Public Awareness is rated as Highly Satisfactory.

Rating for Factors Affecting Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues: Highly Satisfactory

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1.16 Conclusions

189. The project stemmed from a political interest of Ghana. The project was relevant in its scope and objective. It was aligned to the priorities of Ghana Government, the GEF Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), UNEP MTS, POW and strategic priorities.
190. The project effectively supported Ghana to participated in the ETF regime for climate action and support under Article 13 introduced by the Paris Agreement
191. The way, in which it was implemented demonstrated to be pertinent and conducive to the expected project achievements. The implementation of the project was characterized by proactive leadership of EPA, collaboration spirit from all stakeholders involved, effective working relations between EPA and UNEP, and transparent management of project resources.
192. The intervention logic, visualized through the Results Framework, was redundant. The objective and outcome statements, although formulated differently, had the same meaning, i.e. a better mechanism in place for monitoring and reporting its NDC to respond to the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. The set of outputs 1, 2 and 3 is a more articulated and detailed form to express the same concept conveyed by the formulations of the outcome and objective of the project.
193. Although its redundancy, the Results Framework could be used to guide and monitor the implementation of the project. This is partly due also to the nature of the project, which did not entail activities at field level, being its focus on institutional and normative levels.
194. The project was successful in achieving its objective: the improved and upgraded C-GARP informs the Annual Progress Report of the Implementation of the Medium-Term National Development. The CBIT project has actually supported clarity, transparency and tracking of Ghana's progress towards achieving its NDC, to inform the global stock take under Article 14 of the Paris Agreement.
195. The problems that remain do not relate were beyond the scope of the project itself. These may be referred to as structural problems that characterized the work of data collection and data management within public and private companies, municipalities, public agencies, and district directorates of Government ministries. Their capacities, in terms of M&E skills and knowledge and in terms of availability of resources, may not always be there, data may not be collected and managed in a systematic way. These problems may affect the quality of data that informs the MRV efforts of each sector.
196. The financial management of the project was timely, transparent and adherent to the UNEP's financial policies and procedures. As a result, the project follow of funds from UNEP to EPA was efficient and effective allowing a smooth implementation of the activities.
197. The project arrangement as outlined in the project document demonstrated to be effective in delivering the expected outputs. The decision to appoint internal staff to work within the Project Management Unit boosted the institutional buy-in of project activities and results, strengthen the national ownership and created institutional memory that remain after project completion.
198. The TR regards the request and approval of the no-cost extension as a well justified and strategic choice that made the project achievements possible.
199. The review considers that the project achievements are solid and sustainable in the short, medium and long term. Both the design and implementation of the project were

characterized by participation of involved stakeholders, that eventually led to a high degree of national ownership.

200. The project also created awareness on climate reporting among project stakeholders, whose participation in project activities was well tailored to their specific needs and interests. All activities were led by the EPA and the collaboration with stakeholders was made possible by their own interest in participating in the project.
201. The project set up an improved system for MRV purposes that is adopted at national level to report against the implementation of the Ghanaian NDC. The system is expected to accompany the national efforts related to its commitments in relation to the Paris Agreement. Relevant NDC sectors have adopted the new tools developed by the project.
202. Finally, it is important to state that gender issues were not addressed by any project activity. This element should not be considered as negative: the nature of the project did not leave room for that.

1.17 Summary of project findings and ratings

203. The table below provides a summary of the ratings and finding discussed in Chapter 0.

UNEP Evaluation Office Validation of Performance Ratings:

The UNEP Evaluation Office formally quality assesses (see Annex XI) management led Terminal Review reports and validates the performance ratings therein by ensuring that the performance judgments made are consistent with evidence presented in the Review report and in-line with the performance standards set out for independent evaluations.

The Evaluation Office assesses a Terminal Review report in the same way as it assesses the initial draft of a Terminal Evaluation report. It applies the following assumptions in its validation process:

- That what is being assessed is the contents of the report and the extent to which it makes a consistent and justifiable case for the performance ratings it records.
- That the consultant has, within the report, presented all the evidence that was made available to them.
- That the Review has been based on a robust Theory of Change, reconstructed where necessary, which reflects UNEP's definitions at all levels of results.
- That the project team and key stakeholders have already reviewed a draft version of the report and provided substantive comments and made factual corrections to the Review Consultant, who has responded to them. The Evaluation Office assumes, therefore, that it has received the Final (revised) version of the report.

In this instance the Evaluation Office validates the overall project performance rating at the '**Satisfactory**' level.

Table 7. Summary of project findings and ratings

Criterion	Summary assessment	Rating	Justification for any ratings’ changes due to validation (to be completed by the UNEP Evaluation Office – EOU)	EOU Validated Rating
Strategic Relevance		Highly Satisfactory		Highly Satisfactory
1. Alignment to UNEP MTS, POW and Strategic Priorities	The project is aligned with the UNEP MTS (2022-2025); specifically with Outcome 3“State and non-state actors adopt the enhanced transparency framework arrangements under the Paris Agreement” of its sub-programme on climate action	Highly Satisfactory	Rating validated.	Highly Satisfactory
2. Alignment to UNEP Donor/GEF/Partner strategic priorities	The alignment of the project with the GEF Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) is full.	Highly Satisfactory	Rating validated.	Highly Satisfactory
3. Relevance to global, regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities	The project relevant for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of Agenda 2030, specifically to SDGs 13 “Climate Action” and 17 “Partnerships for the Goals”.	Highly Satisfactory	Rating validated.	Highly Satisfactory
4. Complementarity with existing interventions/ Coherence	The project aimed at improving an existing initiative of the Government of Ghana, i.e., the G-CARP.	Highly Satisfactory	Para 70 states ‘The project per-se did not present any direct complementarity with other projects implemented at country level in the course of its implementation’. Beneficial collaboration with other initiatives is a requirement for a Highly Satisfactory rating. The Evaluation Office validates this rating as Satisfactory.	Satisfactory
Quality of Project Design	<i>Refer to Annex III Assessment of Project Design Quality</i>	Satisfactory		Satisfactory
Nature of External Context	No need for any modification to the project design emerged during the implementation. The request of the no-cost extension (due to the COVID-19 pandemic) to complete the implementation of project activities is considered as an adequate choice that eventually allow the project achievements.	Satisfactory	Rating validated, although this criterion is assigned a rating in terms of the ‘favourability’ of the external context.	Favourable
Effectiveness		Satisfactory		Satisfactory
1. Availability of outputs	All outputs were delivered.	Satisfactory	Rating validated.	Satisfactory
2. Achievement of project outcomes	All outcomes were achieved.	Satisfactory	Rating validated.	Satisfactory

Criterion	Summary assessment	Rating	Justification for any ratings’ changes due to validation (to be completed by the UNEP Evaluation Office – EOU)	EOU Validated Rating
3. Likelihood of impact	The objective of the project was achieved.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	The objective in the TOC (fig 2) is ‘The CBIT project will support clarity and tracking of Ghana’s progress towards achieving its NDC, to inform the global stock take under Article 14 of the Paris Agreement’. A key assumption that the monitoring data informing the tracking of progress was of good quality and reliable etc. is missing from the analysis. Given paras 123 and 195, which indicates that there are serious shortcomings in the data collection capacity (‘these problems may affect the quality of data that informs the MRV efforts of each sector’), this assumption would have limited the assessment of the likelihood of impact. The Evaluation Office validates this rating as Moderately Likely.	Moderately Likely
Financial Management		Satisfactory		Satisfactory
1. Adherence to UNEP’s financial policies and procedures	Project management adhered to UNEP’s financial policies and procedures.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>
2. Completeness of project financial information	Financial information was complete and timely provided by EPA to UNEP.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>
3. Communication between finance and project management staff	Communication between the UNEP Climate Change Mitigation Unit and EPA PMU was regular with mutual respect for the respective roles.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>
Efficiency	The project arrangement as outlined in the project document demonstrated to be effective in delivering the expected outputs. The PMU made sure that deliverables of the project were robust from the technical point of view and accepted by all those involved.	Satisfactory	Rating validated.	Satisfactory
Monitoring and Reporting		Satisfactory		Satisfactory
1. Monitoring design and budgeting	The M&E budget and work plan demonstrated to be sufficient for the M&E needs of the project.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>

Criterion	Summary assessment	Rating	Justification for any ratings’ changes due to validation (to be completed by the UNEP Evaluation Office – EOU)	EOU Validated Rating
2. Monitoring of project implementation	Project implementation was well monitored. The results framework, although characterized by certain flaws represented an effective tool to guide the monitoring of project implementation.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	Satisfactory
3. Project reporting	The PIRs provide a clear, honest and transparent overview of the project status at the different stages of its implementation. The progress of project implementation is described against the results framework.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	Satisfactory
Sustainability		Highly likely	Based on an aggregation of the sub-categories below. The rating for lowest sub-criterion is applied as these are regarded as limiting factors.	Likely
1. Socio-political sustainability	The system established by the project is being utilized by the various stakeholders who participated in the project and who are involved in the NDC reporting inter-institutional mechanism.	<i>Highly likely</i>	Rating validated.	Highly Likely
2. Financial sustainability	The results of the project are mainstreamed in the routine work of the stakeholders involved. The Climate Data Hub is built with an open-source software. To maintain the system operative in the long-term, there is only an additional cost which is the annual payment server provider after 2026 that hosts the Data Hub.	<i>Highly likely</i>	Rating validated.	Highly Likely
3. Institutional sustainability	The project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date.	<i>Highly likely</i>	There is an institutional capacity weakness that affects this project through the <u>assumption</u> that the data entering the system and informing decision making is reliable and of good quality. This Review report suggest (paras 123 and 195) that this necessary capacity, does not exist. This assumption should have been included in the TOC analysis. While it is recognised that building this capacity was not within the scope of this project, the likelihood of long-lasting impact is affected by that institutional weakness. The Evaluation Office validates this rating at Likely.	Likely
Factors Affecting Performance		Satisfactory		Satisfactory

Criterion	Summary assessment	Rating	Justification for any ratings’ changes due to validation (to be completed by the UNEP Evaluation Office – EOU)	EOU Validated Rating
1. Preparation and readiness	The design does not present any major weaknesses and no changes occurred between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>
2. Quality of project management and supervision	The PMU managed the flow of information to UNEP, the Project Steering Committee and project partners. The Project Steering Committee could provide its leadership effectively. However, the project implementation adhered substantially to the project document, except for the no-cost extension, no other adaptive decisions were made.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>
2.1 UNEP / Implementing Agency:	UNEP primarily assisted the PMU by reviewing timely both the narrative and financial reports, which facilitated the smooth release of cash advances for project implementation.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>
2.2 Partners / Executing Agency:	The project implementation closely followed the project document, and aside from the no-cost extension, no other adaptive decisions were made. The PMU effectively handled the communication flow with UNEP, the Project Steering Committee, and efficiently coordinated activities with project partners.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>
3. Stakeholders’ participation and cooperation	The targeting of public officers for training focused on those officers in charge of data reporting. Their involvement fit naturally well with the requirements of the climate reporting system the project established.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	<i>Satisfactory</i>

Criterion	Summary assessment	Rating	Justification for any ratings' changes due to validation (to be completed by the UNEP Evaluation Office – EOU)	EOU Validated Rating
4. Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality	The nature of the project did not leave much room to EPA for mainstreaming human rights and gender equity in the implementation and in the results of the project.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<p>Para 78 on project design states that: ... 'due to the nature of the project, has a focus on institutions. Therefore, gender and minority groupings are not included in that analysis'.</p> <p>However, Abantu for Development is listed in Table 1 Stakeholder List as a CSO member in the inter-ministerial committee. Abantu is described as being: 'actively involved in the advocacy for gender dimension of climate change and sustainable development at the international and national levels'. The inclusion of Abantu suggests the project did anticipate some gender dimensions associated with the project. The report also states (para 148) that the PIRs reported on 'gender mainstreaming', yet this is not elaborated upon during the Review report.</p> <p>Based on the proposed inclusion of Abantu as a member of the inter-ministerial committee, but apparent exclusion of that CSO during project implementation, the Evaluation Office validates this rating as Moderately Satisfactory.</p>	Moderately Satisfactory
5. Environmental and social safeguards	The project adhered to the environmental and social safeguards laid out in UNEP policy. It was correctly rated at the "Low" safeguard risk category as it mainly focused on normative issues, i.e., institutional capacity building toward improved reporting on NDC.	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	Satisfactory
6. Country ownership and driven-ness	An improved system for MRV purposes is adopted at national level to report against the implementation of the Ghanaian NDC and will accompany the national efforts related to its commitments in relation to the Paris Agreement.	<i>Highly Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	Highly Satisfactory
7. Communication and public awareness	The actual dissemination of the assessment on Ghana's Climate Ambitious Reporting Programme was a key element for the project success as it promoted a common understanding of its findings and an actual uptake of its recommendations.	<i>Highly Satisfactory</i>	Rating validated.	Highly Satisfactory

Criterion	Summary assessment	Rating	Justification for any ratings’ changes due to validation (to be completed by the UNEP Evaluation Office – EOU)	EOU Validated Rating
Overall Project Performance Rating		Satisfactory		Satisfactory

1.18 Lessons learned

<p>Lesson Learned #1: <i>Political and institutional support throughout all project phases.</i></p>	<p>Political and institutional support is a key condition for a GEF/CBIT project to be successful since this kind of projects are implemented within the institutional space of the beneficiary country. Political will to move towards the project objective is reflected on the acceptance of project activities by all governmental institutions, which, consequently, are available to participate pro-actively in the implementation.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>The good and effective collaboration between stakeholders in the project implementation could not happen without an unambiguous political support. As a matter of fact, UNFCCC reporting is first and foremost a political commitment.</p> <p>In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide. Broadly, it applies to all kind of capacity building initiatives, not only those related to climate reporting.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #2: <i>Building on existing procedures and structures / Maximization of efforts.</i></p>	<p>Whenever it is possible, CBIT projects should build on existing procedures and structures, i.e., they should aim at improving existing institutional mechanisms to reduce redundancy and to ensure the sustainability of project achievement. Involvement of relevant climate change focal person in each institution, targeted capacity building of those officers in charge of relevant activities, upgrading and enhancement of existing MRV structures, and generally the avoidance of any double efforts that may constitute a burden on the government administration, represent key elements for both the effectiveness and, to a larger extent, to the sustainability of the achievement.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>The utilization of excel files as tracking tools (an instrument the all public officers can manages properly), the coordination trough climate change focal persons, the possibility of calculation of indicators with existing data collection procedures represent the elements that the review has identified to support the formulation of the lesson learned.</p> <p>In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide. Broadly, it applies to all kind of capacity building initiatives, not only those related to climate reporting.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #3: <i>Promote professional growth</i></p>	<p>Creation of awareness of the importance of climate reporting amongst the public officers as a means for career development is, as well, an opportunity to create enthusiasm amongst them.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>Individuals trained on MRV system interviewed on the matter expressed their satisfaction with their involvement in the project and specifically in the trainings. Being recognized as an MRV expert may represent a real career development opportunity that is worth to be explored. This perception is a factor that promote their level of engagement in being part of the MRV system established.</p> <p>In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #4: <i>Internal staff in charge of project management</i></p>	<p>CBIT projects for their very nature entail the involvement of many institutional stakeholders. They represent a means for stakeholders to come together and strengthen institutional relationships. Having internal staff in charge of project management is important because they can shape the project according to their way of doing business, get to know all stakeholders, that later will inform their MRV efforts and will have the recognition of leading agency on the issues at stake.</p>

Context/comment:	<p>During the review, the capacities of the PMU to deal with respect and competence with the variety of actors involved was highlighted by all those interviewed on the matter. The project contributed to the creation of an institutional networks of colleagues that will collaborate in the future.</p> <p>In principle, the lesson learned may apply to all GEF CBIT projects implemented by UNEP world-wide. Broadly, it applies to all kind of capacity building initiatives, not only those related to climate reporting.</p>
-------------------------	---

1.19 Recommendations⁷

Recommendation #1: <i>Data collection and management</i>	Data collection and management should be the focus of a potential successor CBIT project.
Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation:	<p>Data collection and data management persist as main problem at the terminal level, i.e., those organizations in charge of collecting primary data from the field. These organizations (ministry agencies at district level, NGOs and CSOs and private companies) do not always in place reliable and standardized procedures for data collection and management.</p> <p>Note: it is important to note that data collection and management at district level were not included in the scope of the CBIT.</p>
Priority Level:	Critical
Type of Recommendation	Project
Responsibility:	Environmental Protection Agency and UNEP
Proposed implementation time-frame:	During the design and implementation phase of a potential successor CBIT project in Ghana.

Cross-reference(s) to rationale and supporting discussions:

- Section: Achievement of Likelihood of Impact
Paragraph: 122
- Section: 1.14.2 Financial Sustainability
Paragraph: 153

Recommendation #2: <i>Actual dissemination and uptake of Lessons Learned</i>	<p>Lessons learned n.2 "Building on existing procedures and structures / Maximization of efforts" and n. 3. "Promote professional growth" should not be only disseminated within UNEP and the dedicated CBIT portal https://www.cbitplatform.org. UNEP should make sure that they are up taken during the design phase of CBIT projects in other countries worldwide.</p>
--	--

⁷ The TR proposes three main recommendations. Due to the very good performance of the project, there is no need to suggest substantial activities to adjust critical elements emerged during the review. Actually, they did not emerge. Recommendations 1 and 3 focus mainly on a successor CBIT project, which is in the plan of both UNEP and EPA. Instead, recommendations 2 focus on the work on ETF promoted globally by UNEP.

Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation:	The review identifies the two lessons learned as the two most important elements for the success of the project. It is, then, worthwhile to pursue this kind of approach in other CBIT projects.
Priority Level:	Low (opportunity for improvement)
Type of Recommendation	Project level
Responsibility:	UNEP
Proposed implementation time-frame:	During the design and implementation phases of CBIT projects in other countries worldwide.

Cross-reference(s) to rationale and supporting discussions:

- Section: 1.17 Lessons learned
Paragraph: Lessons learned n. 2 and 3

Recommendation #3: <i>Learning by doing exercise</i>	Activities related to a learning by doing exercise about the correct compilation of the NDC tracking tool within each NDC sector should be included in a potential successor CBIT project.
Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation:	The NDC tracking tool represents a novelty mainstreamed into the workstream of NDC sectors. A learning by doing exercise may be needed to improve the overall quality of the process, from data collection to data upload in the Climate Data Hub.
Priority Level:	Low (opportunity for improvement)
Type of Recommendation	Project level
Responsibility:	Environmental Protection Agency and UNEP
Proposed implementation time-frame:	During all 2023 and during the design and implementation phase of a potential successor CBIT project.

Cross-reference(s) to rationale and supporting discussions:

- Section: 1.10.1 Availability of Outputs
Paragraph: 100

ANNEX I. TORS OF THE REVIEW (WITHOUT ANNEXES)

Terminal Review of the UNEP/GEF project GEF ID: 9820

Title: Strengthening Ghana’s national capacity for transparency and ambitious climate reporting

Section 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

(This section describes what is to be reviewed. Key parameters are: project timeframe, funding envelope, results framework and geographic scope)

1. Project General Information

Table 1. Project summary

UNEP Sub-programme:	Climate Change	UNEP Division/Branch	Economy Division, Climate Mitigation, Energy and Climate Branch
Expected Accomplishment(s):	<u>Climate stability</u> : Countries increasingly transition to low-emission economic development pathways and enhance their adaptation and resilience to climate change	Programme of Work output(s):	Outcome 1C: State and non-State actors adopt the enhanced transparency framework arrangements under the Paris Agreement. Indicator (iii) Number of national, subnational and private sector actors reporting under the enhanced transparency arrangements of the Paris Agreement with UNEP support
SDG(s) and indicator(s) UNEP Division/Branch	SDG-13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target 13.3: Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning; Indicator 13.3.2: Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions. 		
GEF Core Indicator Targets (identify these for projects approved prior to GEF-7)	N/A – this GEF-6 project was designed without any indicators corresponding to the GEF -7 Cote Indicator Worksheet.		
Dates of previous project phases:	Not Applicable	Status of future project phases:	Not Applicable

FROM THE PROJECT’S PIR REPORT (use latest version):

Project Title:	Strengthening Ghana's national capacity for transparency and ambitious climate reporting
-----------------------	--

Executing Agency:	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
--------------------------	---------------------------------------

Project partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology, and Innovation (MESTI) Ghana Statistical Services (GSS) Ministry of Energy (MoE) Ministry of Transport Forestry Commission The University of Ghana – Department of Statistics Ministry of Food and Agriculture Energy Commission Ministry of Sanitation and Resources Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development KASA NGO Platform Volta River Authority Hatof Foundation National Development Planning Commission
--------------------------	---

Geographical Scope:	National		
Participating Countries:	Ghana		
GEF project ID:	9820	IMIS number*:	SB-011329.02/P1-33CBL-000020
Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Mitigation	GEF OP #:	
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	Strengthen Ghana's national capacity for transparency and ambitious reporting by improving on the functionality of the national system and integrate into national M&E framework having identified institutional capacities, opportunities and gaps.	GEF approval date*:	19 November 2018
UNEP approval date:		Date of first disbursement*:	15 July 2019
Actual start date:	4 March 2019	Planned duration:	36 months
Intended completion date*:	31 January 2022	Actual or Expected completion date:	31 December 2022
Project Type:	Medium Size Project	GEF Allocation*:	US\$1,100,000
PPG GEF cost*:	US\$ 30,000	PPG co-financing*:	N/A
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	US\$ 1,177,500	Total Cost*:	\$2,277,500
Mid-term Review/eval. (Planned date):	Not Applicable	Terminal Evaluation (planned date):	1 March 2023
Mid-term Review/eval. (Actual date):	Not Applicable	No. of revisions*:	1
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	8 August 2022	Date of last Revision*:	11 May 2021
Disbursement as of 31 December 2022*:	\$ 1,000,000	Date of planned financial closure*:	31 December 2023
Date of planned completion*:	31 December 2022	Actual expenditures reported as of 30 Sept. 2022:	US\$ 664,763
Total co-financing realized as of 31 December 2022:	US\$ 997,500	Actual expenditures entered in Umoja as of 30 September 2022*:	US\$ 578,963
Leveraged financing:	US\$ 0		

2. Project Rationale

The Paris Agreement (PA) introduced the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) regime for climate action and support under Article 13. According to the UNEP Emissions Gap Report 2019, countries are far from reaching the global goal of 2°C if only the current levels of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) are considered. Hence, the ETF under the PA is critical to enable all countries to track the progress of climate action and raise ambition. The Parties to the PA established Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) to strengthen the institutional and technical capacity of developing countries to effectively participate in the ETF.

Following this, the UNFCCC requested the Global Environment Fund (GEF) to support the implementation of CBIT through voluntary contributions during GEF-6 and future replenishment cycles; hence during COP 21, the GEF established CBIT. Globally, the CBIT programme aims to strengthen national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities; provide relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Agreement and assist in the progressive improvement of transparency efforts.

Ghana is part of the African countries that have received funding from the GEF. Ghana's CBIT project is a medium-sized GEF project which went through a 2.5-year preparatory work before receiving funding. The funding was approved by the GEF CEO on 19 November 2018. Although the project was initially planned to start in year 2019, the actual implementation period of the project spans from 2020 to 2022.

The objective of Ghana's CBIT project was to strengthen national systems to effectively and regularly track and report Ghana's NDC. The CBIT project enabled Ghana to enhance gaps in institutional arrangements, develop an effective data management system and integrate and mainstream climate change into Ghana's Medium-Term Development Framework.

3. Project Results Framework

The project's logical framework as per the Project Document is provided below:

Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co- financing
1.0 Improving and integrating transparency framework of the Paris Agreement into Ghana's Monitoring & Evaluation (M & E) system	TA	1.NDC targets become a central part of Ghana's system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development framework	1.An effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions established	CBIT	219,500	300,000
			2. A centralized national infrastructure for improved data access and information management established.	CBIT	381,500	267,500
			3. Five climate change indicators mainstreamed into the medium-term development framework (Yr. 2018-2022)	CBIT	289,500	210,000
			4. Testing and piloting of domestic transparency framework in Energy and Transport sectors.	CBIT	109,500	300,000
Subtotal					1,000,000	1,077,500
Project Management Cost (PMC)				CBIT	100,000	100,000
Total project costs					1,100,000	1,177,500

The project’s results framework as per the Project Document is provided below:

Project objective: Strengthen Ghana’s capacity for transparency and ambitious reporting by improving on the functionality of its national system and integrate into national M&E framework					
Project Objective	Indicators	Baseline	Targets at the end of the project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Strengthen Ghana national capacity for transparency and ambitious reporting by improving on the functionality of the national system and integrate into national M&E framework having identified institutional capacities, opportunities and gaps	<p>A) Domestic MRV system integrated to M&E framework established and in operation</p> <p>B) Number of public and private organizations that have adopted and use MRV template to report progress of sector NDC actions</p>	<p>A) No</p> <p>B) Zero</p>	<p>A) Yes</p> <p>B) 7 line ministries and 3 private organizations</p>	<p>Template developed</p> <p>Sector and National Annual Progress Reports (APRs)</p> <p>Guidelines and protocols established</p> <p>Reports</p> <p>Website Information</p> <p>Workshop materials and list of attendees</p>	<p>Inadequate data and information inputs of MRV.</p> <p>Ineffective coordination among the stakeholders, will hinder effective stakeholder participation</p> <p>Consultations with line ministries and agencies during the project inception and implementation phases will help address barriers.</p>
<p>Project Outcome: NDC targets become a central part of Ghana’s system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development framework</p> <p><i>Output 1: An effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions established.</i></p>	<p>1) Number of climate change indicators for tracking progress of NDC goals included in the national M&E result framework of the medium-term development being used by line ministries</p>	<p>1) Zero</p> <p>2) Zero</p>	<p>1) 5</p> <p>2) 2 Ministries and</p>	<p>1) Sector and National APRs Approved Indicators</p>	<p>NPDC committed to allow inclusion of climate indicators into M&E results framework</p>


<p>Output 2: A centralized national infrastructure for improved data access and information management established.</p> <p>Output 3: Five climate change indicators mainstreamed into the medium-term development framework (Yr. 2018-2022)</p> <p>Output 4: Testing and piloting of domestic transparency framework in Energy and Transport sectors.</p>	<p>2) Number of ministries/regulators piloting the full-package of MRV of GHG, Action and Support</p>		<p>1 Regulator</p>	<p>2) MRV Reports Contact Persons</p>	<p>Ministries of Energy and Transport and their Agencies willing to pilot full-package of sector MRV.</p>
--	---	--	--------------------	---------------------------------------	---

For further detailed information see the CEO Endorsement Document of the project.

4. Executing Arrangements

UNEP is the GEF Implementing Agency and Ghana's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the CBIT project's Executing Agency. As such the EPA was in charge of the day to day execution of all the project's activities. The EPA is qualified to lead in the implementation of the CBIT because it has the requisite experience and competence to manage the project. Over the last two decades, the EPA backed by its legislative instrument ACT 490 has been responsible for coordinating international climate change reporting in Ghana and for that matter has been the leader in the establishment of structures of G-CARP over the years.

At the project management level, EPA ensured enhanced coordination of CBIT project deliverables with that of preparation of Ghana's Fourth National Communication, Second Biennial Update Report under the UNFCCC and other climate-related projects. The climate change team coordinated the use of project resources/inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) to ensure delivery of project results at a lower cost while avoiding duplication of efforts. Within EPA, the Climate Change Unit hosted the CBIT Project Management Unit (PMU) headed by the Project Manager (PM). The PMU was in-charge of the day-to-day management of the CBIT project and ensure that reports are prepared and delivered on time. The CBIT Project Manager reported to the Executive Director of EPA through the Deputy Executive for Technical Services.



5. Project Cost and Financing

The table below provides the breakdown of the project budget.

Project Components/ Programs	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1.0 Improving and integrating transparency framework of the Paris Agreement into Ghana's Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) system	1.NDC targets become a central part of Ghana's system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development framework	1.An effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions established	219,500	300,000
		2. A centralized national infrastructure for improved data access and information management established.	381,500	267,500
		3. Five climate change indicators mainstreamed into the medium-term development framework (Yr. 2018-2022)	289,500	210,000
		4. Testing and piloting of domestic transparency framework in Energy and Transport sectors.	109,500	300,000
Subtotal			1,000,000	1,077,500
Project Management Cost (PMC)			100,000	100,000
Total project costs			1,100,000	1,177,500

6. Implementation Issues

At the start of implementation, there was some delay in the EPA setting up the Project Management Unit and kicking off the project and a budget revision extending the project's technical completion date to 31 December 2022 was done in order to factor in the delay. Over the course of implementation, the project team did not identify any medium, substantive and high risks (refer to the different PIRs). Some delays were experienced on the onset of COVID-19 (in particular for activities involving in-person meetings or travelling) however this did not affect the project's ability to reach the expected outcomes.

Section 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

7. Objective of the Review

In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy and the UNEP Programme Manual, the Terminal Review (TR) is undertaken at operational completion of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The Review has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and project Partners.

8. Key Review principles

Review findings and judgements will be based on **sound evidence and analysis**, clearly documented in the Review Report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

The “Why?” Question. As this is a Terminal Review and a follow-up project is a possibility, particular attention will be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the “why?” question should be at the front of the consultant(s)’ minds all through the review exercise and is supported by the use of a theory of change approach. This means that the consultant(s) need to go beyond the assessment of “what” the project performance was and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance was as it was (i.e. what contributed to the achievement of the project’s results). This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project.

Attribution, Contribution and Credible Association: In order to *attribute* any outcomes and impacts to a project intervention, one needs to consider the difference between what has happened with, and what would have happened without, the project (i.e. take account of changes over time and between contexts in order to isolate the effects of an intervention). This requires appropriate baseline data and the identification of a relevant counterfactual, both of which are frequently not available for reviews. Establishing the *contribution* made by a project in a complex change process relies heavily on prior intentionality (e.g. approved project design documentation, logical framework) and the articulation of causality (e.g. narrative and/or illustration of the Theory of Change). Robust evidence that a project was delivered as designed and that the expected causal pathways developed supports claims of contribution and this is strengthened where an alternative theory of change can be excluded. A *credible association* between the implementation of a project and observed positive effects can be made where a strong causal narrative, although not explicitly articulated, can be inferred by the chronological sequence of events, active involvement of key actors and engagement in critical processes.

Communicating Review Results. A key aim of the Review is to encourage reflection and learning by UNEP staff and key project stakeholders. The consultant should consider how reflection and learning can be promoted, both through the review process and in the communication of review findings and key lessons. Clear and concise writing is required on all review deliverables. Draft and final versions of the main Review Report will be shared with key stakeholders by the Task Manager. There may, however, be several intended audiences, each with different interests and needs regarding the report. The consultant will plan with the Task Manager which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key review findings and lessons to them. This may include some, or all, of the following; a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, or the preparation of an interactive presentation.

9. Key Strategic Questions

In addition to the review criteria outlined in Section 10 below, the Review will address the **strategic questions** listed below (no more than 3 questions are recommended). These are questions of interest to UNEP and to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution. Also included are four questions that are required when reporting in the GEF Portal and these must be addressed in the TR:

Q1: Did the State and non-State actors participating in the project adopt the enhanced transparency framework arrangements under the Paris Agreement? If so, what are the key project elements that contributed to allowing them to do so? If not, what prevented them from doing so?

Q2: Did the project contribute to strengthening / improving transparency mechanisms of national institutions for domestic and UN conventions reporting? If so, please explain how.

Q3: Did the State and non-State actors participating in the project adopt the new tools developed by the project? If so, what are the key project elements that contributed to allowing them to do so? If not, what prevented them from doing so?

Q4: What changes were made to adapt to the effects of COVID-19 and how might any changes affect the project's performance?

Address the questions required for the GEF Portal in the appropriate parts of the report and provide a **summary of the findings in the Conclusions section of the report:**

a) **Under Monitoring and Reporting/Monitoring of Project Implementation:**

What was the performance at the project's-completion against Core Indicator Targets? (For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided).

b) **Under Factors Affecting Performance/Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation:**

What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR? *(This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval)*

c) **Under Factors Affecting Performance/Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality:**

What were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas? *(This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent)*

d) **Under Factors Affecting Performance/Environmental and Social Safeguards:**

What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval? The risk classifications reported in the latest PIR report should be verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. *(Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant during this Review should be shared with the Task Manager for uploading in the GEF Portal)*

e) **Under Factors Affecting Performance/Communication and Public Awareness:**

What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions? *(This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval)*

10. Review Criteria

All review criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Sections A-I below, outline the scope of the review criteria. The set of review criteria are grouped in nine categories: (A) Strategic Relevance; (B) Quality of Project Design; (C) Nature of External Context; (D) Effectiveness, which comprises assessments of the availability of outputs, achievement of outcomes and likelihood of impact; (E) Financial Management; (F) Efficiency; (G) Monitoring and Reporting; (H) Sustainability; and (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance.

Annex 1 of these Terms of Reference provides a table with a list of various tools, templates and guidelines that can help Review Consultant(s) to follow a thorough review process that meets all of UNEP's needs.

A. Strategic Relevance

The Review will assess the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the donors, implementing regions/countries and the target beneficiaries. The Review will include an assessment of the project's relevance in relation to UNEP's mandate and its alignment with UNEP's policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Under strategic relevance an assessment of the

complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

i. Alignment to the UNEP's Medium-Term Strategy (MTS), Programme of Work (POW) and Strategic Priorities

The Review should assess the project's alignment with the MTS and POW under which the project was approved and include, in its narrative, reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant MTS and POW. UNEP strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building (BSP) and South-South Cooperation (S-SC). The BSP relates to the capacity of governments to: comply with international agreements and obligations at the national level; promote, facilitate and finance environmentally sound technologies and to strengthen frameworks for developing coherent international environmental policies. S-SC is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge between developing countries.

ii. Alignment to Donor/GEF/Partner Strategic Priorities

Donor strategic priorities will vary across interventions. The Review will assess the extent to which the project is suited to, or responding to, donor priorities. In some cases, alignment with donor priorities may be a fundamental part of project design and grant approval processes while in others, for example, instances of 'softly-earmarked' funding, such alignment may be more of an assumption that should be assessed.

iii. Relevance to Global, Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities

The Review will assess the alignment of the project with global priorities such as the SDGs and Agenda 2030. The extent to which the intervention is suited, or responding to, the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries, sub-regions or regions where it is being implemented will also be considered. Examples may include: UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF) or, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) plans or regional agreements etc. Within this section consideration will be given to whether the needs of all beneficiary groups are being met and reflects the current policy priority to leave no-one behind.

iv. Complementarity with Relevant Existing Interventions/Coherence

An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project inception or mobilization, took account of ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same sub-programme, other UNEP sub-programmes, or being implemented by other agencies within the same country, sector or institution) that address similar needs of the same target groups. The Review will consider if the project team, in collaboration with Regional Offices and Sub-Programme Coordinators, made efforts to ensure their own intervention was complementary to other interventions, optimized any synergies and avoided duplication of effort. Examples may include work within UNDAFs or One UN programming. Linkages with other interventions should be described and instances where UNEP's comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Country ownership and driven-ness

B. Quality of Project Design

The quality of project design is assessed using an agreed template during the review inception phase. Ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established. The complete Project Design Quality template should be annexed in the Review Inception Report. Later, the overall Project Design Quality rating should be entered in the final review ratings table (as item B) in the Main Review Report and a summary of the project's strengths and weaknesses at design stage should be included within the body of the Main Review Report.

Factors affecting this criterion may include (at the design stage):

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

C. Nature of External Context

At review inception stage a rating is established for the project's external operating context (considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval). This rating is entered in the final review ratings table as item C. Where a project has been rated as facing either an *Unfavourable* or *Highly Unfavourable* external operating context, and/or a negative external event has occurred during project implementation, the ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency and/or Sustainability may be increased at the discretion of the Review Consultant and Task Manager together. A justification for such an increase must be given.

D. Effectiveness

i. Availability of Outputs

The Review will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs and making them available to the intended beneficiaries as well as its success in achieving milestones as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any formal modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. Where the project outputs are inappropriately or inaccurately stated in the ProDoc, reformulations may be necessary in the reconstruction of the Theory of Change (TOC). In such cases a table should be provided showing the original and the reformulation of the outputs for transparency. The availability of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their provision. It is noted that emphasis is placed on the performance of those outputs that are most important to achieve outcomes. The Review will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs available and meeting expected quality standards.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision

ii. Achievement of Project Outcomes

The achievement of project outcomes is assessed as performance against the outcomes as defined in the reconstructed Theory of Change. These are outcomes that are intended to be achieved by the end of the project timeframe and within the project's resource envelope. Emphasis is placed on the achievement of project outcomes that are most important for attaining intermediate states. As with outputs, a table can be used to show where substantive amendments to the formulation of project outcomes is necessary to allow for an assessment of performance. The Review should report evidence of attribution between UNEP's intervention and the project outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UNEP's 'substantive contribution' should be included and/or 'credible association' established between project efforts and the project outcomes realised.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Communication and public awareness

iii. Likelihood of Impact

Based on the articulation of long-lasting effects in the reconstructed TOC (*i.e. from project outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact*), the Review will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Project objectives or goals should be incorporated in the TOC, possibly as intermediate states or long-lasting impacts. The Evaluation Office's approach to the use of TOC in project reviews is outlined in a guidance note and is supported by an excel-based flow chart, 'Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree'. Essentially the approach follows a 'likelihood tree' from project outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC held. Any unintended positive effects should also be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described.

The Review will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects (e.g. will vulnerable groups such as those living with disabilities and/or women and children, be disproportionately affected by the project?). Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental and Social Safeguards.

The Review will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role or has promoted scaling up and/or replication as part of its Theory of Change (either explicitly as in a project with a demonstration component or implicitly as expressed in the drivers required to move to outcome levels) and as factors that are likely to contribute to greater or long lasting impact.

Ultimately UNEP and all its partners aim to bring about benefits to the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-lasting or broad-based changes. However, the Review will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the long-lasting changes represented by the Sustainable Development Goals, and/or the intermediate-level results reflected in UNEP's Expected Accomplishments and the strategic priorities of funding partner(s).

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of Project Management and Supervision (including adaptive management)
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Country ownership and driven-ness
- Communication and public awareness

E. Financial Management

Financial management will be assessed under three themes: *adherence* to UNEP's financial policies and procedures, *completeness* of financial information and *communication* between financial and project management staff. The Review will establish the actual spend across the life of the project of funds secured from all donors. This expenditure will be reported, where possible, at output/component level and will be compared with the approved budget. The Review will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UNEP's financial management policies. Any financial management issues that have affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted. The Review will record where standard financial documentation is missing, inaccurate, incomplete or unavailable in a timely manner. The Review will assess the level of communication between the Project Manager, Task Manager and the Administrative Officer as it relates to the effective delivery of the planned project and the needs of a responsive, adaptive management approach.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision

F. Efficiency

Under the efficiency criterion the Review will assess the extent to which the project delivered maximum results from the given resources. This will include an assessment of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution.

Focusing on the translation of inputs into outputs, *cost-effectiveness* is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. *Timeliness* refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The Review will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The Review will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches.

The Review will give special attention to efforts made by the project teams during project implementation to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency.

The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed. Consultants should note that as management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of 'no cost extensions', such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to UNEP and Executing Agencies.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness (e.g. timeliness)
- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation

G. Monitoring and Reporting

The Review will assess monitoring and reporting across three sub-categories: monitoring design and budgeting, monitoring implementation and project reporting.

i. Monitoring Design and Budgeting

Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART results towards the achievement of the project's outputs and outcomes, including at a level disaggregated by gender, marginalisation or vulnerability, including those living with disabilities. In particular, the Review will assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project indicators as well as the methods used for tracking progress against them as part of conscious results-based management. The Review will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation. The adequacy of resources for Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation/Review should be discussed, where applicable.

ii. Monitoring of Project Implementation

The Review will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards project objectives throughout the project implementation period. This assessment will include consideration of whether the project gathered relevant and good quality baseline data that is accurately and appropriately documented. This should include monitoring the representation and participation of disaggregated groups, including gendered, marginalised or vulnerable groups, such as those living with disabilities, in project activities. It will also consider the quality of the information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation and how it was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensure sustainability. The Review should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

The performance at project completion against Core Indicator Targets should be reviewed. For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided.

iii. Project Reporting

The project reporting information will be provided to the Review Consultant(s) by the Task Manager. Some projects have additional requirements to report regularly to funding partners, which will be supplied by the project team (e.g. the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool for GEF-funded projects). The Review will assess the extent to which both UNEP and GEF reporting commitments have been fulfilled. Consideration will be given as to whether reporting has been carried out with respect to the effects of the initiative on disaggregated groups.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g disaggregated indicators and data)

H. Sustainability

Sustainability is understood as the probability of the benefits derived from the achievement of project outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The Review will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the endurance of achieved project outcomes (i.e. 'assumptions' and 'drivers'). Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. Where applicable an assessment of bio-physical factors that may affect the sustainability of direct outcomes may also be included.

i. Socio-political Sustainability

The Review will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of the benefits derived from project outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards. In particular the Review will consider whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

ii. Financial Sustainability

Some project outcomes, once achieved, do not require further financial inputs, e.g. the adoption of a revised policy. However, in order to derive a benefit from this outcome further management action may still be needed e.g. to undertake actions to enforce the policy. Other project outcomes may be dependent on a continuous flow of action that needs to be resourced for them to be maintained, e.g. continuation of a new natural resource management approach. The Review will assess the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained. Secured future funding is only relevant to financial sustainability where the project outcomes have been extended into a future project phase. Even where future funding has been secured, the question still remains as to whether the project outcomes are financially sustainable.

iii. Institutional Sustainability

The Review will assess the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes (especially those relating to policies and laws) is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure. In particular, the Review will consider whether institutional capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g. where interventions are not inclusive, their sustainability may be undermined)
- Communication and public awareness
- Country ownership and driven-ness

I. Factors Affecting Project Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues

(These factors are rated in the ratings table but are discussed within the Main Review Report as cross-cutting themes as appropriate under the other review criteria, above. If these issues have not been addressed under the Review Criteria above, then independent summaries of their status within the reviewed project should be given in this section)

i. Preparation and Readiness

This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project (i.e. the time between project approval and first disbursement). The Review will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular the Review will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements. *(Project preparation is included in the template for the assessment of Project Design Quality).*

ii. Quality of Project Management and Supervision

For GEF funded projects 'project management and supervision' may refer to the project management performance of the Executing Agency and the technical backstopping and supervision provided by UNEP as Implementing Agency. The performance of parties playing different roles should be discussed and a rating provided for both types of supervision (UNEP/Implementing Agency; Partner/Executing Agency) and the overall rating for this sub-category established as a simple average of the two.

The Review will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including Steering Groups etc.); maintaining project relevance within changing external and strategic contexts; communication and collaboration with UNEP colleagues; risk management; use

of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive management should be highlighted.

iii. Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation

Here the term 'stakeholder' should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs, target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UNEP and the executing partner(s). The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning and expertise. The inclusion and participation of all differentiated groups, including gender groups should be considered.

The progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program occurring since the MTR should be reviewed. This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval.

iv. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality

The Review will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Within this human rights context the Review will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UNEP's Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment:

The report should present the extent to which the intervention, following an adequate gender analysis at design stage, has implemented the identified actions and/or applied adaptive management to ensure that Gender Equality and Human Rights are adequately taken into account. In particular the Review will consider to what extent project, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible inequalities (especially those related to gender) in access to, and the control over, natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of disadvantaged groups (especially women, youth and children and those living with disabilities) to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of disadvantaged groups (especially women, youth and children and those living with disabilities) in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

The completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas should be reviewed. This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent.

v. Environmental and Social Safeguards

UNEP projects address environmental and social safeguards primarily through the process of environmental and social screening at the project approval stage, risk assessment and management (avoidance, minimization, mitigation or, in exceptional cases, offsetting) of potential environmental and social risks and impacts associated with project and programme activities. The Review will confirm whether UNEP requirements were met to: *review* risk ratings on a regular basis; *monitor* project implementation for possible safeguard issues; *respond* (where relevant) to safeguard issues through risk avoidance, minimization, mitigation or offsetting and *report* on the implementation of safeguard management measures taken. UNEP requirements for proposed projects to be screened for any safeguarding issues; for sound environmental and social risk assessments to be conducted and initial risk ratings to be assigned are reviewed above under Quality of Project Design).

The Review will also consider the extent to which the management of the project minimised UNEP's environmental footprint.

Implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval should be reviewed, the risk classifications verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant should be shared with the Task Manager.

vi. Country Ownership and Driven-ness

The Review will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies in the project. While there is some overlap between Country Ownership and Institutional Sustainability, this criterion focuses primarily on the forward momentum of the intended projects results, i.e. either: a) moving forwards from outputs to project outcomes or b) moving forward from project outcomes towards intermediate states. The Review will consider the involvement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices (e.g. representatives from multiple sectors or relevant ministries beyond Ministry of Environment). This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long term impact to be realised. Ownership should extend to all gender and marginalised groups.

vii. Communication and Public Awareness

The Review will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The Review should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively, including meeting the differentiated needs of gendered or marginalised groups, and whether any feedback channels were established. Where knowledge sharing platforms have been established under a project the Review will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate

The project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions should be reviewed. This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval.

Section 3. REVIEW APPROACH, METHODS AND DELIVERABLES

The Terminal Review will be an in-depth review using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the review process. Both quantitative and qualitative review methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultant(s) maintains close communication with the project team and promotes information exchange throughout the review implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the review findings. Where applicable, the consultant(s) should provide a geo-referenced map that demarcates the area covered by the project and, where possible, provide geo-reference photographs of key intervention sites, if applicable (e.g. sites of habitat rehabilitation and protection, pollution treatment infrastructure, etc.).

The findings of the Review will be based on the following:

- (a) **A desk review** of:
 - Relevant background documentation, inter alia ;
 - Project Document and Appendices. This includes, among others, relevant work plans, budget, as well as any revisions introduced after approval.
 - Theory of change, problem tree, and logical framework.
 - Project reports, including: half year progress reports, project implementation reports (PIRs), expenditure reports, financial statements, audits, inventory reports, progress reports from collaborating partners, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence and Tracking Tool;
 - Evaluations/Reviews of similar projects.
- (b) **Interviews and focus group discussions** (individual or in group) with:
 - UNEP Task Manager (TM);
 - Executing Agency Project Manager (PM)
 - Project management team;
 - UNEP Administrative Officer (AO);
 - Portfolio Manager and Sub-Programme Coordinator, where appropriate;
 - Project partners ;

- Relevant resource persons;
 - Representatives from civil society and specialist groups (such as women's, farmers and trade associations etc).
- (c) Surveys to be determined at inception phase
 (d) Field visit to Accra, Ghana
 (e) Other data collection tools to be determined at inception phase

11. Review Deliverables and Review Procedures

The Review Consultant will prepare:

- **Inception Report:** (see Annex 1 for a list of all templates, tables and guidance notes) containing an assessment of project design quality, a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, review framework and a tentative review schedule.
- **Preliminary Findings Note:** typically in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings.
- **Draft and Final Review Report:** containing an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the review findings organised by review criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.

Review of the Draft Review Report. The Review Consultant will submit a draft report to the Task Manager and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. The Task Manager will then forward the revised draft report to other project stakeholders, for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the Task Manager for consolidation. The Task Manager will provide all comments to the Review Consultant for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.

The final version of the Terminal Review report will be assessed for its quality by the UNEP Evaluation Office using a standard template and this assessment will be annexed to the final Terminal Review report.

At the end of the review process, the Task Manager will prepare a **Recommendations Implementation Plan** in the format of a table, to be completed and updated at regular intervals, and circulate the **Lessons Learned** to key project proponents.

12. The Review Consultant

The Review Consultant will work under the overall responsibility of the Task Manager, Julien Lheureux, in consultation with the Administrative Officer, Fatma Twahir,

The Review Consultant will liaise with the Task Manager on any procedural and methodological matters related to the Review. It is, however, the consultant's individual responsibility (where applicable) to arrange for their visas and immunizations as well as to plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, obtain documentary evidence and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The UNEP Task Manager and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultants to conduct the Review as efficiently and independently as possible.

The Review Consultant will be hired over a period of 8 months [tentatively March to October 2023] and should have the following: a university degree a university degree in environmental sciences, international development, or other relevant political or social sciences area is required and an advanced degree in the same areas is desirable; a minimum of 7 years of technical / evaluation experience is required, preferably including evaluating large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach; and a good/broad understanding of Climate Changes Transparency Projects is desired. English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this consultancy, fluency in oral and written English is a requirement. Working knowledge of the UN

system and specifically the work of UNEP is an added advantage. The work will be home-based with possible field visits.

The Review Consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with the Task Manager, for overall quality of the review and timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Review Deliverables, above. The Review Consultant will ensure that all review criteria and questions are adequately covered.

13. Schedule of the Review

The table below presents the tentative schedule for the Review.

Table 3. Tentative schedule for the Review

Milestone	Tentative Dates
Desk Review of project documentation	From 1 to 31 March 2023
Inception Report by Reviewer	7 April 2023
Comments / approval of Inception report by Task Manager	14 April 2023
Desk based review of documents (continued) and preparation for field mission	10 to 21 April 2023
Terminal Review field mission (in country)	24-28 April or 1-5 May 2023 (tentatively)
E-based interviews, surveys etc. (if needed)	8 to 26 May 2023
PowerPoint / presentation by Reviewer on preliminary findings and recommendations	9 June 2023
Draft Terminal Review Report shared with Task Manager (TM) for review / fact checking	14 July 2023
Comments / approval on draft Terminal Review Report returned by Task Manager	28 July 2023
Updated Draft Final Review Report shared with wider group of stakeholders	11 August 2023
Draft Final Review Report shared with UNEP Evaluation Office (EO)	11 August 2023
Comments from stakeholders and UNEP EO submitted to Reviewer	25 August 2023
Final Review Report	15 September 2023
Final Review Report shared with all respondents	22 September 2023

14. Contractual Arrangements

The Review Consultant(s) will be selected and recruited by the Task Manager under an individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) on a "fees only" basis (see below). By signing the service contract with UNEP/UNON, the consultant certifies that they have not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project's executing or implementing units. All consultants are required to sign the Code of Conduct Agreement Form.

Fees will be paid on an instalment basis, paid on acceptance and approval by the Task Manager of expected key deliverables. The schedule of payment is as follows:

Schedule of Payment:

Deliverables	Deadline	Amount (USD)
Approved Inception Report (as per Annex I document #9)	29 April 2023	#,#### USD
Approved Main Terminal Review draft report (as per Annex I document #10)	28 July 2023	#,#### USD
Approved Final Main Terminal Review Report (as per Annex I document #10)	31 Sept. 2023	#,#### USD

Fees only contracts: Where applicable, air tickets will be purchased by UNEP and 75% of the Daily Subsistence Allowance for each authorised travel mission will be paid up front. Local in-country travel will only be reimbursed where agreed in advance with the Task Manager and on the production of acceptable receipts. Terminal expenses and residual DSA entitlements (25%) will be paid after mission completion.

The consultant may be provided with access to UNEP's information management systems (e.g. PIMS, SharePoint, etc.) and, if such access is granted, the consultants agree not to disclose information from that system to third parties beyond information required for, and included in, the Review Report.

In case the consultant is not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines, and in line with the expected quality standards by UNEP, payment may be withheld at the discretion of the Head of Branch or Portfolio Manager until the consultants have improved the deliverables to meet UNEP's quality standards.

If the consultant fails to submit a satisfactory final product to the Task Manager in a timely manner, i.e. before the end date of their contract, UNEP reserves the right to employ additional human resources to finalize the report, and to reduce the consultant's fees by an amount equal to the additional costs borne by the project team to bring the report up to standard or completion.

ANNEX II. REVIEW FRAMEWORK

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
Criterion A: Strategic Relevance			
A.1. Alignment to the UNEP Medium Term Strategy (MTS), Programme of Work (POW) and Strategic Priorities			
1. To what extent the project was aligned to the MTS and POW under which it was approved?	Extent to which the project was aligned to the MTS and POW at approval.	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, UNEP staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
2. To what extent the project was aligned to the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building?	Extent to which the project was aligned to the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building.	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, UNEP staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
3. To what extent the project was aligned to the UNEP Strategy for South-South and Triangular Cooperation?	Extent to which the project was aligned to the UNEP Strategy for South-South and Triangular Cooperation.	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, UNEP staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
A.2. Alignment to GEF Priorities			
4. To what extent which is the project suited to, or responding to, donor priorities?	Extent to which the project is suited to, or responding to, donor priorities.	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs	- Desk review - Triangulation
A.3. Relevance to regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities			
5. To what extent is the project aligned with the global priorities such as the SDGs and Agenda 2030?	Extent the project is suited, or responding to, the environmental concerns and needs of Ghana	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, National policies and programmes, UNEP staff, project staff, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
6. To what extent is the project suited, or responding to the environmental concerns and needs of the Ghana?	Extent the project is suited, or responding to, the environmental concerns and needs of Ghana	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, National policies and programmes, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
A.4. Complementarity with existing interventions			
7. To what extent has the project explored and built complementarity with other existing initiatives that address similar needs of the same target groups and are implemented by UNEP, national entities or other organizations?	Evidence and extent of complementarities	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, National policies and programmes, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
Criterion B. Quality of Project Design			

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
See quality of design matrix attached – Annex II			
Criterion C: Nature of External Context			
8. Was the implementation of the project responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country occurred during its implementation period? (The question include also the COVID-19 implications on the project)	Identification of political, legal, economic, institutional changes in the country and extent to which the project was appropriately responsive to them	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, National policies and programmes, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
Criterion D: Effectiveness			
D1. Availability of Outputs			
9. Was the project successful in delivering its outputs as per its Results Framework included in the ProDoc?	Indicators included in the Results Framework at output level	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
10. Did the outputs delivered met expected quality standards?	Level of satisfaction of stakeholders involved in the delivery of outputs	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
11. Was the project successful in delivering the planned outputs in a timely manner? In case of delays, what were the reasons behind?	Identification of delays	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
12. What were the reasons behind any failures/successes of the project in delivering its outputs?	Identification of reasons for failures/successes	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
13. Were stakeholders appropriately involved in delivering programmed outputs?	Extent of stakeholders' participation	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
D2. Achievement of Project Outcomes			

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
14. To what extent have the targets of outcome indicators been achieved?	Indicators included in the Results Framework at outcome level	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
15. What are the areas in which the project had the greatest and fewest achievements? And what were the contributing/hindering factors?	Identification of contributing and hindering factors	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
D3. Likelihood of impact			
16. Are there evidence that the objective of the project has been achieved?	Identification of evidence	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
17. Strategic question 1: Did the State and non-State actors participating in the project adopt the enhanced transparency framework arrangements under the Paris Agreement? If so, what are the key project elements that contributed to allowing them to do so? If not, what prevented them from doing so?	Identification of State and non-State actors adopting the enhanced transparency framework arrangements	Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
18. Strategic question 2: Did the project contribute to strengthening / improving transparency mechanisms of national institutions for domestic and UN conventions reporting? If so, please explain how.	Identification of strengthening elements of the transparency mechanisms of national institutions for for domestic and UN conventions reporting and brief explanation	Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
19. Strategic question 3: Did the State and non-State actors participating in the project adopt the new tools developed by the project? If so, what are the key project elements that contributed to allowing them to do so? If not, what prevented them from doing so?	Extent of adoption of the new tools and identification of adoption contributing or preventing factors	Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
E.1. Adherence to UNEP's policies and procedures			
20. How did the financial reporting and management adhere to the policies and procedures of UNEP?	Extent of adherence of financial reporting and management adhere to the policies and procedures of UNEP	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff.	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
E.2. Completeness of financial information			
21. What is the level of completeness of financial information?	Level of completeness of financial information	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff.	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
22. How sound was the budget planning and execution? Did expenditures match the approved budget / work-plan? What were the reasons for under/overspent budget, if any?	Identification of difference between planned and executed budget and identification of reasons behind	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff.	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
23. To what extent did the financial management issues affect the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance?	Identification of elements of financial management issues that affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff.	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
24. What levels of co-financing did the project obtain (percent of planned)?	Evidence of co-financing and identification of reasons behind discrepancies obtained vs planned	Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, co-financing documents, project partners and beneficiaries, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
E.3. Communication between financial and project management staff			
25. To what extent did the communication issues between financial and project management staff affect the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance?	Identification of elements of communication issues that affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff, Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
Criterion F: Efficiency			
26. Was the use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) to achieve outcomes of efficient and economical?	Extent to which there was an efficient and economical use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) to achieve outcomes	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff, Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
27. Strategic question 4: What changes were made to adapt to the effects of COVID-19 and how might any changes affect the project's performance?	Identification of changes to adapt to the effects of COVID-19 and their repercussions on project performance	UNEP staff, project staff, Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
28. Was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?	Extent to which the project management structure as outlined in the project document was efficient in generating the expected results	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff, Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
29. Were project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?	Extent to which project funds and activities were delivered in a timely manner	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff, Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
30. Were there any cost-effectiveness strategies in place to deliver project funds and activities?	Identification of cost-effectiveness strategies	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff, Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
31. Was the project extension necessary?	Extent to which a project extension could have been avoided (if any was approved) and identification of reason supporting the need for extensions.	Contracts, financial reports, UNEP staff, project staff, Project Document, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
Criterion G: Monitoring and Reporting			
G.1. Monitoring Design and Budgeting			
32. Was an M&E system in place for project monitoring?	Identification of M&E tools and procedures and assessment of their appropriateness	M&E system, Progress Reports, PIRs, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
33. Were M&E activities organized and budgeted in a conducive way to achieve project's results?	Extent to which the organization and the budgeting of monitoring activities were conducive to achieve project's results and identification of budget gaps	M&E system, financial reports, Progress Reports, PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
G.2. Monitoring of Project Implementation			
34. Was the M&E system effectively used to guide project implementation?	Identification of evidence	M&E system, Progress Reports, PIRs, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
35. Was the M&E budget spent in accordance with M&E needs?	Identification of evidence	M&E system, Progress Reports, PIRs, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
36. GEF Portal question 1: What was the performance at the project's completion against Core Indicator Targets? (<i>For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided</i>).	Core Indicator Targets identified retrospectively	M&E system, Progress Reports, PIRs, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
G.3. Project reporting			
37. To what extent UNEP and donor reporting commitments have been fulfilled?	Extent to which both UNEP and donor reporting commitments have been fulfilled	M&E system, financial reports, Progress Reports, PIRs	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
Criterion H: Sustainability			
H.1. Socio-political sustainability			
38. Are there any social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project results and progress towards impact?	Identification of social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project results and progress towards impact	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
39. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership and capacities will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?	Identification of the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership and capacities will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
40. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?	Identification of stakeholders' interest and perception of it.	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
41. Is there sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?	Extent to which public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project exist	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
H.2. Financial sustainability			
42. To what extent project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained?	Extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
43. What is the likelihood that financial resources will be available once the GEF assistance ends to support the continuation of benefits?	Evidence of the likelihood that financial resources will be available once the GEF assistance ends to support the continuation of benefits	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
H.3. Institutional sustainability			
44. To what extent has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure?	Extent to which project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
45. To what extent has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date?	Extent to which project developed appropriate institutional capacity that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date?	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
46. Has the project achieved stakeholders' (including government stakeholders') consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date?	Identification of defined courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
47. What is the likelihood that gender and human rights issues promoted by the project will be supported after the project's closure date?	Identification of gender and human rights issues promoted by the project and identification of evidence of likelihood of support after project's closure date	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff, project deliverables	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
I. Factors Affecting Project Performance and Cross-cutting Issues			
I.1. Preparation and readiness (included in design)			
48. Were appropriate measures taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation?	Evidence of appropriate measures taken to address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
49. What was the extent and quality of engagement of the PMU with all the relevant stakeholder groups?	Quality and extent to which PMU engage effectively with all relevant stakeholder groups	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
I.2. Quality of Project Management and Supervision			
50. To which extent the flow of information within project staff, PSC, project partners was conducive to achieve project results?	Extent to which the flow of information within project staff, PSC, and project partners conducive to achieve project results	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
51. To what extent was the role of the implementing agency and the executive agency conducive to achieve project results? Were the efforts put in place by the two agencies relevant?	Extent to which the role of the two agencies was conducive to achieve project results	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
52. Did PSC provide effective leadership to achieve project results?	Evidence of PSC leadership	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
53. Were adaptive management measures necessary and appropriate to achieve project results?	Identification of adaptive management measures	PIRs, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
I.3. Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation			
54. To which extent the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with stakeholders to achieve project results?	Extent to which the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with stakeholders to achieve project results	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
55. To which extent the project developed national government stakeholders supported the objectives of the project?	Extent to which the project developed local and national government stakeholders supported the objectives of the project.	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
56. GEF Portal question 2: What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR? (This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval)	Identification of progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff Note: the question, included in the ToRs, is not relevant as no MTR was carried out. Therefore, the review will investigate the question from the beginning of the implementation.	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
I.4. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity			

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
57. To which extent cross cutting issues including human rights and gender equality were adequately considered in project design and implementation?	Extent to which cross cutting issues including human rights and gender equality were adequately considered in project design and implementation	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
58. GEF Portal question 3: Were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas? <i>(This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent)</i>	Identification of gender-responsive measures and gender result areas	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
I.5. Environmental and social safeguards			
59. To what extent did the project adhere to the environmental and social safeguards laid out in UNEP policy?	Extent to which project adhered to the environmental and social safeguards laid out in UNEP policy	PIRs, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Triangulation
60. GEF Portal question 4: What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval? <i>The risk classifications reported in the latest PIR report should be verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. (Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant during this review should be shared with the Task Manager for uploading in the GEF Portal)</i>	Identification of measures implemented against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval.	PIRs, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
I.6. Country ownership and drivenness/championship			
61. Have project partners and/or other relevant parties been building on project achievements?	Evidence of activities that build on project achievement	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	- Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
I.7. Communication and Public Awareness			

Main Review Criteria / Questions	Review Indicators	Source of Data	Methods
62. Where project communication and public awareness tools relevant and effective to support the achievement of project results?	Evidence of relevance and effectiveness of project communication and public awareness tools	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
63. To what extent did the communication and public awareness affect project delivery or the quality of its performance?	Extent to which the the communication and public awareness affected project delivery or the quality of its performance	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation
64. GEF Portal question 5: What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions? (This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).	Identification of challenges and outcomes	PIRs, project partners and beneficiaries, UNEP staff, project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Interviews - Focus group discussions - Triangulation

ANNEX III. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN QUALITY

A.	Operating Context	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:	
1	Does the project document identify any unusually challenging operational factors that are likely to negatively affect project performance?	i) Ongoing/high likelihood of conflict?	No	The project document does not identify any likelihood of conflict. Instead, several risks (inertia on institutional buy-in, insufficient institutional coordination, insufficient high – level political will and commitment, data availability and accessibility constraint, limited skill-set, possibility of not finishing the project within 3 years) are identified. Their identification is relevant and appropriate being the project aiming at promoting changes at institutional and normative levels. The review will assess if other risks, not identified in the project document, actually materialized during the implementation of the project.	Satisfactory (S=5)
		ii) Ongoing/high likelihood of natural disaster?	No	No mention of on-going or likelihood of natural disaster. The project document does not foresee any activity in the field. Therefore, the description of the likelihood of natural disaster is not relevant to identify the operating context.	
		iii) Ongoing/high likelihood of change in national government?	No	No mention of on-going or likelihood of change in national government.	
B.	Project Preparation	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:	
2	Does the project document entail clear and adequate problem and situation analyses?	Yes	The project document has dedicated and articulated sections to problem and situation analyses. The reasons behind the necessity to implement the project are clear.	Highly Satisfactory (HS=6)	
3	Does the project document include a clear and adequate stakeholder analysis, including by gender/minority groupings or indigenous peoples?	No	The project document has a section dedicated to stakeholder analysis, which, due to the nature of the project, has a focus on institutions. Therefore, gender and minority groupings are not included in that analysis.		
4	Does the project document provide a description of stakeholder consultation/participation during project design process? (If yes, were any key groups overlooked: government, private sector, civil society, gendered groups and those who will potentially be negatively affected)	Yes	In section "A.3. Stakeholders" of the project document, it is clearly stated that the majority of the stakeholders have been consulted to solicit their views on the project design... The comments and suggestions expressed have been reflected in this document. Instead, representatives of academia and CSOs were not consulted. During the review, the actual involvement of stakeholders will be assessed.		
5	Does the project document identify concerns with respect to human rights, including in relation to sustainable development? (e.g. integrated approach to human/natural systems; gender perspectives, rights of indigenous people).	i) Sustainable development in terms of integrated approach to human/natural systems	No		In the project document, there is no specific mention to any integrated approach to human/natural system. The occurrence does not raise any concerns because the project document does not entail any activity implemented in the field. The project is about the strengthening of Ghana national capacity for transparency and reporting.
		ii) Gender	No		A gender analysis was not conducted during project preparation. The project document does not foresee any activity at field level. However, it is explicitly stated that throughout the project, gender perspective would be introduced into MRV and an actual involvement of gender actors ensured. Gender issues will be considered during the review.
		iii) Indigenous peoples	NO	In the project document, there is no specific mention to indigenous people. The occurrence does not raise any concerns because the project document does not entail	

				any activity implemented in the field. The project is about the strengthening of Ghana national capacity for transparency and reporting.	
C	Strategic Relevance		Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
6	Is the project document clear in terms of its alignment and relevance to:	i) UN Environment MTS and PoW	Yes	The alignment and relevance of the project to the UNEP relevant MTS and POW is clear.	Satisfactory (S = 5)
		ii)) UN Environment /GEF/Donor strategic priorities	Yes	The alignment and relevance of the project to the GEF strategic priority is clear: it is fully aligned with the donor’s Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT).	
		iii) Regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities?	Yes	The project is relevant for the national environmental priorities.	
		iv) Complementarity with other interventions	Yes	The project builds on existing governmental institutions.	
D	Intended Results and Causality		Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
7	Are the causal pathways from project outputs (availability of goods and services to intended beneficiaries) through outcomes (changes in stakeholder behaviour) towards impacts (long lasting, collective change of state) clearly and convincingly described in either the logframe or the TOC? (NOTE if there is no TOC in the project design documents a reconstructed TOC at Review Inception will be needed)		No	A TOC is not included in the Project Document. However, it is easily understandable that the project aims at setting up an effective institutional arrangement that ultimately should serve the purpose of tracking the progress of Ghana towards achieving its NDC, to inform the global stock under Article 14 of Paris Agreement. The project does not foresee impacts on the ground, i.e. on the environmental status of the country. A ToC was, however, utilized during the preparation phase to inform the project proposal, but it was not officially included in the project document.	Satisfactory (S=5)
8	Are impact drivers and assumptions clearly described for each key causal pathway?		No	Several risks such as inertia on institutional buy-in, insufficient institutional coordination, insufficient high –level political will and commitment, data availability and accessibility constraint, limited skill-set, possibility of not finishing the project within 3 years, are identified in the proje document. However, specific impact drivers are not specified.	
9	Are the roles of key actors and stakeholders, including gendered/minority groups, clearly described for each key causal pathway?		No	Roles of key actors and stakeholders are clearly described but they are not associated to any causal pathway. Key stakeholders are institutions and CSOs.	
10	Are the outcomes realistic with respect to the timeframe and scale of the intervention?		Yes	Outcomes are realistic with respect to the timeframe and scale of the intervention	
E	Logical Framework and Monitoring		Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
11	Does the logical framework ...	i) Capture the key elements of the Theory of Change / intervention logic for the project?		The intervention logic has some elements of redundancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective and outcome statements, although formulated differently, have the same meaning, i.e. Ghana has a better mechanism in place for monitoring and reporting its NDC to respond to the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. The set of outputs 1, 2 and 3 is a more articulated and detailed form to express the same concept conveyed by the formulations of the outcome and objective of the project. In other words, a better mechanism in place for monitoring and reporting 	Moderately Satisfactory (S=4)

			<p>is composed by an effective institutional arrangement to plan, implement and report climate actions (output 1), a centralized national infrastructure for improved data access and information management (output 2), which includes five climate change indicators (output 3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finally, output 4 represents the test for fine-tuning the functionality of the system. • It is noteworthy to mention that the formulation of output 1 does not reflect the actual activities implemented by the project. In fact, under output 1, activities related to institutional assessment on Ghana’s Climate Ambitious Reporting Programme and training. <p>The review also acknowledges that a Theory of Change (ToC) was developed during the project preparation phase. However, it was not included in the final project document. The ToC does not differ significantly from the intervention logic (as shown in the Results Framework); in the ToC a few drivers and assumptions are visualized.</p>	
		ii) Have appropriate and ‘SMART’ results at output level?	<p>Yes</p> <p>Formally, the outputs included in the Results Framework do not have indicators, and consequently neither baseline nor target values. However, this does not constitute a problem, because their formulation shows the implicit target levels. In other words, the outputs are formulated as SMART indicators.</p> <p>In addition, the target level of the indicator of output 3 (i.e. five climate change indicators mainstreamed into the medium-term development framework) is the same as the target level of indicator n.1 at outcome level.</p>	
		iii) Have appropriate and ‘SMART’ results at outcome level?	<p>Yes</p> <p>Having the formulations of outcome and objective the same meaning, the indicators at outcome and objective level are quite similar. The indicators and their targets at outcome level refers to steps necessary to reach the targets of the indicators at objective level. It is necessary to developed 5 climate change related indicators for the MRV system (outcome indicator n.1) and to piloting the full-package of MRV of GHG with 3 institutions/organizations (outcome indicator n. 2) to have the domestic MRV system integrated to M&E framework established and in operation (objective indicator a) and to have relevant institutions/organizations using it (objective indicator b)</p>	
		iv) Reflect the project’s scope of work and ambitions?	<p>Yes</p> <p>The results framework reflect the project’s scope of work and ambitions.</p>	
12	Is there baseline information in relation to key performance indicators?	Yes	<p>The indicators of the outcome and objective of the project have baseline values reported in the Results Framework. As mentioned (see point 11 ii.) outputs are formulated as SMART indicators. Their baseline values are not reported in the Results Framework, but it is self-evident that the values are “NO” for outputs 1 and 2 and 4, “0” for output 3.</p>	
13	Has the desired level of achievement (targets) been specified for indicators of outputs and outcomes?	Yes	<p>The indicators of the outcome and objective of the project have target values reported in the Results Framework. As mentioned (see point 11 ii.) outputs are formulated as SMART indicators. Their baseline values are not reported in the Results Framework, but it is self-evident that the values are “YES” for outputs 1 and 2 and 4, “5” for output 3.</p>	

14	Are the milestones in the monitoring plan appropriate and sufficient to track progress and foster management towards outputs and outcomes?	Yes	Milestones for monitoring activities are include in Annex G: M&E Budget and Work Plan of the project document.	
15	Have responsibilities for monitoring activities been made clear?	Yes	Responsibilities for monitoring activities are include in Annex G: M&E Budget and Work Plan of the project document.	
16	Has a budget been allocated for monitoring project progress?	Yes	A costed M&E plan is presented in Annex G: M&E Budget and Work Plan of the project document.	
17	Is the workplan clear, adequate and realistic? (eg. Adequate time between capacity building and take up etc)	Yes	Work plan is adequate.	
F	Governance and Supervision Arrangements	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
18	Is the project governance and supervision model comprehensive, clear and appropriate? (<i>Steering Committee, partner consultations etc.</i>)		Annex H: Project Implementation Arrangements of the project document is well-articulated and defines the roles of the Project Advisory Board, UNEP, the Project Management Unit (PMU) and the Inter-ministerial Committee. The review will assess the actual functioning of the implementation arrangements (did they actually work well and help the project to achieve its results?).	Highly Satisfactory (S=6)
19	Are roles and responsibilities within UNEP clearly defined? (<i>If there are no stated responsibilities for UNEP Regional Offices, note where Regional Offices should be consulted prior to, and during, the review</i>)	Yes	The role of UNEP is specified in detailed in Annex H: Project Implementation Arrangements of the project. It is understood that the involvement of UNEP is ensured exclusively by its Climate Change Mitigation Unit, whose role is detailed in Annex H: Project Implementation Arrangements of the project document. The report will have a specific chapter related to the role of UNEP and its contribution to the success of the project.	
G	Partnerships	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
20	Have the capacities of partners been adequately assessed? (CHECK if partner capacity was assessed during inception/mobilisation where partners were either not known or changed after project design approval)	Yes	Capacities of stakeholders <i>Table 2: List of institutions and their roles in the CBIT project</i> included in the project document.	Highly Satisfactory (S=6)
21	Are the roles and responsibilities of external partners properly specified and appropriate to their capacities?	Yes	The project document includes <i>Table 2: List of institutions and their roles in the CBIT project</i> . The roles and responsibilities of external partners are properly specified and appropriate to their capacities.	
H	Learning, Communication and Outreach	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
22	Does the project have a clear and adequate knowledge management approach?	Yes	The project has a clear and adequate knowledge management approach. The work of a communication expert on the issue is envisaged in the project document. It is important to note that knowledge management is at the core of the project.	Satisfactory (HS=5)
23	Has the project identified appropriate methods for communication with key stakeholders, including gendered/minority groups, during the project life? If yes, do the plans build on an analysis of existing communication channels and networks used by key stakeholders?	Yes	The project has appropriate methods for communication with key stakeholders. An inter-ministerial committee has been envisaged to coordinate the communication between the PMU and the relevant institutions involved in the project. Due to the nature of the project, gendered/minority groups are not targeted by project activities: the project is inter-institutional.	

24	Are plans in place for dissemination of results and lesson sharing at the end of the project? If yes, do they build on an analysis of existing communication channels and networks?	Yes	A specific project activity is dedicated to the dissemination of results and lessons learnt.	
I	Financial Planning / Budgeting	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
25	Are the budgets / financial planning adequate at design stage? (Coherence of the budget, do figures add up etc.)	Yes	The budget was adequate at design stage.	Satisfactory (S=5)
26	Is the resource mobilization strategy reasonable/realistic? (E.g. If the expectations are over-ambitious the delivery of the project outcomes may be undermined or if under-ambitious may lead to repeated no cost extensions)	No	A resource mobilization strategy is not included in or attached to the project document. However, the project is heavily co-financed.	
J	Efficiency	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
27	Has the project been appropriately designed/adapted in relation to the duration and/or levels of secured funding?	Yes	The project was appropriately designed and adapted in relation to the duration. The outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic and its effects on the budget and duration of the project will be investigated during the review.	Satisfactory (S=5)
28	Does the project design make use of / build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency?	Yes	The project intends to work through existing national ministries, with some CSOs and with academic sector. At its core, it is a project that supports directly the government ministries. Collaboration between involved ministries and governmental institutions is therefore expected to happen.	
29	Does the project document refer to any value for money strategies (i.e. increasing economy, efficiency and/or cost-effectiveness)?	No	The project document does not refer to any value for money strategies.	
30	Has the project been extended beyond its original end date? (If yes, explore the reasons for delays and no-cost extensions during the review)	Yes		
K	Risk identification and Social Safeguards	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
31	Are risks appropriately identified in both the TOC/logic framework and the risk table? (If no, include key assumptions in reconstructed TOC at Review Inception)	Yes	Risks are identified in the Results Framework and in the dedicated section "A.5 Risk" of the project document. They are all relating to the institutional nature of the project itself. No climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved are identified. The terminal review at inception phase considers the risks appropriately identified. During the implementation of the review, the appropriateness of the identification of risks will be assessed again taking into consideration the actual context in which the project was implemented.	Satisfactory (S=5)
32	Are potentially negative environmental, economic and social impacts of the project identified and is the mitigation strategy adequate? (consider unintended impacts)	No	The project does not foresee any activities on the ground. It is an institutional project aiming at improving transparency and reporting. As such, it is assumed that it cannot generate significant environmental, economic and social impacts during and after its implementation.	
33	Does the project have adequate mechanisms to reduce its negative environmental foot-print? (including in relation to project management and work implemented by UNEP partners)	No	There is no mechanisms to reduce the environmental foot-print caused by its implementation.	

L	Sustainability / Replication and Catalytic Effects	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
34	Did the design address any/all of the following: socio-political, financial, institutional and environmental sustainability issues?	No	Sustainability issues are covered in the section "A.1.6. Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up". No socio-political, financial, institutional and environmental sustainability issues are identified. The section, instead, identifies ways to enhance technical aspects of the project in order to ensure a higher degree of sustainability. Being an institutional project, these technical aspects may also be considered as institutional.	Satisfactory (S=5)
35	Was there a credible sustainability strategy and/or appropriate exit strategy at design stage?	No	A sustainability strategy is not identified in the project document. However, it is clearly written that future funding plays a role for the sustainability of the project. It is as well written that there is the necessity	
36	Does the project design present strategies to promote/support scaling up, replication and/or catalytic action? (if yes, capture this feature in the reconstructed TOC at Review Inception)	No	The project design does not entail strategies for scaling up or replication. This is coherent with the nature of the project. It does not implement activities on the ground. It is about setting up a central system for tracking and implementing progress towards its national development framework.	
M	Identified Project Design Weaknesses/Gaps	Yes/No	Comments/Implications for the review design	Section Rating:
37	Were recommendations made by the PRC adopted in the final project design? If no, what were the critical issues raised by PRC that were not addressed.	No	No specific recommendations were made by the PRC	Satisfactory (S=5)
38	Were there any critical issues not flagged by PRC?	No		

ANNEX IV. PEOPLE INTERVIEWED DURING THE REVIEW

#	Organisation	Name	Position	Gender
1	Environmental Protection Agency	Juliana Bempah <i>(met on-line and in person in Accra)</i>	Principal Programme Officer	F
2	Environmental Protection Agency	Daniel Akwetey Limptay <i>(met on-line and in person in Accra)</i>	Principal Programme Officer	M
3	Environmental Protection Agency	Dr. Daniel Tutu Benefoh <i>(met on-line and in person in Accra)</i>	Project Manager / AG. DIRECTOR/UNFCCC Focal Point	M
4	Environmental Protection Agency	Samsom Bothway <i>(met on-line and in person in Accra)</i>	Principal IT Officer	M
5	Ministry of Food and Agriculture	Kingsley Kwako Amoako <i>(met on-line)</i>	Deputy Director of Climate Change	M
6	United Nations Environment Programme	Julien Lheureux <i>(met on-line)</i>	Programme Management Officer - Climate Change Mitigation Unit	M
7	M& E Consultant	Akua Okyere-Darko <i>(met on-line)</i>	Development and MRV Expert	F
8	National Development Planning Commission	Daniel Amofa <i>(met on-line)</i>	Principal M&E Officer	M
9	National Development Planning Commission	Winfred Nelson <i>(met on-line)</i>	Acting Director Development Coordination Division	M
10	Environmental Protection Agency	Joy Ankomah <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	Deputy Director, Built Environment Department	M
11	Environmental Protection Agency	Goodwin Kwesi Asiedu <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	Principal Programme Officer, Petroleum Department	M
12	Ministry of Energy	Fatawu Issah <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	Head, Health, Safety, Security and Environment Unit	M
13	Ministry of Transport	Daniel Essel <i>(met on-line)</i>	Deputy Director, Directorate of Policy, Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation	M
14	Environmental Protection Agency	Elvis Ahiahonu <i>(met on-line)</i>	Principal Programme Officer, Manufactory Department	M
15	Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources	Godfred Fifi Boadi <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	Senior Public Health Engineer	M
16	Ghana Statistical Services	Bernice Offoso-Badu <i>(met on-line)</i>	Head of Agricultural and Environmental Services	F
17	Consultant	Albert Owusu Ansah <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	Communication Specialist	M
18	Consultant	Charles Acquaaah <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	Consultant (Energy Sector)	M
19	Consultant	Winston Amoah Asante <i>(met on-line)</i>	MRV Expert	M
20	Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources	Jacob Amoako <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	MRV and GIS Expert – Forestry Commission	M

#	Organisation	Name	Position	Gender
21	Ministry of Energy	Hanz Ablor <i>(met in person in Accra)</i>	Engineer	M
22	Consultant	Mary Jane Enchill <i>(met on-line)</i>	Communication Expert	F
23	Energy Commission	Salifu Addo <i>(met on-line)</i>	Deputy Director (MRV Expert) – Planning and Policy Directorate	M
24	Hatoff Foundation	Samuel Dotse	Chief Executive Officer	M
25	United Nations Environment Programme	Fatma Twahir <i>(met on-line)</i>	Administrative Officer - Climate Change Mitigation Unit	F

ANNEX V. KEY DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Reference documents

- Project Document
- Request for CEO Endorsement

Institutional documents, reports and strategies

- Medium-Term Strategy 2022–2025: For People and Planet - The United Nations Environment Programme strategy for tackling climate change, biodiversity and nature loss, and pollution and waste from 2022–2025.
- For people and planet: the United Nations Environment Programme strategy for 2022–2025 to tackle climate change, loss of nature and pollution – Addendum: Programme of work and budget for the biennium 2022–2023

Project planning and reporting documents

- Annual Co-Finance Report – Overall Project Report (December, 2022)
- Final report
- Project Implementation Reports:
 - Fiscal years: 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023
- Project revision sheet (11 month-extension)
- Quarterly expenditure reports
 - 2020 (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4), 2021 (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4) 2022 (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4) 2023 (Q1, Q2)

External audits

- Independent Auditor's report: Financial Statements for the period ended 31 May 2021
- Financial Reports for the period ended 30 September 2022

Project outputs – Overall

- <https://climatedatahub.com.gh>

Project outputs work package 1 - Outcome 1

Output 1

- Ghana Assessment Report Card - Initial assessment of the status of institutions involved in Ghana's Climate Ambitious Reporting Programme (GCARP) Using Scale Defined in The GEF Programming Document
- Report on the focus group discussion meeting on the review of the methodology for the preparation of energy, waste, transport, and agriculture Statistics for Climate Reporting
- Report on the institutional assessment on Ghana's Climate Ambitious Reporting Programme
- Report on Training Workshops on Climate Reporting for Experienced National Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) Experts

- Training Workshops on Climate Reporting for New Entrants Identified to the List of National Experts (8-9 April 2021)

Output 2

- Report – Consultancy to establish a functional & centralized data-sharing network
- Factsheet – Mainstreaming Eight Climate Change Outcome Indicators into the Medium-Term Development Agenda
- Newsletter - The Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency Project
- Report on Developing a Knowledge Management Instruction
- Verification Manual (National Determined Contribution Tracking Tool)
- NDC tracking tools for the following sectors: (1) Forestry, (2) Communication and Interior, (3) Waste, (4) Energy, (5) Oil & Gas, (6) Agriculture, (7) Health, (8) Transport, (9) Water, and (10) Works and Housing

Output 3

- Mainstreaming Climate Change Indicators into the Medium-Term Development Agenda
- Stakeholder Consultative Workshop on the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) – Indicators and Template
- Stakeholder Training Workshop on the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) – Regional Coordinating Councils, EPA Regional Offices and Metropolitan Assemblies

Output 4

- NDC MRV System - Work flow of the NDC greenhouse gas accounting tool

Web-sites

- <https://www.cbitplatform.org>
- <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- <https://www.thegef.org>
- <https://www.unep.org>
- <https://unfccc.int>

ANNEX VI. IN-COUNTRY MISSION'S ITINERARY

Sunday, 02 March 2023

Arrival of the Reviewer in Accra

Monday, 03 March 2023

Interviews in Accra with officers from the Environmental Protection Agency and the Ministry of Energy and on-line interviews with officers from the Ministry of Transport

Tuesday, 04 March 2023

Interviews in Accra with officers from Environmental Protection Agency and the Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources

Wednesday, 05 March 2023

Interviews in Accra and on-line with project consultants

Thursday, 06 March 2023

Interviews in Accra with officers from the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources and Ministry of Energy

Friday, 06 March 2023

Interviews on-line with a project consultants

Saturday, 06 March 2023

Departure of the Reviewer from Accra

ANNEX VII. BRIEF CV OF THE REVIEWER

Name	Giacomo Morelli
Profession	Independent Consultant
Nationalities	Italian and Swiss
Country experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Europe: Italy, Switzerland, Moldova, Ukraine • Africa: Algeria, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, and Zimbabwe • America: Argentina, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Paraguay, Uruguay • Asia: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Georgia, Indonesia, Laos, Lebanon, Jordan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Palestine
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSc in Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture (University of Florence, Italy) • Certificate of Advanced Studies in Evaluation (University of Bern, Switzerland)

Short biography

Giacomo Morelli is a professional with proven experience in the development sector in the thematic areas of agriculture, biodiversity, climate change, environment, food security, livelihoods, natural resource management, rural development and resilience. He, holding an MSc in Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture and Certificate of Advanced Studies in Evaluation, has vast experience in evaluation, which he has accrued first-hand by conducting more than 35 evaluation assignments and by attending formal trainings. Since 2012, he has been engaging mainly with evaluations and had the opportunity to carry out evaluations for United Nations entities and international NGOs. He has a broad experience in evaluating GEF and EU funded projects. Prior to his work as Evaluator, work as consultant for a broad spectrum of organizations such as UN agencies, private companies, research institutes and international NGOs.

Key specialties and capabilities cover:

Results-oriented Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation Expert with 20+ years' experience providing data driven solutions driving agriculture, climate change adaptation and mitigation, sustainable land and water management, biodiversity conservation, natural resources management, sustainable value chain development, and rural development initiatives for key donor institutions and non-profit organizations globally. Highly regarded for analytical, problem-solving and interpersonal skills with ability to effectively engage with, communicate, and motivate donors, governments, stakeholders, clients, and communities.

Selected assignments and experiences

1. **OCTOBER 2022/MARCH 2023 – UNDP - INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR**
Midterm review of a UNDP project in South Africa. Project: "Development of Value Chains for Products derived from Genetic Resources in Compliance with the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the National Biodiversity Economy Strategy". Donor: GEF
2. **AUGUST 2022/FEBRUARY 2023 – UNEP - INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR**
Terminal evaluation of a UNEP project in Kenya. Project: "Scaling Up Sustainable Land Management and Agro-Biodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small-Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya". Donor: GEF.
3. **JANUARY/MARCH 2022 - UNOPS - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR**
Terminal evaluation of a UNDP/UNOPS project in Mexico. Project: "the Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Mexico". Donor: GEF.
4. **AUGUST/NOVEMBER 2021 – UNDP - INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR**
Terminal evaluation in South Africa. Project: "Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Land Use Regulation and Management at the Municipal Scale". Donor: GEF.
5. **MAY/AUGUST 2021 – UNDP - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR**

MTR in Colombia. Project: "Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon". Donor: GEF.

6. *APRIL/JUNE 2021 – UNDP - INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Terminal Evaluation in Uruguay. Project: "The integration of the adaptation approach in cities, infrastructure and local planning in Uruguay". Donor: GCF.

7. *APRIL/JUNE 2021 – UNDP - INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Terminal Evaluation in Lebanon. Project: "Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon". Donor: GEF.

8. *OCTOBER/DECEMBER 2020 – UNDP - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Final evaluation in Paraguay. Project: "Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management into Production Practices in all Bioregions and Biomes"). Donor: GEF.

9. *JULY/NOVEMBER 2020 – UNDP - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Final evaluation in Mexico. Project: "Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change". Donor: GEF.

10. *DECEMBER 2019/MARCH 2020 – UNDP - INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Mid-term review in South Africa. Project: "Securing Multiple Ecosystems Benefit through Sustainable Land Management in the Productive but Degraded Landscapes of South Africa"). Donor: GEF

11. *NOVEMBER 2019/MARCH 2020 – UNDP - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Terminal evaluation in Colombia. Project: "Vulnerability and Risk Reduction towards Climate Change in the Momposina Depression in Colombia") Donor: AF.

12. *JULY/OCTOBER 2019 – UNDP - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

MTR in Indonesia. Project: "Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Conventions through Enhancing Incentive Mechanism for Sustainable Watershed/ Land Management". Donor: GEF.

13. *MAY/JUNE 2019 – Caritas Czech Republic - EVALUATOR*

Final evaluation in Mongolia. Project "Strengthening Civil Society Organizations-Local Authorities Partnership in the Agriculture Sector in Khentii Province". Donor: EU and Czech Development Agency.

14. *APRIL/MAY 2019 – Action Against Hunger - EVALUATOR*

Final evaluation in Jordan. "Improvement of Solid Waste Management for host communities and Syrian Refugees in Azraq Town, Zarqa Governorate, Jordan". Donor: Taiwan ICDF

15. *AUGUST/OCTOBER 2018 – Movimento Africa 70 - EVALUATOR*

Mid-term evaluation in Algeria (Saharawi camps). Project: "Food and Work: Self-production with Dignity. Donor: Italian Agency for Development Cooperation.

16. *MARCH/APRIL 2018 – UNDP - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Mid-term review in Argentina. Project: "Sustainable land use management in the drylands of North-west of Argentina". Donor: GEF

17. *MARCH/APRIL 2017 – General Consulting and Training/UNDP - EVALUATION TEAM LEADER*

Final evaluation in Palestine. Project: "Enhancing the Capacities of the Palestinian Authority in Mainstreaming Environment and Climate Change". Donor: Government of Belgium

18. *MAY/SEPTEMBER 2016 – UNCCD Secretariat - LEAD INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR*

Final evaluation of multi-country project implemented in Ecuador, Guatemala, Laos, Mozambique, Niger, Palestine, Rwanda, Senegal and Tanzania. Project: "Integrating Climate Change Finance into Sustainable Land Management Investment Strategies". Donor: EU.

19. *NOVEMBER 2015 /JANUARY 2016 – Blue Ventures - EVALUATOR*

Final evaluation in Madagascar. Project: "Improving the profitability and ecological sustainability of octopus fisheries in southwest Madagascar"). Donor: DFID.

20. *AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 2013 – Secours Catholique/Caritas France - EVALUATOR*

Final evaluation in Mongolia. Project "Food Security and Sustainable Farming Approaches in Mongolia". Donor: EU.

ANNEX VIII. RESPONSE TO STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

Response to stakeholder comments received but not (fully) accepted by the reviewers, where appropriate

Page Ref	Stakeholder comment	Reviewer(s) Response
Throughout the report	Typos and/or imprecise data	Corrections of typos and/or imprecise data have been accepted throughout all the report. They are not reported individually because content-wise are not significant.
Cover page and page 1	Changes related to UNEP corporate requirements are suggested	All changes are accepted, since they do not have relation with the substantive contents of the report
Page 2	Insertion in track-change of the following text: This Terminal Review was prepared for UNEP’s Industry and Economy Division by Giacomo Morelli.	Insertion of the text accepted
Page 2	Insertion in track-change of the following text: The review consultant(s) hopes that the findings, conclusions and recommendations will contribute to the successful finalisation of the current project, formulation of a next phase and to the continuous improvement of similar projects in other countries and regions.	Insertion of the text accepted
Page 8	If needed, we can update this with the actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2023: US\$ 1,055,000. The Q2 2023 expenditure report is available in the shared DropBox folder. Please also refer to our comments in section 1.6 below.	Table adjusted accordingly
Page 8	If needed, we can update this with the actual expenditures <u>recorded</u> as of 30 June 2023 US\$ 995,534	Table adjusted accordingly
Page 11 – Rec 1	Giacomo: if you don't mind, I would include the term "potential", since it is not a given yet that there will be a follow up project.	The word potential added
Page 11 – Rec 3		The word potential added
Page 20 – Table 2	The figures in this column are omitting the budget provisioned for the project Evaluations (which is handled by UNEP, not the EPA), i.e. \$45,000 equally spread across each output (or \$11,250 per output). As such, the revision actually did not change the total budget per output. Let me know if you need further clarifications on this.	\$11.250 added to each output
Page 20 – Table 2	This is the expenditure status as at end of March 2023. It may be important to specify it. Otherwise, you could update it to indicate the expenditures as at end of June 2023. The Q2 2023 expenditure report is uploaded in the shared Dropbox folder.	Table updated accordingly
Page 20 – Table 2	Refer to comment above.	Refer to answer above
Page 20 – Table 2	The project revision was undertaken and approved in year 2021, not 2022.	2021 replaced 2022

Page Ref	Stakeholder comment	Reviewer(s) Response
Page 20 – Table 3	This is not UNEP co-financing. These contributions come from UNDP and ICAT (UNEP-CCC.)	Relevant changes included
Page 30 – Table 5	We could include expenditure figures as per end of June 2023.	Table updated
Page 30 – Table 5	Refer to comments in section 1.6 above.	Table updated
Page 30 – Table 5	Refer to comments in section 1.6 above.	Relevant changes included
Page 30 – Table 5	The project revision was undertaken and approved in year 2021, not 2022.	2021 replaced 2022
Page 30 – Table 6	This co-financing comes from UNDP and ICAT (UNEP-CCC).	Corrected
Paragraph 144	This is partly correct. In fact, the CBIT Ghana project was funded under the GEF-6 cycle and back then there were no Core Indicators. However, the newer generation CBIT projects have 1 Core Indicator relating to the number of direct beneficiaries from the project (disaggregated by gender). But this did not apply to the Ghana project.	No changes needed
Paragraph 172	Sentence unclear. Seems redundant. Please reformulate.	Participation of women and men in project activities were the participation of men and women in the implementation of the initiative was conditional on their roles in the respective institutions changed into The participation of men and women in the implementation of the initiative was conditional on their roles in the respective institutions
Page 41 - Table 7	Summary assessment and rating missing	Summary assessment and rating for UNEP / Implementing Agency and Partners / Executing Agency added
Page 44 Recommendation #1	Giacomo: if you don't mind, I would include the term "potential", since it is not a given yet that there will be a follow up project.	The word potential added
Page 45 Recommendation #3		The word potential added
Annex IX	Giacomo: you had forgotten to include this table in the Annex. Please complete it with your responses to the different questions, based on the terminal review.	Table filled out.
Annex X	Giacomo: please complete this additional table as per Evaluation Office requirements.	Table filled out.

ANNEX IX. GEF PORTAL INPUTS

The following table contains text to be uploaded to the GEF Portal. **It will be drawn from the Review Report, either as copied or summarised text.** In each case, references should be provided for the paragraphs and pages of the report from which the responses have been copied or summarised.

Question:	<i>What was the performance at the project's completion against Core Indicator Targets? (For projects approved prior to GEF-7⁸, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided⁹).</i>
Response:	The question is not applicable to the project under review because it was approved under the GEF-6 cycle, which did not include Core Indicators. In fact, the CBIT initiative funds projects with the aim at (1) strengthening national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities; (2) providing relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Agreement; and (3) assist in the improvement of transparency over time. Instead, the GEF Core Indicators are related to global environmental benefits, i.e. actual changes on the environment (e.g. Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (million metric tons of CO ₂ e), etc.).
Question:	<i>What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR? (This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval)</i>
Response:	A Mid Term Review was not conducted (it was marked as optional in the project document). The necessity for the PMU to work with key stakeholders that were already working in the climate change space and where possible to expand participation to engage with new actors was already included in the project document, specifically in its section dedicated to stakeholders' engagement. The project also created awareness on climate reporting among stakeholders in the line ministries and the private sector, specifically within some units and departments of institutions that previous were not dealing with climate change issues.
Question:	<i>What were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas? (This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent)</i>
Response:	Not apply.
Question:	<i>What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval? The risk classifications reported in the latest PIR report should be verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. (Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant during this review should be shared with the Task Manager for uploading in the GEF Portal)</i>
Response:	

⁸ The GEF is currently operating under the seventh replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund covering the period July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2022. The GEF Portal Reporting Guide for FY20 Reporting Process indicates that GEF-6 projects that have yet to map existing indicators to GEF-7 Core Indicators need to do so at MTR stage or (if already there) at the time of the TE. (i.e. not GEF projects approved before GEF-6)

⁹ This is not applicable for Enabling Activities

The Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note screening exercise performed by UNEP's Safeguards Unit rated this project at "Low" risk. It was reported to the Reviewer that this is the case for all UNEP CBIT projects, since they focus mainly on normative work and capacity building. The review agrees with such consideration.

Question:

What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions? (This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval)

Response:

The project at its core is about knowledge management. The Climate Data Hub, the manual and the NDC tracking tools represent the main tool developed by the project to system for MRV purposes that is adopted at national level to report against the implementation of the Ghanaian NDC. The project did not face any major challenge in deliver these tools.

Question: *What are the main findings of the review?*

Response:

The project originated from Ghana's political interests and was well-suited to its objective. It aligned with the priorities of the Ghanaian government, the GEF Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), UNEP MTS, POW and strategic priorities.

The Results Framework was redundant. The objective and outcome statements, while differently formulated, essentially conveyed the same meaning—establishing a better mechanism to monitor and report Ghana's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to meet the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. The specific outputs (1, 2, and 3) provided more detailed expressions of the same concept found in the project's outcome and objective statements.

The project's financial management was timely, transparent, and in line with UNEP's policies, ensuring efficient fund allocation for smooth implementation.

The project's implementation was noteworthy, demonstrating relevance and conduciveness to achieving its intended outcomes. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) showed proactive leadership, and all stakeholders collaborated in a spirit of cooperation. The partnership between EPA and UNEP was effective, and the management of project resources remained transparent.

The no-cost extension was a well-justified and strategic choice that contributed to the project's success.

Notably, gender issues were not addressed in any project activity. However, this omission should not be seen as negative since the project's nature did not allow for their inclusion.

ANNEX X. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Financial management components:		Rating	Evidence/ Comments
1. Adherence to UNEP's policies and procedures:		HS:HU	S
Any evidence that indicates shortcomings in the project's adherence ¹⁰ to UNEP or donor policies, procedures or rules		Yes/No	No
2. Completeness of project financial information¹¹:			
Provision of key documents to the reviewer (based on the responses to A-H below)		HS:HU	S
A.	Co-financing and Project Cost's tables at design (by budget lines)	Yes/No or N/A	Yes (Project Cost's table provided by budget line, Co-financing table by co-financer)
B.	Revisions to the budget	Yes/No or N/A	Yes
C.	All relevant project legal agreements (e.g. SSFA, PCA, ICA)	Yes/No or N/A	Yes
D.	Proof of fund transfers	Yes/No or N/A	Yes
E.	Proof of co-financing (cash and in-kind)	Yes/No or N/A	Yes
F.	A summary report on the project's expenditures during the life of the project (by budget lines, project components and/or annual level)	Yes/No or N/A	Yes (project expenditures per budget lines per year)
G.	Copies of any completed audits and management responses (where applicable)	Yes/No or N/A	Yes
H.	Any other financial information that was required for this project (list):	Yes/No or N/A	N/A
3. Communication between finance and project management staff		HS:HU	S
Project Manager and/or Task Manager's level of awareness of the project's financial status.		HS:HU	S
Fund Management Officer's knowledge of project progress/status when disbursements are done.		HS:HU	S
Level of addressing and resolving financial management issues among Fund Management Officer and Project Manager/Task Manager.		HS:HU	S
Contact/communication between by Fund Management Officer, Project Manager/Task Manager during the preparation of financial and progress reports.		HS:HU	S
Project Manager, Task Manager and Fund Management Officer responsiveness to financial requests during the review process		HS:HU	S
Overall rating			S

¹⁰ If the review raises concerns over adherence with policies or standard procedures, a recommendation maybe given to cover the topic in an upcoming audit, or similar financial oversight exercise.

¹¹ See also document 'Criterion Rating Description' for reference

ANNEX XI. QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF THE REVIEW REPORT

Review Title: Validated Terminal Review of the UNEP Project “Strengthening Ghana's national capacity for transparency and ambitious climate reporting” GEF PROJECT ID: 9820 2019 - 2023

Consultant: Giacomo Morelli

All UNEP Reviews are subject to a quality assessment by the UNEP Evaluation Office. This is an assessment of the quality of the review product (i.e. Main Review Report).

	UNEP Evaluation Office Comments	Final Review Report Rating
Substantive Report Quality Criteria		
<p>Quality of the Executive Summary:</p> <p>The Summary should be able to stand alone as an accurate summary of the main review product. It should include a concise overview of the review object; clear summary of the review objectives and scope; overall project performance rating of the project and key features of performance (strengths and weaknesses) against exceptional criteria (plus reference to where the review ratings table can be found within the report); summary of the main findings of the exercise, including a synthesis of main conclusions (which include a summary response to key strategic review questions), lessons learned and recommendations.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>The summary is clear and concise and meets most of the report quality criteria. A summary of performance ratings by criterion was neither included in the Executive Summary nor a reference provided to where in the report can be found.</p> <p>Summary responses to the 4 strategic questions presented in the TOR are not included and GEF portal questions, as formulated in the TOR, are partly included in the Executive Summary.</p>	4
<p>I. Introduction</p> <p>A brief introduction should be given identifying, where possible and relevant, the following: institutional context of the project (sub-programme, Division, regions/countries where implemented) and coverage of the review; date of PRC approval and project document signature); results frameworks to which it contributes (e.g. Expected Accomplishment in POW); project duration and start/end dates; number of project phases (where appropriate); implementing partners; total secured budget and whether the project has been reviewed/evaluated in the past (e.g. mid-term, part of a synthesis evaluation, evaluated by another agency etc.)</p> <p>Consider the extent to which the introduction includes a concise statement of the purpose of the review and the key intended audience for the findings?</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>Clear and brief introduction meeting the elements of the report quality criteria.</p> <p>Relevant POWs not specified here, but mentioned in the Executive Summary.</p>	5
<p>II. Review Methods</p> <p>A data collection section should include: a description of review methods and information sources used, including the number and type of respondents; justification for methods used (e.g. qualitative/quantitative; electronic/face-to-face); any selection criteria used to identify respondents, case studies or sites/countries visited; strategies used to increase stakeholder engagement and consultation; details of how data were verified (e.g. triangulation, review by stakeholders etc.). Efforts to include the voices of different groups, e.g.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>All report quality criteria elements are very well covered, including the limitations to the methodology and justification for methods.</p> <p>In para 35. The report erroneously refers to itself as a Mid Term Review whereas it is a Terminal Review.</p>	5

<p>vulnerable, gender, marginalised etc) should be described.</p> <p>Methods to ensure that potentially excluded groups (excluded by gender, vulnerability or marginalisation) are reached and their experiences captured effectively, should be made explicit in this section.</p> <p>The methods used to analyse data (e.g. scoring; coding; thematic analysis etc.) should be described.</p> <p>It should also address review limitations such as: low or imbalanced response rates across different groups; gaps in documentation; extent to which findings can be either generalised to wider review questions or constraints on aggregation/disaggregation; any potential or apparent biases; language barriers and ways they were overcome.</p> <p>Ethics and human rights issues should be highlighted including: how anonymity and confidentiality were protected and strategies used to include the views of marginalised or potentially disadvantaged groups and/or divergent views. E.g. <i>‘Throughout the review process and in the compilation of the Final Review Report efforts have been made to represent the views of both mainstream and more marginalised groups. All efforts to provide respondents with anonymity have been made’</i></p>	<p>It does not include information on methods to ensure that potentially excluded groups (excluded by gender, vulnerability or marginalisation) were considered. However, the Reviewer indicates in the Executive summary that gender issues were not addressed in any project activity.</p> <p>Ethics of conduct, specifically anonymity and confidentiality, are mentioned in para 43.</p>	
<p>III. The Project</p> <p>This section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Context:</i> Overview of the main issue that the project is trying to address, its root causes and consequences on the environment and human well-being (i.e. synopsis of the problem and situational analyses). • <i>Results Framework:</i> Summary of the project’s results hierarchy as stated in the ProDoc (or as officially revised) • <i>Stakeholders:</i> Description of groups of targeted stakeholders organised according to relevant common characteristics • <i>Project implementation structure and partners:</i> A description of the implementation structure with diagram and a list of key project partners • <i>Changes in design during implementation:</i> Any key events that affected the project’s scope or parameters should be described in brief in chronological order • <i>Project financing:</i> Completed tables of: (a) budget at design and expenditure by components (b) planned and actual sources of funding/co-financing 	<p>Final report:</p> <p>A well-structured section covering all the elements of the report quality criteria.</p> <p>It is noted that paras 51 and 52 are written in the present tense. However, the Evaluation Office reads this to be the status prior to the project under review beginning.</p>	5
<p>IV. Theory of Change</p> <p>The reconstructed TOC at Review should be presented clearly in both diagrammatic and narrative forms. Clear articulation of each major causal pathway is expected, (starting from outputs to long term impact), including explanations of all drivers and assumptions as well as the expected roles of key actors.</p> <p>This section should include a description of how the <i>TOC at Review</i>¹² was designed (who was involved etc.) and</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>Figure 2 is called the ‘Project Theory of Change’ yet it reflects some reconstruction: one output was upgraded to an outcome and the project objective in figure 2 is not the same as that written in para 53. A substantive narrative of the</p>	3

¹² During the Inception Phase of the review process a *TOC at Design* is created based on the information contained in the approved project documents (these may include either logical framework or a TOC or narrative descriptions). During the review process this TOC is revised based on changes made during project intervention and becomes the *TOC at Review*.

<p>applied to the context of the project? Where different groups (e.g. vulnerable, gender, marginalised etc) are included in, or affected by the project in different ways, this should be reflected in the TOC.</p> <p>Where the project results as stated in the project design documents (or formal revisions of the project design) are not an accurate reflection of the project's intentions or do not follow UNEP's definitions of different results levels, project results may need to be re-phrased or reformulated. In such cases, a summary of the project's results hierarchy should be presented for: a) the results as stated in the approved/ revised Prodoc logframe/TOC and b) as formulated in the TOC at Review. <i>The two results hierarchies should be presented as a two column table to show clearly that, although wording and placement may have changed, the results 'goal posts' have not been 'moved'.</i> This table may have initially been presented in the Inception Report and should appear somewhere in the Main Review report.</p>	<p>reconstructed Theory of Change was needed to both complete the reconstruction and provide a more solid foundation for the analysis of results that follows.</p> <p>The narrative does not go into the detail of causal pathways.</p> <p>Drivers are described but assumptions are not included.</p> <p>The project's performance is assessed against the results presented in figure 2.</p>	
<p>V. Key Findings</p> <p>A. Strategic relevance:</p> <p>This section should include an assessment of the project's relevance in relation to UNEP's mandate and its alignment with UNEP's policies and strategies at the time of project approval. An assessment of the complementarity of the project at design (or during inception/mobilisation¹³) with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups should be included. Consider the extent to which all four elements have been addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment to the UNEP Medium Term Strategy (MTS), Programme of Work (POW) and Strategic Priorities • Alignment to Donor/Partner Strategic Priorities • Relevance to Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities • Complementarity with Existing Interventions 	<p>Final report:</p> <p>All the elements of the report quality criteria are covered, including GEF Programme and SDGs.</p> <p>Alignment with MTS 2018-2021 and POW 2018-2019 and 2020-2021, within which the project period falls, is not indicated.</p> <p>Reference to national document or plan by title is not provided.</p>	4.5
<p>B. Quality of Project Design</p> <p>To what extent are the strength and weaknesses of the project design effectively <u>summarized</u>?</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>Detailed review follows closely criteria for review of project design. Strengths and weaknesses are not specifically termed as such, but the project design weaknesses/ gaps criterion is rated satisfactory.</p>	4.5
<p>C. Nature of the External Context</p> <p>For projects where this is appropriate, key external features of the project's implementing context that may have been reasonably expected to limit the project's performance (e.g. conflict, natural disaster, political upheaval¹⁴) and how they have affected performance, should be described.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>The nature of the external context is described as per the report quality criteria.</p>	5

¹³ A project's inception or mobilization period is understood as the time between project approval and first disbursement. Complementarity during project implementation is considered under Efficiency, see below.

¹⁴ Note that 'political upheaval' does not include regular national election cycles, but unanticipated unrest or prolonged disruption. The potential delays or changes in political support that are often associated with the regular national election cycle should be part of the project's design and addressed through adaptive management of the project team.

<p>D. Effectiveness</p> <p>(i) Outputs and Project Outcomes: How well does the report present a well-reasoned, complete and evidence-based assessment of the a) availability of outputs, and b) achievement of project outcomes? How convincing is the discussion of attribution and contribution, as well as the constraints to attributing effects to the intervention.</p> <p>The effects of the intervention on differentiated groups, including those with specific needs due to gender, vulnerability or marginalisation, should be discussed explicitly.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>A summary of the outputs and outcomes of the project with indication of the evidence found is provided. However, source of information and possibly qualitative information (interviews) not mentioned for outputs (only outcomes). Given that there was field mission and the list of respondents, the Evaluation Office assumes data to assess the availability of outputs was gathered.</p> <p>Attribution and contribution are not described explicitly.</p> <p>There is no discussion of the engagement of, or addressing the needs of, differentiated groups. Para 173 explains that participants were appropriately selected based on the positions they held.</p>	<p>4.5</p>
<p>(ii) Likelihood of Impact: How well does the report present an integrated analysis, guided by the causal pathways represented by the TOC, of all evidence relating to likelihood of impact?</p> <p>How well are change processes explained and the roles of key actors, as well as drivers and assumptions, explicitly discussed?</p> <p>Any unintended negative effects of the project should be discussed under Effectiveness, especially negative effects on disadvantaged groups.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>It is noted that the project objective is essentially a reformulation of the project outcomes and therefore leaves little scope for an assessment of the likelihood of long-lasting change.</p> <p>An analysis of the likelihood of impact is presented. However, there is no integrated analysis guided by the causal pathways represented by the TOC nor key actors, drivers and assumptions.</p> <p>Specifically, there is no discussion of whether the impact driver - 'enhancement of public-private partnerships for data collection, reporting, tracking and verification' - held and this could have presented some learning.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>E. Financial Management</p> <p>This section should contain an integrated analysis of all dimensions evaluated under financial management and include a completed 'financial management' table.</p> <p>Consider how well the report addresses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>adherence</i> to UNEP's financial policies and procedures • <i>completeness</i> of financial information, including the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used 	<p>Final report:</p> <p>This section covers all elements in detail and indicates the evidence found.</p> <p>Qualitative source of information from stakeholders not included.</p>	<p>4</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>communication</i> between financial and project management staff 		
<p>F. Efficiency To what extent, and how well, does the report present a well-reasoned, complete and evidence-based assessment of efficiency under the primary categories of cost-effectiveness and timeliness including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of delays and no cost extensions • Time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe • Discussion of making use during project implementation of/building on pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. • The extent to which the management of the project minimised UNEP's environmental footprint. 	<p>Final report: All elements are well covered. UNEP environmental footprint is not discussed.</p>	4.5
<p>G. Monitoring and Reporting How well does the report assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring design and budgeting (<i>including SMART results with measurable indicators, resources for MTE/R etc.</i>) • Monitoring of project implementation (<i>including use of monitoring data for adaptive management</i>) • Project reporting (<i>e.g. PIMS and donor reports</i>) 	<p>Final report: The text in the Monitoring Design and Budgeting is not easy to understand. However, the Monitoring of project implementation and project reporting cover the elements of the report quality criteria.</p>	4.5
<p>H. Sustainability How well does the review identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved project outcomes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-political Sustainability • Financial Sustainability • Institutional Sustainability (<i>including issues of partnerships</i>) 	<p>Final report: All elements are covered.</p>	5
<p>I. Factors Affecting Performance These factors are <u>not</u> discussed in stand-alone sections but are integrated in criteria A-H as appropriate. Note that these are described in the Evaluation Criteria Ratings Matrix. To what extent, and how well, does the review report cover the following cross-cutting themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation and readiness • Quality of project management and supervision¹⁵ • Stakeholder participation and co-operation 	<p>Final report: All elements are covered. However, the overall rating for Factors Affecting Performance is satisfactory in the rating table but in the Review finding section in para. 187 is indicated as "Highly Satisfactory".</p>	4

¹⁵ In some cases 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the Executing Agency and the overall supervision/technical backstopping provided by UNEP, as the Implementing Agency. Comments and a rating should be provided for both types of supervision and the overall rating for this sub-category established as a simple average of the two.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity • Environmental and social safeguards • Country ownership and driven-ness • Communication and public awareness 	<p>Preparation and readiness analysis does not assess roles of EPA and PMU. Separate ratings are not provided for the IA and EA.</p> <p>Para 148 refers to gender mainstreaming being mentioned in the PIRs but there is no discussion under this cross-cutting issue. The inclusion of Abantu being included in the inter-ministerial committee (Table 1) is not explored, confirmed or discussed. The gender of interviewees is provided in the annex but there is no discussion of the steering committee membership, etc.</p>	
<p>VI. Conclusions and Recommendations</p> <p>Quality of the conclusions: The key strategic questions should be clearly and succinctly addressed within the conclusions section.</p> <p>It is expected that the conclusions will highlight the main strengths and weaknesses of the project, and connect them in a compelling story line. Human rights and gender dimensions of the intervention (e.g. how these dimensions were considered, addressed or impacted on) should be discussed explicitly. Conclusions, as well as lessons and recommendations, should be consistent with the evidence presented in the main body of the report.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>The strategic questions 1 and 2 (state and non-state actors adopting enhanced transparency framework arrangements under Paris Agreement and contribution to strengthening transparency mechanisms) as formulated in the TOR were addressed indirectly but strategic questions 3 and 4 (uptake of tools and changes made due to Covid) do not appear to have been mentioned in the conclusions.</p> <p>Good summary of selected key findings from analysis.</p> <p>Summary table of project findings and rating included.</p>	<p>4.5</p>
<p>ii) Quality and utility of the lessons: Both positive and negative lessons are expected and duplication with recommendations should be avoided. Based on explicit review findings, lessons should be rooted in real project experiences or derived from problems encountered and mistakes made that should be avoided in the future. Lessons are intended to be adopted any time they are deemed to be relevant in the future and must have the potential for wider application (replication and generalization) and use and should briefly describe the context from which they are derived and those contexts in which they may be useful.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>The lessons are clear and follow the structure for lessons learned provided in the TR guidelines.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>iii) Quality and utility of the recommendations:</p> <p>To what extent are the recommendations <u>proposals for specific action to be taken by identified people/position-holders to resolve concrete problems affecting the project or the sustainability of its results?</u> They should be feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available (including local capacities) and specific in terms of who would do what and when.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>The recommendations are clear and provide information on who does what, how, and when. The cross-reference to the rational and supporting discussion is useful to understand where the recommendations stem from.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>At least one recommendation relating to strengthening the human rights and gender dimensions of UNEP interventions, should be given. Recommendations should represent a measurable performance target in order that the Evaluation Office can monitor and assess compliance with the recommendations.</p> <p>In cases where the recommendation is addressed to a third party, compliance can only be monitored and assessed where a contractual/legal agreement remains in place. Without such an agreement, the recommendation should be formulated to say that UNEP project staff should pass on the recommendation to the relevant third party in an effective or substantive manner. The effective transmission by UNEP of the recommendation will then be monitored for compliance.</p> <p>Where a new project phase is already under discussion or in preparation with the same third party, a recommendation can be made to address the issue in the next phase.</p>		
VII. Report Structure and Presentation Quality		
<p>i) Structure and completeness of the report: To what extent does the report follow the Evaluation Office guidelines? Are all requested Annexes included and complete, including a gender disaggregation total for respondents.</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>The structure of the report mostly follows the Evaluation Office guidelines. All required Annexes are included, which include a list of interviewees with gender disaggregation total for respondents.</p>	5
<p>ii) Quality of writing and formatting: Consider whether the report is well written (clear English language and grammar) with language that is adequate in quality and tone for an official document? Do visual aids, such as maps and graphs convey key information? Does the report follow UNEP Evaluation Office formatting guidelines?</p>	<p>Final report:</p> <p>Short and concise analysis of each evaluation criteria.</p> <p>More direct use of, and reference to, the evidence from interviewees would have been desirable explicit for triangulation.</p> <p>While the report is concise and readable, a final proof-reading and editing was necessary. This would have supported greater ease of comprehension and avoided some sentences whose meaning cannot be understood.</p>	4.5
OVERALL REPORT QUALITY RATING		4.5

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. The overall quality of the review report is calculated by taking the mean score of all rated quality criteria.