



NCAP evaluation
October-November 2007

Final draft
February 2008

TABLE OF CONTENT

TABLE OF CONTENT	I
LIST OF TABLES	I
GLOSSARY AND TERMINOLOGY	II
MAIN FINDINGS.....	III
1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Acknowledgement	2
2 THE DUTCH AND DGIS APPROACH TO CLIMATE ASSISTANCE	3
3 THE DGIS CLIMATE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME: NCCSAP AND NCAP	4
4 THE EVALUATION APPROACH	6
5 FINDINGS.....	7
5.1 The context of the evaluation.....	7
5.2 Aspects of NCAP execution (facts and figures; appendices E and F)	8
5.3 Country visits (appendices B to D).....	10
5.4 Assessment of ETC performance and results	11
5.5 Learning lessons	13
6 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED (SEE ALSO APPENDICES B, C AND D)	15
APPENDICES	16

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Comparison budgets and expenses.....	10
Table 2: Country table of objectives and expected outcomes	40
Table 3: Country table of progress.....	43
Table 4: Country table of results	44
Table 5: Country table of use of resources.....	45

GLOSSARY AND TERMINOLOGY

Throughout the document the following terminology is used for reasons of clarity.

- ◇ NCCSAP refers to the Dutch climate assistance programme, executed by IVM between 1996 and 2000.
- ◇ NCAP refers to the Dutch climate assistance programme executed by ETC between 2003 and 2008.
- ◇ DGIS-CAP refers to the Climate Assistance Programme as executed by DGIS, which started after the Rio 92 conference and incorporates NCCSAP and NCAP.
- ◇ Project(s) refer to the country studies under NCAP.
- ◇ Phases 1 and 2 refer to phases (of 18 month each) in the country projects under NCAP.
- ◇ When referring to NCCSAP and NCAP together reference will be made to DGIS-CAP.

CAP	Climate Assistance Programme Netherlands Government
CC	Climate Change
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
DGIS	Directorate General of International Cooperation of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
ETC	Consultants NCAP project
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Green House Gases
IVM	Institute of Environmental Studies of the University of Amsterdam
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NCAP	Netherlands Climate Assistance Programme
NCCSAP	Netherlands Climate Change Studies Assistance Programme
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NIMOS	National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
TA	Technical Assistants NCAP country projects
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
VROM	Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment

MAIN FINDINGS

- Supported by DGIS, ETC has been able to grasp pragmatically the opportunities in the fourteen NCAP countries to contribute to the national climate change (CC) debate. Country studies were efficiently coached through a group of TAs who in a flexible way responded to the specific diversities and needs of the individual countries.
- The pragmatic approach resulted in a good and effective use of the limited resources available in each of the fourteen countries. It draws the attention, however, that under NCAP only less than one-third of the total budget was locally spent on the country studies.
- Impacts can be considered “remaining”, mostly because in most -- if not all -- country-studies the de-facto key person on CC issues was actively involved, though this person not always corresponded with the official UNFCCC’s national focal point.
- The success of the fragmented approach is considered to compensate the fact that under NCAP the development of a more uniform approach for climate (change) vulnerability assessment and adaptation has been limited. The guidance of a well functioning advisory committee has been missing here.
- DGIS-CAP through the NCCSAP and NCAP has played a pioneer role in many countries, in spite of the limited contributions. Both programmes played an important role in increasing the awareness for climate change issues and institutionalizing the dialogue on them.
- NCAP in the last years embarked on innovative efforts to introduce livelihood vulnerability assessments into the climate change debate and further into the poverty and development agenda’s. These efforts, however, still need time to contribute effectively to the policy dialogue and decision making, e.g., in the context of poverty reduction strategies.
- The growing attention, both national and international, for climate change and climate variability leads to an increasing institutionalization of climate (change) issues, which should facilitate addressing these issues in the context of national development. Though this was found a promising development it merits mention that in many countries this “institutionalization” refers to only one key person, which makes this process rather vulnerable. Hence, the critical need for capacity building of institutions and individuals, if sustainability is to be realized in the long run.
- Due to the pragmatic, country-specific approach, the DGIS-CAP projects, for example in comparison with GEF/UNDP CC programmes, lack a uniform and consistent structure, but often are of high quality. This offers a potential for a complementary role with other climate change related programmes that has to be further explored.
- An important challenge for the future is to develop the national capacity for assessing the vulnerability of the poor for climate variability and climate change and have these assessments effectively impacting the poverty reduction and sustainable development agenda’s and corresponding political decision making.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND¹

The evaluation of the Netherlands Climate Assistance Programme (NCAP) was carried out by Mr Rob Koudstaal (independent consultant, The Netherlands) and Mrs Dorothy A. Amwata (Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel (OSS), Tunisia) in the months of October and November 2007. An itinerary of the mission is included in Appendix A. As part of the evaluation, brief visits were made to three of the fourteen countries where NCAP projects are being implemented: Tanzania, Ghana and Suriname. Reports of those visits are included in the appendices B, C and D, respectively.

According to the Terms of Reference, the evaluation will “assess the extent to which NCAP has been in accord with Dutch policies in relation to climate change and with the needs and capacities of the selected countries. It will assess the results of the programme and the success in meeting its objectives in the most effective way, the intended and unintended results of the programme – both positive and negative – and the probability of the longer term maintenance of sustainable results.”

The evaluation is expected to address both general and country specific issues. General issues deal with: (i) the relevance and approach of NCAP with respect to both DGIS and participating countries; (ii) implementation issues in terms of the organization of NCAP, the effective use of available resources and timing of activities; and (iii) the sustainability of the results. Country specific issues will be primarily based on the three countries visited that reflect different levels of progress: *Tanzania* as an example of what NCAP has attempted to achieve; *Ghana* as a country that has moved at average pace; and *Suriname* as a country that had faced serious delays. Progress in each of these countries will be assessed in terms of project performance indicators that have been designed by the project itself, grouped under the headings: project management; quality of the study; in-country coordination; and policy influence. Special attention should be given to the quality of the study and its policy influence.

The main purpose of the evaluation is to support the decision making process of NCAP’s follow up. As this process needs to start early in 2008, it was decided that an evaluation during the last quarter of 2007 was appropriate. Though NCAP is still in its final phase, it was considered that the NCAP experience has delivered enough substance to draw lessons from and to help the decision taking process of NCAP’s follow-up forward in a timely manner.

In this respect, it should be noted that the evaluation is somehow ambiguously in between a mid-term and a final review as it is expected to contribute to both the finalization of NCAP (scheduled in June 2008) and the decision making of NCAP’s follow-up. Obviously, evaluating a 6 M€ programme that is executed over a period of 4 years in 14 countries in which studies are still in their final phase, through visits to only three of these 14 countries, deals with substantial constraints both as mid-term and final evaluation. From a mid-term evaluation perspective, the short visits at the moment that studies have slightly more than half a year to go and are in their final documentation and presentation phases, may not be expected to contribute much to the studies themselves. From a final evaluation perspective it is unfortunate that most if not all of the projects -- have scheduled their major dissemination activities that aim at national decision making levels in the last month of the project. This makes conclusions on the policy relevance of the projects premature.

The above implies that the findings in Chapter 5 should be read as observations and suggestions and -- in particular with respect to the policy influence of the country studies – are not meant as critics of the ETC and DGIS staff and the country project teams. Chapters 2 and 3 provide the context of the evaluation through brief descriptions of the Dutch and DGIS approach to climate assistance and the set up of the Netherlands Climate Assistance Programme. Chapter 4 gives an overview of the approach of the evaluation that resulted in the findings formulated in Chapter 5.

¹ Reference is made to the Glossary for the NCAP/NCCSAP terminology used throughout this document.

1.1 Acknowledgement

In the course of the evaluation we met and depended on many people, the majority of which was taken by surprise given the tight time schedule on which we had to work. We are extremely grateful to all of them, as they made their time available at such short notice and shared with us their experience and information without any hesitation. Special reference is made to the support of ETC's project management staff who effectively supported us throughout the evaluation, promptly providing all required information and helping us in preparing the country visits and interviews.

2 THE DUTCH AND DGIS APPROACH TO CLIMATE ASSISTANCE

The following gives a brief summary of the context for the Climate Assistance Programme realized by DGIS (DGIS-CAP).

- DGIS is one of the implementing agencies of the Netherlands Climate Policy with respect to foreign countries as is, among others, outlined in policy notes of the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM, 2000; VROM, 2005). These documents clearly state that DGIS support is to be anchored in UNFCCC and Kyoto protocols and have to be compatible with Dutch Development Cooperation Policy. Focus should be on a structured approach to develop national capacities: (i) to develop and implement national policies; and (ii) to participate in international fora. The three objectives formulated are:
 - ◊ building the capacity and developing the institutions required for the formulation and execution of climate policy and for participation in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM);
 - ◊ an eventual contribution towards the limitation of global greenhouse gas emissions; and
 - ◊ accommodating the effects of climate change.

Under the first objective, DGIS-CAP is mentioned to assist approximately 15 countries in creating a “framework for providing substantive support to developing countries in their efforts to develop climate policy.” This support is considered to be complementary to the efforts of GEF, UNEP and UNDP.

- The main goal of Dutch Development Cooperation Policy is sustainable poverty control (VROM, 2000, Appendix 1). From this perspective, DGIS played an important role in the discussion how poverty is linked to climate change and how adaptation contributes to reducing the vulnerability of the poor (Multi-donor, 2003). This document is considered a breakthrough in promoting an adaptation approach through the vulnerability of the poor (bottom-up). The document recognizes that CC increase the stress from climate variability which is an important component in the vulnerability of the poor in many parts of the developing world. The document also argues that the focus of adaptation should shift to its integration into strategies for poverty reduction to ensure sustainable development and thus recommends integration of climate risk management in development programs.
- The multi-donor document also gives a broad and comprehensive overview of how adaptation efforts can be strengthened, justifying in climate change approaches a broad range of activities, including ones that would enable:
 - ◊ governance improvement;
 - ◊ mainstreaming of climate issues into national, (sub) national and sector planning processes such as Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS) and national strategies for sustainable development;
 - ◊ encouraging involvement of ministries with a broad mandate, such as planning and finance;
 - ◊ empowerment of communities; and
 - ◊ integration of impacts in macro economic projections (national budget is key process to identify climate change risk and incorporate risk management).

3 THE DGIS CLIMATE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME: NCCSAP AND NCAP

- The DGIS Climate Assistance Programme (DGIS-CAP) was triggered by the Rio Conference in 1992. It started in the period that internationally climate (change) and poverty reduction strategies were being formulated and structured, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) of 1994, the Kyoto protocol of 1997, the formulation of the Millennium Development Goals, and the World Bank stimulated approach to development planning through Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers.
- In the beginning of the nineties reconnaissance visits to different countries were made about the need, possibilities and willingness to receive support in approaching climate change problems. This resulted in the initiation of the Netherlands Climate Change Studies Assistance Programme (NCCSAP) in 1996, which was in line with the commitments under the UNFCCC of 1994 to support non-Annex 1 countries to develop a climate policy.
- NCCSAP (1996 – 2000) was executed by the Institute for Environmental Studies (IVM) of the Vrije University (Amsterdam, The Netherlands). It had the following aims:
 - ◊ assist developing countries to implement the climate convention;
 - ◊ raise awareness of the problem of climate change; and
 - ◊ increase the involvement of policy makers, scientists and ‘broad layers’ of the population in the debate on climate change.
- NCAP -- which followed NCCSAP with similar aims -- was contracted out to ETC-International for the period March 1, 2003 till June 30, 2008 (including an extension of half a year). After an extensive reconnaissance and selection procedure in the first 18 months of NCAP, the following 14 countries were selected (5 new countries are in italic with the remaining being a continuation of NCCSAP): *Bangladesh*, Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Ghana, *Guatemala*, Mali, Mongolia, *Mozambique*, Senegal, Suriname, *Tanzania*, *Vietnam*, and Yemen.
- Activities under NCCSAP included: inventories of emissions and sinks of green house gasses and trends; vulnerability assessments of the effects of CC on human beings and the environment; and analyses of technical and policy options for mitigation and adaptation.
- The following 13 countries were involved in NCCSAP: Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Mali, Mongolia, Senegal, Suriname, Yemen en Zimbabwe. Before the start of NCCSAP studies were already done in Bangladesh, Egypt, Nicaragua and Vietnam. Activities in Colombia, Mali and Zimbabwe continued till end of 2002 and in Bhutan till mid 2003.
- In the year 2000 an evaluation was made of NCCSAP that signaled the continuous effort needed to institutionalize the approach to climate change problems in developing countries and recommended a stronger emphasis on adaptation and an increased effort to reach policy makers and the civil society.
- The 2000-evaluation contributed to the following general and specific objectives of NCAP.
 - ◊ General aim: support a number of developing countries to prepare, formulate, implement and evaluate their policy in relation to climate change, with a view to these countries becoming self-supporting in formulating climate policy.
 - ◊ More specifically, NCAP aimed to support developing countries by: (i) implementing studies to support the general aim; (ii) meeting commitments under the UNFCCC (in particular the national conventions); (iii) paying attention to impact and adaptation assessments (in particular for livelihood systems of poor communities); and (iv) raising awareness among policy makers, scientists and relevant NGOs.

- The intentional but carefully formulated paradigm shift between NCCSAP and NCAP (“from mitigation to adaptation”; strong focus on local communities and influencing the policy dialogue) became more and more the “flag” of NCAP and was strongly supported by developments in the international debate on CC, described in the previous chapter.
- It was a conscious decision by DGIS and ETC not to assume that a common methodological approach (protocol) was required for all countries. Instead DGIS encouraged and supported ETC to take a learning by doing approach rather than adhering to strict Terms of Reference for the programme.

4 THE EVALUATION APPROACH

The following sources of information were used for the evaluation (see also Appendix A):

- ◇ visits to three NCAP countries; Tanzania, Ghana and Surinam;
- ◇ discussions with ETC project director (Mr Phil O'Keefe) and project manager (Mr Ian Tellam);
- ◇ interviews with members of the Technical Assistants team by telephone;
- ◇ meetings at DGIS with actual and previous project officers (Mrs Christine Pirenne en Mr Jaap Rooimans); and
- ◇ survey of literature and documents made available by DGIS and ETC.

Due to logistic problems Mrs Dorothy Amwata was unable to attend some of these activities, which was compensated by intensive contact through email and telephone.

The evaluation started with both evaluators attending the Advisory Group meeting in The Hague on October 5, 2007. In the course of the evaluation, several meetings were held with an ad-hoc sounding board consisting of Mrs Christine Pirenne (DGIS) and Messrs Ted Kliet (Policy and Operations Evaluation Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and Peter van der Werff (independent). The first debriefing after the country visits was done with the sounding board on November 22, 2007, in presence of Mr Paul Hassing (DGIS, deputy director Environment and Water). A draft report was sent (electronically) to DGIS on January 6, 2008 and discussed in e meeting with the sounding board and Mr Paul Hassing on January 21.

The country visits to Tanzania, Ghana and Suriname were prepared by ETC (advising the project coordinators) and DGIS (advising the embassies) and were effectively coordinated by the project coordinators. Focus of the interviews was mainly on NCAP results and their utilization in the national decision making processes rather than on the execution of the studies itself. The visits are reported separately in the appendices B, C and D and include an itinerary, findings, notes on the meetings, an overview of consulted documents and contact data of persons and institutions visited. Findings are roused in 4 categories (consistent with DGIS/ETC indicator table): study performance and quality; project management; in-country coordination; and policy influence and South-South communication.

After debriefing the findings of the Tanzania visit to the country's TA (Mr Phil O'Keefe) the mission was drawn into a discussion on the contribution of the project to national decision making and the involvement of NGOs. On both aspects, the findings of the mission differed from the perceptions of the project coordinator and the TA, partly because the mission has not been able to meet the key-persons of the project. Additional information was received that changed the findings of the mission in a positive sense (see Appendix B), but it also became clear that having involved key persons in the study would not automatically lead to a widespread awareness and policy influence. The other conclusion triggered by this discussion was that it seems to be difficult to get NGOs interested and participating in the country's climate change dialogue beyond their specific contribution contracted out under the project.

In Suriname Mr Rob Koudstaal shared his experience on coastal zone management and multi-criteria analysis with the project coordinator and NIMOS (see Appendix D) and contacts were established with the Ghana project coordinator to share experience on the multi-criteria approach for selecting priority interventions in the adaptation strategies.

5 FINDINGS

Overview tables of the 14 country projects are presented in appendices E and F. The table in Appendix E – prepared by the mission and reviewed by ETC -- summarizes the objectives and expected outcomes. The tables in Appendix F summarize progress, results and use of resources. These tables were prepared by ETC and, where possible, reviewed by the mission, based on the country visits and the interviews.

5.1 The context of the evaluation

- i. For better understanding how NCAP developed and performed and also to support the follow-up decision-making by DGIS, this section summarizes some of the relevant dynamics or changes in the international CC debate and development cooperation approaches. These observations do not pretend to be exhaustive or detailed, they merely aim at reflecting on a trend that was observed by the evaluators through actively following the media and confirmed through the interviews held and the literature reviewed during the evaluation.
 - ◇ The *awareness of CC and the attention developing countries pay to CC has been growing* for a variety of reasons, including the growing “proof” that sustainable development is at stake and growing international actions, such as the Clean Development Mechanism. This has resulted in a growing “institutionalization of CC”.
 - ◇ Although there is a *shift towards more research on adaptation*, still the majority of the work (e.g., the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change and the 4th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) is focusing on mitigation.
 - ◇ Understanding is growing that adaptation to CC is closely *linked to poverty alleviation* and thus should be explicitly considered in the developing countries’ development planning (PRS). (Multidonor, 2003). This implies also that donor interest and approaches are changing. More and more donors take climate change as an important issue in the development context and have adapted their priorities.
 - ◇ At the same time, however, there *is no clear strategy* – rather there was confusion – among all donors on how to handle climate adaptation.
 - ◇ The change in perception (adaptation closely linked to poverty alleviation and sustainable development) is among the contributing factors behind the growing need to better understand the *vulnerability of households* and the role climate variability and climate change play in this. This implies the need to complement macro-studies on sectors (such as agriculture and water) or regions (such as coastal zones) with a vulnerability assessment of different social groups for climate variability and CC.
 - ◇ The adaptation focus has been limited to studies that identify and prioritize adaptation interventions but *political commitment is still lacking* or inadequate to move into effective implementation.
 - ◇ The understanding is growing that *CC is not an isolated issue* but should be considered in the context of climate variability and other natural and anthropogenic changes. (e.g., UNDP-GEF Adaptation Policy Framework 2003: “adaptation to short-term climate variability and extreme events is a basis for reducing vulnerability to longer term climate changes” (from Bolivia workplan)).
 - ◇ *Donor coordination and common basket approaches offer opportunities* for more development focus and demand oriented approaches at country levels.
 - ◇ There is a growing concern that short term adaptation interventions that serve poverty alleviation -- e.g., changes in land use and cropping patterns – might be *inconsistent with sustainable development*.

- ii. The assessment of the extent to which projects and NCAP have been successful was found to be rather subjective.
 - ◇ Firstly, there is a *difficult trade-off between quality of the studies and their impacts*. For example, studies in Surinam and Mozambique might be classified of low quality in international scientific standards but they were found to be of significant impact on awareness and institution building.
 - ◇ Second, *simplified indicator-type responses* to such questions as “have the project activities influenced the country’s poverty reduction strategy paper?” give no justification to the intensity and value of such impacts, certainly not if scores come from different TAs.
 - ◇ The mission is aware of the table of indicators developed by the programme (ETC in interaction with DGIS and the Advisory Committee) that would give a uniform assessment of the performance of the different country projects. However, because of the above considerations and the NCAP’s pragmatic approach to the different country studies (leading to a wide variety of projects), *the evaluation has taken a qualitative approach on the issues reflected by the indicators*.
- iii. In the following sections attention is subsequently given to: aspects of NCAP execution, which discusses important relevant characteristics of NCAP to be taken into account in the interpretation of the assessment (5.2); country visits, summarizing the findings presented in the three appendices (5.3); overall assessment of performance and results, containing the assessment proper (5.4); and learning lessons, including suggestions to be considered in follow-up discussions (5.5).

5.2 Aspects of NCAP execution (facts and figures; appendices E and F)

- i. *Nine projects were a continuation of NCCSAP*, while five were started under NCAP (Chapter 3).
- ii. In 50% of the countries, the national focal point for CC, the contracting organization and the implementing organization (project coordinator) are one and the same. In seven other countries project activities are implemented by other organizations. In six of them the national focal point is not even the contracting organization – or in other words: *in about 40% of the projects there is no direct involvement of the national focal point in NCAP*.
- iii. NCAP studies in the 14 countries represent a *wide array of topics and approaches* (see appendices E and F) and were found to be more complex than studies under NCCSAP because of the increased attention for socio-economic aspects and the call for policy relevance. Four countries focused on the coastal zone, five on river basins or regional water resources, while another five had a more sector-oriented approach addressing such sectors as agriculture, fisheries and tourism. Subjects ranged from glacial lakes outburst floods to droughts in mountain semi arid regions and rangelands, and drainage and flooding in coastal areas. Ten out of the fourteen countries were active at local level, four mainly at national level. Seven projects included the development of new approaches and data collection, five were involved in institutional arrangements, six had links to disaster management while a majority (eleven) dealt with issues of planning and strategy formulation. Projects could be executed by government agencies, universities or private consultants.
- iv. *Focus of country activities was on studies and data collection* (see Table F.5): in 12 countries more than 1/3 of the budget was spent on these activities (overall average 56%). In 6 countries more than 1/3 was spent on awareness building and outreach (overall average 29%), while only in 1 country more than 1/3 of the budget was spent on contributions to national communications, NAPA’s, national development planning and coordination with other donors (overall average 15%).

- v. NCAP *input in each of the 14 countries was relatively small* (about US\$180,000 for two phases) and often additional to the input of other donors, for example, to support the formulation of second National Communications and the implementation of NAPA.
- vi. *TA involvement was minimal and appeared to be well tuned to the need of the different projects*, in line with the project's philosophy: "bring local experts in action".
- vii. NCAP suffered substantial *delays in the transfer from NCCSAP to NCAP* and the start of projects in individual countries. This appeared to be mainly due to the change in focus: from mitigation to adaptation. As a result, no smooth handover was possible where NCCSAP counterpart institutions were involved that were unable or even unwilling to deal with these changes. In addition DGIS has asked ETC to conduct a (time consuming) reconnaissance in about 20 countries to identify the most relevant counterpart institutions that would be able to deal more directly with poverty issues. Time and information was lacking to study into detail the country selection process, but no indications were found that consultants were to be blamed for the delay it caused in starting the projects.
- viii. Because of the delays mentioned above, *six out of the fourteen countries could only execute a first phase of NCAP*. This proved rather unfortunate, because in most projects phase 1 would focus on data collection and assessments of vulnerabilities, while phase 2 was to focus on the identification and selection of adaptation options, the formulation of action plans and dissemination and awareness raising.
- ix. With respect to the *role of DGIS and the Dutch embassies* in the NCAP countries the following is noted.
 - ◇ The Advisory Group has not been functioning well and developed into progress-reporting meetings by the TAs.
 - ◇ The Dutch embassies in general responded well when approached for support, particularly in the beginning of the project. In some countries they were not involved at all, in others (e.g., Mozambique) they played a crucial role in execution of the projects.
 - ◇ Within the context of NCAP, little efforts seem to have been made to internalize the CC concerns and approaches within the Netherland's embassies.
 - ◇ Though not directly linked to NCAP, the following efforts to internalize the CC concerns and approaches within the Ministry and in particular the Netherland's embassies merit mention: (i) CC has been brought into the training module of DGIS, targeting it's own personnel; and (ii) -- more specifically -- DGIS has initiated in three partner countries a climate risk analysis of development programmes supported by the Netherlands.²
- x. *Budget utilization*. Table 1 presents a comparison between the available budget and expenses up to September 7, 2007 (from documents sent to the Advisory Group meeting on October 5, 2007). The table shows a shift from country and technical assistance activities (planned 57%, realized 51%) to ETC management and mission activities (planned 26%, realized 34%). The table also shows a substantial underspending for the Advisory Group.
- xi. Appendix F gives a more detailed overview of the use of resources. It draws the attention that the effectively available budget for country studies in Table F.5 sums up to 2.1 M€ (country average 150 k€), which differs from the intended 2.7 M€ budget for country activities in Table 1 (country average 180 k€). *This implies that only one-third of the total available budget is spent through contracts with counterpart organization in developing countries.*

² This climate risk analysis was an attempt to concretize climate risks, to identify follow-up actions and -- most importantly -- to raise awareness amongst embassy staff on the relevance of climate risk assessments to help achieve the specific targets set by the corresponding development programmes.

Table 1: Comparison budgets and expenses

	Budget 6-07-06		Expenses till 7-09-07	
	in Euro	in %	in Euro	in %
management/policy	1,380,697	21	1,191,515	26
advisory group	62,000	1	15,485	0
missions ETC	346,031	5	353,057	8
technical assistance	1,075,131	16	588,568	13
country activities	2,705,569	41	1,699,694	38
regional activities	261,881	4	158,054	4
inventory studies	299,678	5	291,159	6
miscellaneous	153,662	2	77,891	2
contingencies	82,440	1	7,832	0
Subtotal	6,367,089	97	4,383,255	97
climate risk project top up	211,717	3	114,789	3
Total	6,578,806	100	4,498,044	100

5.3 Country visits (appendices B to D)

- i. The three countries visited were selected to *represent three levels of performance*: high (Tanzania); medium (Ghana); and low (Suriname). This might be true in terms of producing deliverables and the mission recognized this ranking in terms of stakeholder involvement and understanding the linkage between vulnerability and poverty, but could not confirm this ranking in terms of participation in the countries CC and poverty dialogue in which Ghana scored higher than Tanzania.
- ii. In all countries, there was *good compliance with the original objectives and expected outcomes* of the project proposals (Appendix E).
- iii. *Project staff was found to be highly motivated and knowledgeable* about climate change. They functioned well within a technical network of relevant individuals, institutes and government agencies, but lacked effective interactions with policy and decision makers. In all three countries it was found that the available expertise was scarce and that CC activities very much depended on the personal drive of a few persons or even one individual only (e.g., Ghana and Suriname). There is a need for more capacity building at all levels (community to national) as the concentration of expertise in only a few persons is a risk to the sustainability of CC approaches. This explains why in the Ghana integration workshop in which adaptation measures were prioritized both awareness building and training/education came out with high priorities.
- iv. On *study performance and quality* the following merits mention (see appendices B to D).
 - ◇ The Tanzanian project focused on local scales, those in Ghana and Surinam on national scales.
 - ◇ All projects were in their final phase of documentation and dissemination.
 - ◇ The (limited) financial and personal resources were well used; all project teams operated independently with only minimum support from TAs.
 - ◇ Quality was assessed to be very good, though on different levels and in different aspects. Tanzania did promising innovative work on vulnerability assessment at local scale. Ghana completed a high quality sector assessment that was started under NCCSAP, developed a methodology for prioritization of adaptation measures and is heading towards an operational plan of action in close linkage with the PRSP efforts in the country. In Suriname a highly relevant data collection effort has been concluded that supports many CC related and coastal zone planning activities, while an important contribution has been

made to awareness raising of CC problems and institutional arrangements with respect to environment and CC.

- v. *Project management was found to be satisfactory.* Project coordinators were properly housed in relevant expert-institutes or government agencies and acting within in a relevant and responding network of cooperating individuals and institutes.
- vi. *In-country coordination.* CC committees that were established and functioned well in the beginning stopped functioning in Tanzania and Suriname. In Suriname because the Committee's short term mandate expired; in Tanzania apparently because ad-hoc mechanisms (that seem to function well) developed that replaced an institutionalized committee. In Ghana laudable progress was made in donor-supported environmental sector management in which a climate change approach is institutionalized. In Suriname an Environmental Council is in preparation under a new Environment Act that also will be involved in coordinating CC activities.
- vii. There is a growing number of projects that deal with CC issues (including the UNDP-GEF NAPA initiatives). The *CC approach would benefit from a higher level of donor coordination* than actually practiced.
- viii. *Policy influence and South-South communication.* Projects contributed substantially to the awareness and information collection and distribution on climate change and variability and impacts. Government agencies were thus actively informed and involved and aware of CC issue, but there is lack of political commitment, which would be reflected in concrete development plans and budget allocations. Signs of positive developments in this respect are: the participation of the Minister of Finance of Ghana in the Bali meeting and the attendance of the President of Suriname's National Bank in the recently held water conference under the NCAP project.

5.4 Assessment of ETC performance and results

- i. In overall, the mission is convinced that the hugely fragmented and complicated *NCAP was well managed by ETC*. ETC proved to be able to grasp pragmatically the opportunities in the NCAP countries and coached the studies efficiently through a group of TAs who in a flexible way responded to the specific circumstances and needs of the individual countries, making good use of available resources. The project management system has not been analyzed in detail but seemed to be well-functioning and no complaints or issues were raised during the country visits.
- ii. The fragmented NCAP resulted in a portfolio of projects that were primarily focused on getting the country teams to work and maximize the impacts under the local conditions and circumstances. This raises questions about *commonalities, overall guidance and learning lessons* and above all the question: how did this patchwork of projects comply with Dutch and DGIS policies and NCAP objectives. This triggers the following remarks.
 - ◇ The fragmentation has been a consequence of the learning-by-doing approach and the decision that there was no such thing as a one size fits all. The advantage of this approach is that there seem to be little to no opportunities missed and that money was well spent.
 - ◇ Little attention has been paid to harmonizing approaches and discussing how projects could react to the kind of developments and changes as referred to under bullet (i) in Section 5.1. NCAP did not address, for example, the general issues that came up in the last years: how to interpret adaptation; how to link to poverty alleviation; how to infiltrate in the sustainable development and poverty alleviation approaches?
 - ◇ Also more methodological guidance could have been provided in some cases: e.g., how to make an assessment of policies and an identification of climate related political problems; how to prioritize proposals for alternative adaptation interventions through a multi-criteria analysis; how to perform household surveys and focal group discussions to assess gender-

- differentiated vulnerabilities; and how to make vulnerability profiles and how to draft adaptation plans.
- ◇ TAs seem to have had a dual position: delegated management, support of the study and quality control. Approaches seem to be left to the judgment of the TAs, no central methodology was available to guide them.
 - ◇ NCAP organized a synthesizing write shop in 2006 (ETC, 2006) and announced the publication of a synthesis publication in 2008, but the mission fails to see what is the additional contribution of these efforts to the NCAP country projects (reference is made to the third bullet in this section).
 - ◇ An important reason behind this development might be found in the non-functioning Advisory Group and the absence of a proper mid-term evaluation, which should have provided the platforms for dealing with harmonization issues.
- iii. *The delay in starting the country activities and the limited resources implied that selections had to be made that reduced the impact of the studies.* For example: vulnerability assessments were either done on local (community) or on sector scale (water resources, agriculture); those on local scale contributed greatly to the poverty focus and understanding of the relation between CC vulnerability and poverty but results were not optimal to influence government policy making; on the other hand, those on sector scale might have been more successful in reaching out to government agencies, but proved to be difficult to get local level stakeholders involved. It has been mentioned already that unfortunately in six countries only one phase was implemented, reducing the possibilities to identify and select adaptation options and formulate action plans.
- iv. With respect to the *Dutch and DGIS objectives* the following is observed.
- ◇ NCCSAP and NCAP have made a major contribution to getting climate change on the agenda in developing countries, which, where applicable, benefited from a NCCSAP-NCAP follow up. Results in this context reduce as projects become more fragmented, shift to local level issues and field work and when other donors move in and become more action oriented (e.g., NAPA implementation).
 - ◇ Most projects successfully focused on adaptation, either on a local or on a national scale. However the impact results had on the policy dialogue and operational decision making was limited (Appendix F).
 - ◇ Hardly any attention was paid to GHG emission inventories.
- v. With respect to *poverty control*, communication with the PRS exercises proved to be difficult. Integration of CC efforts into PRS is not stimulated by the fact that often different donor agencies are involved in CC adaptation (UNDP and others) and poverty alleviation (World Bank and others). However, it should be mentioned that in a number of countries NCAP was successful in shifting the focus of vulnerability and adaptation towards the poor and local communities, while in other countries they were successful in involving government agencies and scientists.
- vi. Insufficient information is available to make an overall assessment whether the NCAP projects respond to the “*need of the countries*”. In all country studies seem to be justified at least by the need to generate information that is useful in decision making and international commitments. In the three countries visited it could be confirmed that government agencies were involved in the selection and formulation of the projects. However, it also seems likely that the pragmatic approach ETC took after the initial delay and problems in finding an adequate counterpart, in some countries may have resulted in projects reflecting more the scientific interest of the partner organization than “the need of the country”(such as in Bangladesh and Bhutan). This does certainly not imply that studies have not been useful.

- vii. It is further observed that in the last years many countries have started to develop a climate change agenda of their own, which would allow a *more demand-oriented approach in the future*. Such an approach can be expected to contribute to improving the access of the CC projects to the national policy dialogue.
- viii. *The involvement of international and local NGOs and local level stakeholders was below expectations*. In different ways, their involvement was considered insufficient and not in line with the intentions of the programme. No overall assessment can be made, but it is assumed that the country experience in this respect is representative. In Tanzania it was found that NGOs, though fully informed and participating in their assigned tasks, did not move beyond their contracted assignments and did not develop into participants in the country's CC debate. In Ghana, the contracted NGO participated in the national climate debate and PRS activities but had no real grass root experience. In Suriname, the only one-person NGO that was involved in both grass root investigations and policy making, was complaining that none of the many NGOs were interested to make an effort to orient themselves on CC issues. This coincides with a more general impression that many NGOs developed into local consultants with limited capacities, resources or willingness to move into new fields of work. This also holds for the international NGOs ETC tried to involve in NCAP from the beginning.
- ix. *Sustainability*. This is not really a critical issue. NCAP is part of and contributed substantially to a growing multi-donor effort in which the same individuals and organizations are involved as in the NCAP projects. The data that was collected, the capacities that were built and the awareness that was raised will have a lasting impact on the country's approaches to CC.

5.5 Learning lessons

- i. The CC area is broadening: *bring the human element into CC policies*. This means that on the one hand detailed information is needed on vulnerabilities of local communities, while on the other hand access is needed to the national policy making and dialogue on development planning and annual budget allocation. This implies, among others, operational links to PRS efforts. From a more technical perspective it can be concluded that this would need:
 - ◇ less fragmentation and concentration on a few countries, for example within a similar region or setting;
 - ◇ a perspective of long term commitments;
 - ◇ using the opportunities offered by donor coordination and basket approaches to become more demand-oriented;
 - ◇ an analysis of policy aspects and an identification of the key political decision making issues that relate to climate (variability) and climate change;
 - ◇ a more structured approach to link such issues as: regional climatic changes; their impacts and vulnerability assessments; the development of adaptation options in the context of poverty alleviation and sustainable development; and
 - ◇ capacity building of individuals and institutions and corresponding awareness raising, among all the actors or stakeholders.
- ii. In the field it is extremely difficult or even *impossible to differentiate between impacts of CC and other exogenous agents of change* that affect people's livelihoods (deforestation, world market prices). People are unable to grasp the different timeframes of these changes and poor people are usually not interested in long term changes. This implies that CC should be taken out of its "isolated" approach and focus should more be on poverty alleviation in general with the understanding that a reduced poverty also reduces the vulnerability to CC.

- iii. As mentioned the focus of the evaluation is on the contribution of NCAP projects to the capacity and development of institutions to make countries self-supporting in incorporating CC related issues in their efforts for poverty alleviation and sustainable development. This implies that countries would need:
- ◇ *to have access to the assessments of regional climatic changes and their impacts;*
 - ◇ *to obtain a proper understanding of vulnerabilities of households, economic sectors, infrastructure, and environmental systems;*
 - ◇ *to be able to identify and select adaptation measures with full stakeholder involvement in a sustainable development context at different levels with focus on poverty alleviation;*
 - ◇ *to be able to bring CC issues into the policy dialogue and the political processes that lead to real implementation and reduction of vulnerability to CC; and*
 - ◇ *to comply with their commitments under the CC conventions and Kyoto protocol.*
- iv. The reconnaissance in the beginning of NCAP of the conditions in the different countries was useful. To facilitate DGIS decision making, it might be considered to *repeat such a reconnaissance before the end of NCAP* to map how the CC landscape and dialogue has changed in different countries and what the possibilities are for a more comprehensive approach as mentioned above. Such a reconnaissance would thus address such issues as: how is the CC issue and the NCAP project situated with respect to the national processes of sustainable development and poverty alleviation; how is the national capacity with respect to complying with international commitments; how is capacity to assess vulnerabilities on micro and macro scales; how is the capacity to draft and implement adaptation plans; how are the capacities and involvement of NGOs and the scientific community; which and how other donors are active; and what is the need for follow-up of NCAP.

6 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED (see also appendices B, C and D)

ETC, 2006. Writeshop. Report of Proceedings. Kontakt de Continenten, Netherlands, 24-28 April 2006. Leusden, Netherlands.

Multidonor, 2003. Poverty and Climate Change; Reducing the Vulnerability of the Poor through Adaptation. Undated multi-donor publication (including DGIS, DFID, UNDP, ADB, OECD, ADBG, EC, UNEP, GTZ, and World Bank). Draft presented at Eight Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC in New Delhi, 2002, and electronic consultations between November 15, 2002 and February 28, 2003.

VROM, 2000. The Netherlands' Climate Policy Implementation Plan, Part II: Cooperation with Foreign Countries. Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment. The Hague, March 2000.

VROM, 2005. Evaluatienota klimaatbeleid 2005; Onderweg naar Kyoto. Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment. The Hague, March 2000.

APPENDICES

A: Itinerary evaluation

B: Report visit Tanzania

C: Report visit Ghana

D: Report visit Suriname

E: Country table of objectives and expected outcomes³

F: Country tables on progress, results and use of resources³

³ These tables were designed by the evaluation mission and made available by ETC (project manager in coordination with TAs). Where possible these tables were checked with and found representative for the information obtained through the country-visits and the telephone interviews of the evaluation mission.

APPENDIX A: ITINERARY EVALUATION

Oct 5, 2007	Mrs Dorothy A. Amwata (DAM) and Mr Rob Koudstaal (RKO) attend NCAP advisory group meeting in The Hague.
Oct 9, 2007	Meeting RKO and Mrs Christine Pirenne (DGIS) in The Hague: discussion ToR.
Oct 10, 2007	Meeting RKO and Mr Ian Tellam (ETC) in Leusden office, the Netherlands: general introduction NCAP and country projects; handing over materials.
Oct 17, 2007	Meeting RKO and Mr Phil O'Keefe (ETC) in UK office, North Shields, UK: general introduction approach NCAP.
Oct 29, 2007	Meeting RKO and Sounding Board group DGIS in The Hague (Mrs Christine Pirenne (DGIS); Mr Ted Kliest (Min Foreign Affairs) and Mr Peter van der Werff (independent)) : briefing and discussion ToR.
Oct 31-Nov 3, 2007	DAM and RKO visit Tanzania.
Nov 5, 2007	Meeting RKO with Mr Jaap Rooimans (DGIS) in The Hague: on evaluation NCCSAP and start NCAP.
Nov 6-11, 2007	DAM and RKO visit Ghana.
Nov 13-20, 2007	RKO visits Suriname.
Nov 21-28, 2007	DAM and RKO join in The Netherlands for meetings and reporting.
Nov 22, 2007	Meeting DAM-RKO and Mr Paul Hassing (DGIS), Mrs Christine Pirenne (DGIS) and Mr Peter van der Werff at DGIS: findings country visits.
Nov 23, 2007	Meeting DAM-RKO and Messrs Phil O'Keefe and Ian Tellam in IJmuiden on results country visits, tentative conclusions and findings Tanzania visit.
Nov 26, 2007 - Jan 5, 2008	Telephone interviews with TA officers; collection of requested information by ETC; drafting evaluation report.
Jan 6, 2008	Submission (electronically) of draft evaluation report to DGIS.
Jan 20-23, 2008	DAM and RKO join in The Netherlands for meetings and final reporting.
Jan 21, 2008	Meeting on draft report at DGIS: DAM-RKO; Mr Paul Hassing (DGIS), Mrs Christine Pirenne (DGIS), Mr Ted Kliest (Min Foreign Affairs) and Mr Peter van der Werff (independent).

APPENDIX B: COUNTRY REPORT TANZANIA EVALUATION NCAP; October 31 – November 3, 2007⁴

B.1 ITINERARY

Mon 29/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrival Dorothy Amwata (DAM)
Tue 30/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrival Rob Koudstaal (RKO)
Wed 31/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mr Maynard Lugenja and Mrs Marianne Hermes (CEEST): orientation project and arranging for meetings (Section B.3.1). • Meeting Mr Richard Muyungi (National Climate Change Focal Point): function / tasks and use of project results (Section B.3.2).
Thu 1/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Prof Adolfo Mascarenhas (advisor CEEST): background and policy relevance project (Section B.3.3). • Meeting Mr Pieter Dorst (head development cooperation, RNE): position Netherlands Embassy (Section B.3.4). • Meeting Mr Abdallah Mkindi (Envirocare, NGO, partner CEEST): cooperation with CEEST and surveys (Section B.3.5).
Fri 2/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mr Shinma Sago (TaTEDO, NGO, partner CEEST); cooperation with CEEST and surveys (Section B.3.6). • Meeting Mr Stephen Mwakifwamba (CEEST; project coordinator / deputy executive director): general issues project (Section B.3.7). • Meeting Mr Tharsis Hyera (EPMS, partner CEEST for 2nd National Communications;): use of project results (Section B.3.8).
Sat 3/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departure DAM and RKO
Mo 5/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tel interview Mr Lars.Mikkel (Danish Embassy, Counselor responsible for donor harmonization and alignment environment): awareness NCAP project and possible coordination (Section B.3.9).

B.2 FINDINGS

- Study performance and quality
 - ◇ The project is well located at CEEST, a specialised CC policy institute in Tanzania with operational links to relevant government agencies and the key person on climate change in Tanzania: the Minister of Environment (though the contact person (National Focal Point for UNFCCC) appeared to have limited knowledge of the project).
 - ◇ The project focuses on an assessment of community-level vulnerabilities and adaptation capacity to the impacts of CC, based on fieldwork and participatory approaches. It puts CC in the context of climate variability and other exogenous changes and as such can be expected to have an important contribution in the dialogue on how to link vulnerability to climate change with poverty and sustainable development.
 - ◇ The mission could not spend much time on the surveys and the subsequent analyses but was not convinced that sufficient attention has been given to the fact that vulnerabilities are different for different social groups and gender.
 - ◇ Though the project and the Tanzanian government agencies involved have the intention and are in a good position to effectively influence the policy dialogue in the last phase of NCAP, only limited influence so far could be detected during the mission itself.
 - ◇ In addition to an increased understanding of these links an important outcome of the project is the increased capacity of a group of researchers to perform this kind of local assessments. Most benefit of this can be made through solid and high quality publications and presentations in workshops on several levels of stakeholders in the last phase of the project.

⁴ Abbreviations at the end of the appendix

- Project management
 - ◇ The project was well managed by CEEST on its own and with the exception of a delay in the reporting (partly due to loss of data banks) the progress seems to be on schedule.
- In-country coordination
 - ◇ Involvement and cooperation with NGO partners was limited to the initial seminars, the field surveys and the July 2007 Kilimanjaro workshop. No indications were found that through the project NGOs were involved in the country's policy dialogue or in the preparation of the country's National Communication or NAPA documents.
 - ◇ Incorporation in the Danish harmonization efforts of environmental and climate change issues is imminent. On their explicit request the mission has sent a one page summary of the project to Mr Lars Mikkel of the Danish Embassy in charge of donor harmonization and alignment in the field of environment.
 - ◇ The Climate Change Committee, in the proposal's stakeholder diagram presented as an important component in linking the project to, e.g., the PRS activities in Tanzania, was not functional during the NCAP project period. It was replaced by ad-hoc commissions in support of the National Focal Point for individual tasks such as formulation of NAPA and the 2nd NC, in which the NCAP project director and coordinator were represented.
- Policy influence and South-South communication.
 - ◇ Though the policy relevance is great and has been adequately referred to from the start, the activities so far concentrated on the field work and subsequent analyses. The evaluation of current policies and measures did not result in a "decision-making inventory": the identification of national decision making problems sensitive to CC to which the results of the study could make a contribution. As mentioned above however, it might be expected that these subjects will get sufficient attention during the last phase of the study, though the prospects for an immediate and effective utilization of the results in such international documents as NAPA, National Communications and PRS seems limited given their advanced state of preparation.
 - ◇ South-South communication was limited but effective by incorporating a representative from Mozambique in the regional July 2007 workshop, which above all stimulated and helped the Mozambique NCAP project to set up its field work.
- Post-visit discussions and information
 - ◇ Findings of the mission as formulated in the meeting with the project coordinator Mr Stephen M. Mwakifwamba - and in particular those with reference to the policy oriented programme indicators - were discussed between the evaluation mission and ETC's NCAP managers Messrs Phil O'Keefe (TA of the Tanzania project) and Ian Tellam. As a result of this meeting additional information was received from key persons in the Tanzania project that were not available during the mission. The following merits mention in addition to the above findings.
 - ◇ CEEST is a key institution in the Tanzanian CC debate. Through their research capacity and institutional network they are in a good position to have studies on local level CC vulnerabilities and adaptation strategies influence the national policy dialogue. There is, however, no direct link with the PRS activities in Tanzania, which is structured through the National Focal Point at the Vice-President's office.
 - ◇ In the beginning of the project good communication was established with the Dutch Embassy (first secretary and gender expert) and efforts were made to inform the Danish Embassy. This was before the harmonization efforts started.
 - ◇ The Kilimanjaro July 2007 workshop, which was considered highly successful in disseminating the project's results in a local context, will be followed by a major national

workshop in February that is expected to be instrumental in the project's intentions to influence the policy dialogue at national level.

B.3 BRIEF NOTES ON MEETINGS DURING THE VISIT

B.3.1 CEEST: Mr Maynard Lugenja (MLU) and Ms Marianne Hermes (project officers)

Wednesday 31/10/2007

- Messrs Stephen Mwakifambwa and Hubert Meena are absent (in the field and attending personal issues outside Dar es Salaam, respectively). Minister of Environment (Prof M.J. Mwandosya) is also out of town.
- Knowledge of the administrative project issues, plans and progress is limited. Reference is made to a scheduled discussion with Stephen Mwakifambwa after his return to Dar es Salaam.
- Arrangements for meetings were successfully facilitated by Mr Lugenja.

B.3.2 National Climate Change Focal Point: Mr Richard Muyungi, assistant director of environment

Wednesday 31/10/2007 (RKO, DAM, MLU)

- Involved in Climate Change issues since 1992 (Rio); heads the NAPA formulation and implementation teams (different teams).
- Not directly involved in 2nd communications, these are prepared by CEEST and EPMS; the final draft document is forwarded to the office of the Vice President, Environment Division for comments before submission.
- National Climate Change Committee as depicted in NCAP project proposal diagram is not existing or functioning. It was replaced by ad-hoc technical teams (government and non-government representatives – list will be sent⁵).
- Responsible for environmental input into the PRS.
- All environmental issues and results of projects are discussed in Environmental Working Group chaired by the Director of Environment.
- Heading / coordinating / following other projects: GEF support of NAPA formulation and implementation; and Danish projects on climate change in the sectors water, health and agriculture (money goes directly to respective sectors).
- Unaware of the NCAP project (see Section B.3.7). Yet the endorsement letter of the NCAP project was received from the division of the environment acknowledging the need for the project in improving the knowledge of the Tanzania government in climate science.

B.3.3 Prof. Adolfo Mascarenhas: Indigenous knowledge, Poverty, Environment; Vice Chairman The African Link; Thursday 1/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, MLU)

- Not really involved in execution of the NCAP project, has advisory role and is instrumental in people-oriented approach: Climate Change to be linked to people.
- Stresses the research intention. Study was much value for little money, but real value of the study should be its impact on national policy level. Unclear how.
- Envisages slow process of increasing understanding and reaching knowledgeable people with influence on policy makers (champions).

⁵ Received from Mr Hubert Meena after the mission. Mr Meena is involved.

- Local July 2007 workshop was great success in informing local NGOs and administrators; national policy makers were not involved.

**B.3.4 Royal Netherlands Embassy: Mr Pieter Dorst, Head Development Cooperation
Thursday 1/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, MLU)**

- Netherlands strong promoter of agreements on donor harmonization and alignment in 2005 (Paris Declaration). Netherlands has chosen (The Hague) to “leave” the sector environment to Denmark. DANIDA is now coordinating environmental donor efforts. Involvement of RNE in the NCAP activities would be in contradiction with these agreements. DGIS The Hague should approach DANIDA Copenhagen for coordination with other relevant climate change and environmental programs.

**B.3.5 Envirocare: Mr Abdallah Mkindi, programme officer
Thursday 1/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, MLU)**

- Envirocare contracted by CEEST to assist in surveys: household survey (ca 1000 households) in 2005 and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in 2006.
- Additional survey (with students from UK) in mid 2006.
- Did not participate in SPSS analysis on data (final report delayed because of loss of databank).

**B.3.6 TaTEDO: Mr Shima Sago programme officer
Friday 2/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, MLU)**

- Familiar with the area. Contracted by CEEST to introduce the project in the region and participate (part time) in the surveys. Provided additional information; not involved in analysis and workshop (only as participants).
- Participated in the ETC training and learned from the project (livelihood analysis as integrated approach).
- Results should be presented to local stakeholders and district administrators (informed from the beginning). No national level representatives in local July 2007 workshop.

**B.3.7 CEEST: Mr Stephen M. Mwakifwamba, project coordinator and deputy executive director CEEST
Friday 2/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, MLU)**

- Confusion on phases, progress and outputs solved.
- CEEST started after Rio (1992) and has links with similar initiatives in other African countries. Chaired by the Min. of Energy, but no substantial government representation in the board.
- Tanzania not involved in NCCSAP. ETC took CEEST as entry. Project was idea of CEEST accorded by DoE (letter vice presidents office March 2004).
- Two phases: (i) phase 1 lowlands, household (hh) survey January 2005, PRA mid 2006; (ii) phase 2 Kilimanjaro slopes, hh survey mid 2006, PRA pending. Phase 1 report submitted to ETC, Phase 2 report compiling. Overall report will compare two areas.
- Initiative publications is with ETC-UK. No arrangements yet for involvement CEEST staff but assumes that Mr Meena will be involved.
- Limited vulnerability assessment, e.g.: no gender differentiation; PRA (ranking 10 problems resulting from household survey) only one session with 20 participants representing all different stakeholders; and no feedback/verification of results to local people (this was also discussed with partner NGOs, see above).

- Agrees that National Climate Change Commission is not working. Was good commission but DoE failed to continue and now organizes work through ad-hoc technical teams, such as for NAPA formulation and implementation. Stephen was involved in the NAPA formulation team but is unaware of the new NAPA implementation team (exists according to Muyungi – see Section B.3.2).
- Findings of the mission so far with respect to the policy-oriented program indicators of NCAP shows less optimistic picture than in the document “summary of activities and progress achieved” of August 2007.
 - ◊ Involvement of study results in NAPA preparation was tried but refused because results were only tentative.
 - ◊ CEEST not currently involved in NAPA implementation.
 - ◊ No indication that results of the project will be effectively used in the 2nd NC, since the partner institution (EPMS) in preparing the 2nd National Communication is not currently aware of the project and of the intention of CEEST to use the findings as case studies to support adaptation at local level.
 - ◊ The National Focal Point was informed and involved in the beginning of the project, but obviously the project was not “alive” for him (Section B.3.2).
 - ◊ No useful links identified with PRS (should link through National Focal Point).
 - ◊ Links with NGOs mainly in surveys. NGOs reluctant to provide feed back on results.
 - ◊ No facilitation of NGO involvement in 2nd NC.
 - ◊ Only south-south cooperation so far was Mozambican participation in local July 2007 workshop.
- Promises to send: draft report phase 1; workshop report; list participants NAPA preparation team⁶.

**B.3.8 EPMS: Mr Tharsis Hyera, program manager
Friday 2/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, MLU)**

- Equal partners with CEEST in formulation 2nd National Communications. 2 years project till mid 2008 (UNEP-GEF financing). Report directly to National Focal Point.
- EPMS as an organization was not involved in 1st NC but members of its staff did participate on an individual basis.
- Outline 2nd NC fixed. Focus on updated climate scenario for Tanzania and impact on sectors of the economy.
- No mention so far of NCAP project by CEEST. Agrees on relevance of poverty aspects, links to PRS and NCAP study but doubts whether these can be included.

B.3.9 Danish Embassy: Mr Lars Mikkel, Counselor; Environment Specialist in charge of harmonization donor activities in the field of environment; Monday 5/11/2007 (RKO, telephone)

- Not aware of NCAP activities.
- Coordination of environmental projects outside regular bi- and multilateral channels is major problem that will be discussed tomorrow in meeting national coordination commission. Requests brief overview of the NCAP activities in Tanzania, which was drafted and mailed by RKO immediately after telephone conversation.
- Coordination with DGIS activities not through Copenhagen (as suggested by RNE) but should go directly between embassies in Tanzania.

⁶ Was indeed received, see Section B.4.

B.4 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- NCAP Tanzania Identification Mission 20-26 February 2004; Final Mission Report, 12 March 2004.
- Letter of endorsement of Vice President's Office: March 19, 2004.
- Proposal phase 1 (undated).
- Co-operation agreement between ETC and CEEST; 20 November 2006; includes proposal phase 2 (draft, undated).
- Detailed work plans phases 1 and 2 (undated).
- Progress reports CEEST: 9/04-3/05; 4/05-9/05; 10/05-3/06; 1/07-6/07.
- Summary of progress achieved; ETC 1/07-6/07.

After the mission

- Proceeding of the CEEST Working Seminar on Climate Change Adaptation, Tanzania-Mozambique South-South, North-South Sharing; July 2007.
- Review of NCAP activities; from Mr Hubert Meena.
- Statement of Hon. Prof. M. J. Mwandosya, Minister of State Vice President's Office (Environment) on the role of CEEST and NCAP.
- Participatory Appraisal for Sustainable Livelihood, Framework for Rufiji Climate Change Adaptation Analysis; by Hubert E. Meena, Maynard Lugenja, Shima Sago and Abdallah Nkindi; October 2005.
- Draft Final Report Climate Change Impacts on Livelihoods in Tanzania and Adaptation Options: Experience of floods and drought in Rufiji; by Hubert E. Meena, Maynard Lugenja, Mike Stephenson; August 2006.
- For Adaptation to the Consequences of Climate Change in Tanzania, with specific reference to the Rufiji District; by Adolfo Mascarenhas. Undated.
- Rufiji District Residents and Adaptation to Environmental Changes over Time; by Abdallah Ramadhani Mkindi and Hubert E. Meena; January 2005.
- Analysis of Technical and Policy Options for Adaptation to Consequences of Climate Change for Tanzania; Rufiji Background report by Maynard Lugenja, Hubert E. Meena and Stephen Mwakifwamba; October 2005.

B.5 CONTACT DATA OF PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS VISITED

Name	Responsibility and institution	Address and phone	Email, website and cell phone
Mr Pieter Dorst	Royal Netherlands Embassy, Head Development Cooperation	4th Floor Umoja House Garden Avenue P.O. Box 9534 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Tel: (255-22) 2110000 Fax: (255-22) 2110044	pieter.dorst@minbuza.nl www.netherlands-embassy.go.tz Cell: (255) 787354697
Mr Abdallah Mkindi	Envirocare, Programme Officer	P.O. Box 76498 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Tel: (255-22) 2700085 Fax: (255-22) 2700090	envirocare@cats-net.com.
Mr Shima Sago	TaTEDO, Programme Officer	Plot 589, Off Shekilango Rd, Kijitonyama P.O. Box 32794 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Tel: (255-22) 2700438 Fax: (255-22) 2774400	energy@tatedo.org or shimasago@yahoo.com www.tatedo.org Cell: (255) 713420382
Mr Stephen Mwakifwamba	CEEST, Deputy Executive Director	P.O. Box 5511 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Tel: (255-22) 2667569 Fax: (255-22) 2667569	cest@ceestcom or smwaki67@yahoo.com Cell: (255-22) 713416020
Mr Tharsis Hyera	EPMS, Program Manager	P.O. Box 7775 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Tel: (255-22) 2120429	epms@bol.co.tz or htmagnus@yahoo.co.uk Cell: (255) 784674367
Prof. Adolfo Mascarenhas	University: Indigenous Knowledge, Poverty Environment The African LINK, Vice Chairman	P.O. Box 35102 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Tel: (255-22) 2774011	mascar@udsm.ac.tz Cell: (255) 748527302
Mr Richard Muyungi,	Vice President's Office, Division of Environment, Assistant Director of Environment and National Climate Change Focal Point	P.O. Box 5380, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania	

Abbreviations:

CEEST: Centre for Energy Environment Science and Technology Foundation
 DoE: Department of Environment of Vice-President's Office
 EPMS: Environmental Protection and Management Services
 TaTEDO: Tanzania Traditional Energy Development and Environment Organization

APPENDIX C: COUNTRY REPORT GHANA EVALUATION NCAP; November 6-11, 2007⁷

C.1 ITINERARY

Tue 6/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrival Dorothy Amwata (DAM) and Rob Koudstaal (RKO)
Wed 7/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mr William Kojo Agyemang-Bonsu (EPA; UNFCCC Focal Point; NCAP project coordinator): general information on project and arranging for interviews (Section C.3.1). • Meeting Mr Winfred A Nelson (NDPC, Principal Planning Analyst): link tot GPRS (Sect. C.3.2). • Visit CARE International.
Thu 8/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mr William Kojo Agyemang-Bonsu: more detailed information on methodology (Section 3.1). • Meeting Mr D. F. Korsah Brown (Executive Director Centre for Environmental Law & Development): bridging gap technical plans and implementation (Section C.3.3). • Meeting Mrs Patience T. M. Dampsey (National Nuclear Research Institute, NCAP gender analysis): gender analysis and impact on adaptation strategy (Section C.3.4). • Meeting Mrs Ama Essel (Community Health Department Univ. of Ghana Medical School; involved in NCAP health issues): public health aspects in interventions (Section C.3.5).
Fri 9/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mrs Sarah Naa Dedei Agbey (Advisor Natural Resources Management SNV – Neth. Development Organisation): Role NGOs and value of project for their activities (Section C.3.6). • Meeting Mr Edwin A. Gyassi (Prof. Dep. of Geography & Resource Development, University of Ghana): Opinion of project and possibilities for implementation of identified integrated land management interventions (Section C.3.7). • Meeting Mr Z Minia (Acting Director General Ghana Meteorological Agency): Approach to formulation of climate scenarios (Section C.3.8). • Meeting Mrs Wilma van Esch (First Secretary Environment and Water Advisor Netherlands Embassy): donor coordination and Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (Section C.3.9).
Sat 10/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report writing. • Departure RKO to The Netherlands.
Su 11/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departure DAM to Tunisia.

C.2 FINDINGS

- Study performance and quality
 - ◇ Building on the NCCSAP outputs, the NCAP project has effectively embarked on complementary analyses of 4 sectors, 2 cross sector issues, the formulation of CC scenarios and the identification and formulation of project plans.
 - ◇ The project embarked on an innovative multi-criteria approach to prioritize among the many suggestions for adaptation measures resulting from these analyses. This is expected to lead to a national plan of action that fills the gap of not having participated in the GEF-NAPA rounds.
 - ◇ The project is considered of high quality, greatly due to the personal drive and management capacity of the project coordinator together with his position as climate change national focal point. However, it should be noted that there is high risk involved should the person quit EPA for whatever reasons, since no immediate replacement or back-up seems available. This underscores the need for broadening of the CC expertise and asks for continuous training of technical staff.
 - ◇ The project has focused on policy level and strategy formulation with little interaction and involvement of local stakeholders.

⁷ Abbreviations at the end of the appendix

- ◇ Though the innovative multi-criteria approach developed for the selection of interventions is considered rather academic and does not involve politicians, it has created a highly valued interaction among the different project participants that contributed to the high quality of the study.
- Project management
 - ◇ The project is well located at the EPA, actively and very well coordinated by the national focal point himself and has built up an impressive network of cooperating organizations and individuals. Partners have been and are currently involved in the project execution on an almost continuous basis rather than being exclusively contracted for specific contributions.
- In-country coordination
 - ◇ See under project management.
 - ◇ The positive results with respect to the well established network and the effective awareness building and consequent involvement of partners was to a considerable extent due to the existence of NCCSAP.
- Policy influence and South-South communication
 - ◇ The project-coordinator-driven network was very crucial in effectively building awareness at high policy levels and mainstreaming climate change issues.
 - ◇ Particular mention should be made of the narrow links that exist with the GPRS and its implementation process in which both the project's participants on poverty are involved in capacity building at district level.
 - ◇ Climate Change remains high on the priority list of the Ghanaian Government. Growing donor coordination and sector-oriented budget contributions offer opportunities to implement more integrated approaches, but requires careful fine-tuning with the new and still fragile coordination mechanisms between the Ghanaian government and development partners.
 - ◇ No South-South interactions.

C.3 BRIEF NOTES ON MEETINGS

C.3.1 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): Mr William Kojo Agyemang-Bonsu (UNFCCC focal point and NCAP project coordinator) and his assistant Mr Kyekyeku Yaw Oppong-Boadi (WKA and KYO) Wednesday-Thursday-Friday 7-8-9/11/2007 (RKO, DAM)

- EPA is a government agency established by an Act of Parliament in 1994, following the Environment Protection Council since 1974. EPA has licensing, monitoring and enforcing authority. It falls under the Ministry of Local Governance, Rural Development and Environment. In addition to head quarters (150 staff), EPA has 10 regional offices and three district offices. Total staff is approximately 550.
- Mr William Bonsu works at EPA since 1996 and is in charge of climate change since 1998. He is also involved in a project to define Ghana-specific emission coefficients.
- In 2008, donor support will be channeled via a “common basket” with budget control and accountability through the Ministry of Finance. Environmental projects under the Natural Resource Management and Environmental Governance Committee. Canada, France and Netherlands play a crucial role in donor coordination. The basket money can be earmarked according to donor preferences.
- The CC Committee was active in the 90s (Government, NGOs, research). Its main function was an advisory function; the Committee came together infrequently (about twice a year), while work was done through ad-hoc working groups.

- NCCSAP in Ghana focused on water resources and coastal zone. CC scenarios were developed for the first time in Ghana. Did not pay much attention on impacts. Substantial contribution to 1st NC (2000).
- NCAP. Given the useful results of NCCSAP Ghana took the initiative to focus on other sectors aiming to contribute to a representative National Adaptation Framework. Ghana does not prepare a NAPA (not qualified as LDC) and considers the output of NCAP as such.
- 2nd NC due in 2009 (GEF funding). GRSP 2nd round 2006-2009. Major contributions of NCAP.
- For 1st NC EPA worked with individuals; now prefers contracting institutes rather than individuals.
- Projects covers: (i) vulnerability and adaptation studies in 4 sectors (human health, fisheries, agriculture and land management); (ii) special studies on links between CC and poverty and CC and women; (iii) national CC scenario; (iv) integration into plan of action.
- No attention for mitigation.
- Involvement NGOs mainly for dissemination. Except SNV with which they have a MoU. CARE international is now organizing a workshop (28th November). Mr William was approached from the beginning and has appointed a colleague to make a presentation. CARE activities are action oriented.
- RNE is actively involved. They are informed and use to attend workshops.
- Poverty study is coordinated by NDCP who is responsible for formulation and implementation of GRSP (Section 3.2).
- No serious delays were noted in the working groups in NCAP, with the exception of the working group on health.
- TA was provided in all sectors and can not be missed in near future. This raises concerns of ownership and sustainability.
- Possible extension would focus on implementation of package-ready programs resulting from NCAP (e.g., improving on land use practices). It is not clear how relevant implementing agencies could be in charge through EPA.
- The funds were used for all sectors of the projects and too thinly spread.
- South-south cooperation was not too much. Together with Mozambique a presentation was prepared in Indonesia.
- Developed *Akropong* methodology to select priorities among the many suggestions for adaptation interventions in the sector studies. Ten priority areas have been selected through multi-sectoral analysis without the involvement of decision makers. Currently the project is at the stage of formulating project plans.

**C.3.2 National Development Planning Commission (NDCP): Mr Winfred A Nelson (Principle Planning Analyst)
Wednesday 7/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, WKA)**

- Leads NCAP phase 2 study on poverty and climate change. Co-responsible for environmental issues in GPRS.
- The GPRS process seems well implemented in Ghana: GPRS1 (2003 - 2005) and GPRS2 (2006 - 2009). NDCP deals with: policy making, plan formulation and monitoring. Winfred thinks that it is most important that CC and poverty links enter into the planning activities. Once in the plans they become part of annual budget allocation procedures. GDRS2 has four priority areas,

including governance and education. Environment and CC do not have a special section in the GPRS but have full and specific attention throughout the plan.

- NCDP has no implementation power but has a strong impact on budget allocation procedures of the Min. of Finance. The main policy mechanism is through NDPC' Commission or Board (established by Act; advisory function to the President).
- Mr Winfred is intensely involved in training of districts (in cooperation with SNV) to make plans that feed (together with sector plans) the GPRS national process. He is not involved in the prioritization processes in NDCP.
- Mr Winfred is convinced of the important role NCAP plays and has played in sensitizing and mainstreaming the links between environment/CC and poverty in the GPRS. In this sense many improvements between GPRS1 and GPRS2.

**C.3.3 Centre for Environmental Law & Development: Mr D. F. Korsah Brown (Executive Director)
Thursday 8/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, WKA)**

- Since 2002; three lawyers: using a right-based approach and legal avenues to promote sustainable development and enhance livelihoods. Also involved in Climate Justice Program of Friends of the Earth International.
- Aims to bridge the gap between technical works / studies / plans and effective policy implementation. Involved in efforts to mainstream environment and anchor this in legislation.
- Advisor to NCAP. Promotes better mechanisms for integration and coordination and involvement of stakeholders from the beginning.

**C.3.4 National Nuclear Research Institute: Mrs Patience T. M. Dampsey (NCAP gender analyst)
Thursday 8/11/2007 (RKO, DAM)**

- Involved in NCAP from the beginning (NCCSAP working in the Ministry of Energy).
- Gender analysis through Focal Group Discussions in only three communities and literature survey: thin.
- Study has had major impact on strategy formulation and awareness building. Played a good role in integration workshop.
- Gender gets lately full attention in Ghana: Ministry of women and children exists since about 5 years and gender departments were recently established in many ministries.
- Awareness raising most important issue for continuation.

**C.3.5 Community Health Department University of Ghana Medical School: Mrs Ama Essel (NCAP health issues)
Thursday 8/11/2007 (RKO, DAM)**

- Only joined NCAP in phase 2 one year ago and participated fully in integration workshop. High opinion of the project and its impact.
- Awareness raising most important issue for continuation

**C.3.6 SNV (Netherlands Development Organisation): Mrs Sarah Naa Dedei Agbey (Advisor Natural Resources Management)
Friday 9/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, YKO)**

- SNV works through 4 regional offices. Focus is not anymore on projects but on capacity building of both government and non-government organizations on planning. Mrs Sarah brought NCAP to SNV that has a MoU with EPA.

- Mrs Sarah is co-author of the project's poverty document together with Winfred (NDCP, Section 3.2). The Project helped a lot in implementing GPRS (district planning).
- Also involved in CDM activities and DFID financed study: moving towards an emission-neutral development.
- Aim: to get a separate chapter on climate change in GPRS3.

**C.3.7 Dep. of Geography & Resource Development, University of Ghana: Mr Edwin A. Gyassi (Professor)
Friday 9/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, YKO)**

- Confirms the importance of the project for Ghana in general. The project certainly created awareness on high policy levels (including the Ministry of Agriculture).
- His work focuses on land degradation and the perception of farmers (how do farmers respond to ongoing degradation) and he criticizes the project because of lack of involvement of farmers, lack of awareness building of farmers and lack of practical interventions.
- Wants more attention to mitigation in relation to micro-climate.
- Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) should be the implementing agency for any intervention on land use management. Uncertain about possible coordinating role by EPA. MoA has own medium term development planning system which provides a framework for implementation on district level. MoA is also formulating a land management policy, but this is too much top-down. MoA has to be trained in bottom-up approaches and take lessons from collapse of state farms in the past (due to not accounting for local geomorphologic and cultural conditions).

**C.3.8 Ghana Meteorological Agency: Mr Z Minia (Acting Director General)
Friday 9/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, YKO)**

- Scenario formulation used IPCC assessments and global circulation model (GCM) that best described the trends in temperature and rainfall in past 30 years (no extrapolation was done).
- Indications that river discharges will change 15 to 30 % (higher floods and reduced low flows).
- Downscaling from GCM to Ghana scale was problem and should be improved in future using newly developed regional models.

**C.3.9 Royal Netherlands Embassy: Mrs Wilma van Esch (First Secretary, Environment and Water Advisor)
Friday 9/11/2007 (RKO, DAM, WKA)**

- Donor coordination in Ghana is growing. Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (GJAS) aims to assist in implementation of GPRS.
- Netherlands leading donor in Health and Environment & Natural Resources and is involved in multi-donor budget support (MDBS).
- In addition to this MDBS, several donors (World Bank, EU, Netherlands, France and United Kingdom) agreed on sector budget support (through Min. of Finance, from 2008 onwards). Switzerland is interested and expected to join shortly after, while Canada, United States, FAO and UNDP participate in coordination (NREG: National Resource and Environment Governance group) but have just started major projects and prefer to wait.
- EPA has formulated 8 policy actions with 5 year targets and annual outputs. (climate change high on the agenda). This will be measuring rod to assess performance.
- Policy and strategy formulation rather well structured. Problem remains in implementation of interventions with multi-sector inputs. High level commitments are needed (studies should address impacts on the economy). EPA would take role of coordinating agency. This seems to work with a GEF project on land use management at district level which is coordinated by EPA.

- Adaptation through direct projects (in addition to sector budget support) still possible.
- Recognition: climate change is a (fashioned) trigger to create commitments in more effectively addressing the environmental degradation and poverty issues in Ghana sustainable development. It is not an issue in itself.

C.4 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Ghana Country Proposal NCCSAP Phase 2 (NCAP) -Part 1; January 19, 2004.
- Cooperation Agreement ETC International and EPA Ghana and corresponding letter EPA on March 17, 2004.
- Detailed workplan for NCCSAP2-Part 1; undated.
- Different Terms of References for sector studies (undated).
- Draft Scenarios; October 19, 2004.
- Different sector outputs phase 1.
- Ghana Country report, Final Report Phase 1; July 2006.
- Report on Sectoral Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessments in Ghana; Technical Summary; September 2007 (updated summary of sectoral studies phase 1).
- Workshop report; Integrated Analysis and Scenarios; Accra, 8-11 November 2005.
- Interim report review; 15 April 2006.
- Detailed workplan for NCAP Part 2; August 8, 2006.
- Country Progress report Ghana, January 1 to June 30, 2007.
- Ghana 2 – Output 3: Scenario Development and MCA Workshop Report; August 2007.
- The Akropong Approach to Multi-sector Project Planning. Draft for publication (undated).

C.5 CONTACT DATA OF PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS VISITED

Name	Responsibility and institution	Address and phone	Email, website and cell phone
Mr William Kojo Agyemang-Bonsu	UNFCCC Focal Point/CDM-DNA; Environmental Protection Agency	P.O. Box M326, Accra, Ghana Tel: (233-21) 663451/664697-8/662465 Fax: (233-21) 662690	wbonsu@epaghana.org or agyemang_bonsu@yahoo.co.uk Cell: (233-24) 4382900
Mr Kyekyeku Yaw Oppong-Boadi	Assistant NFP, Environmental Protection Agency	Same as above	
Mrs Sarah Naa Dedei Agbey	Advisor, Natural Resource Management; SNV, Netherlands Development Organization;	No.34 Senchi St. Airport Res. Area; P.O. Box 30284, Airport, Accra, Ghana Tel: (233-21) 772858/774782 Fax: (233-21) 786286	nagbey@snvworld.org(direct) www.snvworld.org/ghana
Mrs Wilma Van Esch	First Secretary, Environment and Water Advisor, Royal Netherlands Embassy	89 Liberation Road Ako Adjei Interchange P.O. Box CT1647 Accra, Ghana Tel: (233-21) 214350-362 Fax: (233-21) 773655	wilma-van.esch@minbuza.nl
Mrs Dora Adjoa Bonnah	Administrative Officer; CARE International	H/No.3, 6 th Ringway Link P.O. Box CT2487 Cantonments, Accra, Ghana Tel: (233-21) 7012993/7012995-6 Fax: (233-21) 7012196	bonnah@caregog.org Cell: (233-24) 4508386
Mr Winfred A. Nelson	Principal Planning Analyst; National Development Planning Commission (NDPC)	Flagstaff house P. O. Box CT633 Cantonments, Accra, Ghana Tel: (233-21) 773011- ext 124 Fax: (233-21) 773055	winfrednelson@yahoo.co.uk Cell: (233-24) 4482407
Mr Edwin A. Gyasi	Professor, University of Ghana; Environment /Natural Resources Consultant; National Coordinator UNDP/ GEF/GoG/Sustainable Land Management (SLAM) Project	Department of Geography & Resource Development, University of Ghana P.O. Box LG59, Legon, Accra, Ghana Tel: (233-21) 500382/503013 Fax: (233-24) 3457746	edgplec@africaonline.com.gh or plec@ug.edu.gh
Mr Z. Minia	Acting Director General, Ghana Meteorological Agency		minia_zin@yahoo.com metco@africaonline.com.gh

Abbreviations:

EPA:	Environmental Protection Agency
GCM	Global Circulation Model
GJAS	Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy
GPRS:	Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy
MDBS	Multi-donor Budget Support
NDCP:	National Development Planning Commission
NREG	National Resource and Environmental Governance group

APPENDIX D: COUNTRY REPORT SURINAME EVALUATION NCAP; November 13-20, 2007⁸

D.1 ITINERARY

Tue 13/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrival Rob Koudstaal (RKO) in Suriname
Wed 14/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mr Sieuwath Naipal (Anton de Kom University, docent; NCAP project coordinator): general introduction project (Section D.3.1) • Meeting Mrs Christine de Rooij (UNDP; project coordinator): UNDP CC activities and interaction with NCAP project (Section D.3.2)
Thu 15/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mrs Margret Kerkhoffs-Zerp (TI, acting deputy director industry; before 6 months national focal point at ATM: review of experience as national focal point (Section D.3.3). • Meeting Mrses Shelley R. Soetosenojo, Priscilla Setrowidjojo Karijodrono and Haidy Aroma (ATM, environmental officers): policy and approach env. department and role in NCAP (Section D.3.4.). • Meeting Mr Cedric Nelom (NISOM, Director Environmental Monitoring and Enforcement): NISOM organization and link to climate change projects and NCAP (Section D.3.5). • Meeting Mr Cor Becker (Head MDS): capacity MDS and input into NCAP project (Section D.3.6) • Short visit to coast northeast of Paramaribo.
Fri 16/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tel interview Mrs Maureen Silos (NGO Caribbean Institute): role NGOs, poverty in Suriname (Section D.3.7). • Meeting Mr M.A. Amatali (Waterloopkundige Dienst, Head): involvement and water climate change related water management problems (Section D.3.8)
Mon 19/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting
Tue 20/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Mrs Alexandra Valkenburg (RNE, First Secretary): position and role RNE; priority issues and donor coordination (Section D.3.9). • Workshop on National (Climate) Action Plan (NAP) at NIMOS: preparing for first draft NAP (UNDP-GEF) (Section D.3.10). • Departure

D.2 FINDINGS

- Study performance and quality
 - ◇ Focus is on the coastal zone and justification and preparation of a comprehensive CZ development plan, in which CC should be incorporated.
 - ◇ The country has no capacity for formulating regional climate change scenarios and local scale impact assessment (e.g., livelihood analyses).
 - ◇ NCAP benefited greatly from NCCSAP and did a good job in awareness building and data collection. The exclusive focus of NCCSAP on physiographic aspects, map making and general statistics was broadened towards demography and impact assessments on economic sectors under NCAP but not to livelihood issues and vulnerability. Lack of data remains a major bottleneck.
 - ◇ There is little environment-oriented poverty in Suriname. Main CC threats are the economic activities and living conditions in the coastal zone.
 - ◇ The NCAP project is closely related to the formulation of the NAP. The first prioritization effort of alternatives for NAP was poor and could have been improved with more TA under NCAP (as done, e.g., in Ghana⁹).

⁸ Abbreviations at the end of the appendix.

⁹ Mission was instrumental in establishing contacts between project coordinators to share the Ghana experience with prioritization and multi-criteria analysis.

- ◇ In the Suriname conditions, it could have been recognized in an earlier stage of NCAP and NAP activities that the scarce resources available should be dedicated exclusively to an integrated approach to coastal zone management (ICZM). The country needs such an ICZM not only because of CC but to address sustainable development issues of its most important region. CC is an additional and important trigger and could have been more explicitly used as such.
- Project management
 - ◇ The project is staffed with knowledgeable and motivated experts from different agencies. The country has a small administrative and academic community that is insufficiently staffed to respond properly to commitments generated by international conventions and/or donor efforts to support Suriname in these commitments. This implies that the project group is “unique” (hardly any expertise outside the group), cooperates well but is overloaded.
 - ◇ TA was changed twice (last change in July 2007).
 - ◇ In spite of ETC’ efforts to get the project running, the lack of local project staff and overloaded personnel resulted in continuous delays and non-implementation of NCAP phase 2.
- In-country coordination
 - ◇ Donor support in climate change issues only from the Dutch and UNDP. In addition a CZ management planning is being prepared under the IDB. Given the scarce resources available coordination among donor-supported activities could be improved beyond the individual researcher-level.
- Policy influence and South-South communication
 - ◇ The country lacks an operational and structured strategic approach to development planning and subsequent interventions that properly pays attention to environmental, climate and climate change concerns. A PRS has been formulated but is shelved.
 - ◇ The country is restructuring the environmental sector (new act and new institutional arrangements). This is expected to increase the impact environmental concerns (including climate change issues) have on policies and planning. Developments are too slow to expect immediate results in the coming years, e.g., in terms of implementation of adaptation interventions.
 - ◇ Though the technical quality of the study is not outstanding (a.o., because lack of data), the project – and in particular the project coordinator -- did a great job in awareness building, which has had an important influence on the ongoing institutionalization (preparing a new and more permanent CCSC and structuring environmental management) and planning (preparation CZ management) processes.
 - ◇ No South-South interactions.

D.3 BRIEF NOTES ON MEETINGS

D.3.1 Anton de Kom University: Mr Sieuwnath Naipal (NCAP-II project coordinator; 08715714) Wednesday 14/11/2007 (RKO)

- Mr Sieuw Naipal (SNA) since 1996 involved in CC studies and NCCSAP/NCAP. First with Public Works Dep., since 1998 with University. Presented 39th Dies address (2007) University on climate change.
- University structure: department Infrastructure (one of 6); SNA is sub-coordinator Section land and water management (one of 4). Last 5 years only 3 students. Many sponsored research through GoS.
- Time schedule context:

- ◇ NCCSAP finished in 2001 (CSCCS: Country Study Climate Change Surinam). Modeling study (IVM) climate change impacts on hydrology. GIS impact models; start of mapping exercises.
- ◇ 1st NC (National Communications). UNDP supported: signed in 1997; means made available in 1998; (concluded in 2005).
- ◇ 2nd NC in preparation.
- ◇ National Climate Action Plan drafted (workshop coming Tuesday).
- NCAP project from May 2005 till November 2007. SNA claims never to have understood that NCAP would be realized in two steps. Because of slow start and delay step 1, step 2 will not be realized. NCAP project focuses on updating coastal profiles (impacts on sectors; data collection; and mapping) and further identification and elaboration of vulnerability and adaptation measures in Greater Paramaribo. Step 2 could have been used for drafting concrete implementation plans.
- Workshops: Inception in July 2005; draft profiles in March 2006; community workshop in September 2006 and water conference in November 2007.
- Last week international conference opened by the President of Suriname (in presence of President of the National Bank). ETC present (Phil O'Keefe and Adriaan Tas). Recommendations on: establishing new CCSC above ministries (not realistic according to Mrs Margret Kerkhofs, former NFP); drafting coastal zone management plan; promoting interventions in CZ; and data collection.
- Awareness of climate change is growing but there are little to no coherent policy approaches in Suriname. Responsibilities for many tasks in young and often recent government organizations not clearly defined and established.
- Inundations in 2006 (rainfall upstream, Paramaribo not affected because of Brokopondo reservoir) and 2007 (excessive local rainfall, drainage problem coastal area).
- SNA for long only expert at University on Climate Change. This is now changing as more and more students study CC related subjects and their coaches are being trained and involved in CC activities (positive NCAP role).

D.3.2 UNDP: Mrs Christine de Rooij (project coordinator)

Wednesday 14/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- National Climate Action Plan (NAP) in last phase, follows up on 1st NC. Start of 2nd NC in preparation (SNA involved). GEF funds (2 million US\$) still available for implementation.
- GoS poorly organized, plans not implemented. Environmental sector plan still to come; PRS formulated (UNDP support) but never passed council of ministers. Major personnel problem in Suriname (only 60+ and 30-).
- Environment sector to be reorganized (see also sections 3.4/3.5).
- IDB (Inter-american Development Bank) will start with coastal zone management plan.
- Poor coordination development efforts. Partly under PLOS (Planning Development Cooperation, focus on Dutch contributions). IDB under Min of Finance, while most donors under Min of Foreign Affairs.
- Good coordination with NCAP; idea for follow up: co-financing GEF for implementation.
- UNDP major role in awareness building. Impressive brochures made by NGO Caribbean Institute (see Section D.3.7), trained by NCAP.

D.3.3 Former national focal point at ATM: Mrs Margret Kerkhoffs-Zerp (TI, acting deputy director industry). Thursday 15/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- With ATM since 2002. National Focal point (NFP) under ATM started with ETC workshop in 2005. Before 2005 studies were done under/by Public Works and University.
- Chaired CCSC; created for 2 years. Meetings once to twice a month (with attendance participants paid for). SNA was invited for meetings; RNE and UNDP attended as observers. All CC projects discussed: (all NIMOS: 1st NC; small grants programme GEF; NAP).
- CCSC now pending, but continues working. GoS wants to reduce number of commissions and continuation is under discussion (also explicit recommendation last week's water conference).
- Other related planning efforts:
 - ◊ Public Works: drainage plan Greater Pramaribo; took notice of NCCSAP results, no direct impacts; and
 - ◊ Coronie coastal erosion project under Min of Agriculture; NGO Caribbean Institute (Maureen Silos also member CCSC – see Section 3.7) and NIMOS involved; benefited from NCAP.
- Limited staff, strong person is needed as NFP and chair CCSC. Implementation tasks should be better organized.

D.3.4 ATM: Mrses Shelley R. Soetosenojo, Priscilla Setrowidjojo Karijodrono and Haidy Aroma (environmental officers); Thursday 15/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- NFP (Mrs Uiterloo) on maternity leave.
- ATM created on paper in 2000 but came into existence only in 2002. 7 departments; CC under department “atmosphere”, together with air pollution. Environment will become a directorate (one of three, directly under the Minister). Environment section has 11 experts.
- Ministry only planning; NIMOS implementation.
- Are involved in CDM capacity building through Dutch project.
- Expect continuation CCSC.
- Approval new Environmental Act in progress: now with Council of Ministers. The act will upgrade NIMOS till an Environmental Authority with more authority (inspection, enforcement).
- Draft Environment Policy paper annually. An Environment Sector Plan (financed by The Netherlands) is in earliest stages of preparation (formulating ToR) aim is to finalize end 2008. Climate will get attention. This sector plan results from an overall agreement with The Netherlands (donor driven). Sector plan is expected to include environmental issues under other ministries.

D.3.5 NIMOS: Mr Cedric Nelom (Director Environmental Monitoring and Eforcement) Thursday 15/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- New Environmental Authority will not have licensing authority but has to be included in licensing procedures other ministries (with the exception of waste import and export licenses). Involved in auditing discharges; will have laboratory facilities and will coordinating national efforts in this respect.
- Coming Environmental Act defines roles of:
 - ◊ National Environmental Council; exists already and continues as advisory body to ATM and NIMOS.

- ◇ Environmental Authority (NIMOS); role roughly same: no data collection; support policy formulation ATM; and implement formulated policies.
- ◇ Inter-ministerial advisory committee; will be revived; composed of technical directors of departments. NIMOS participates.
- NIMOS no direct involvement in NCAP, but NCAP results had/will have an important role in NIMOS activities 1st NC, NAP and 2nd NC. Data became available at precise moment. Lack of data is great problem in Suriname.
- Wants to increase capacity for environmental research and views NCAP important in data collection and processing activities (e.g., GIS and mapping).
- Lack of capacity and experience in Suriname to set priorities for implementation. For example no experience to assess costs (broad context) and links to poverty.
- CCSC should become a technocratic commission with clearly defined mandate. Not under Environmental Council but separate.

D.3.6 MDS: Mr Cor Becker (head)

Thursday 15/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- Small institute: 80 staff, incl. 65 professionals; 100% GoS funding; operate 50 to 60 stations and collect data from another 20; 7 major synoptic stations of which 4 operational.
- Involved in emission assessments which started under NCCSAP. The 3rd assessment was included in final 1st NC. No Suriname specific emission coefficients. Made trend analysis but no scenario building climatic changes: no estimates were made of changes in temperatures and precipitation (would need access to regional climate models and research capacity to do that).
- Realistic approach because of limited capacity: focuses on data collection and processing. Major personnel problem as many of 65 professionals will retire in coming years. Received NASA (USA) award for reliability information.
- No research capacity and access to models (global and regional circulation models), limited international exchange and interactions (WMO, Germany and The Netherlands; Suriname not in internationally interesting hurricane belt, for example); limited to no access to remote sensing or detailed meteo-satellite info.
- Becker: no real climate hazards in Surinam; floods as experienced in past two years are not a big issue.

D.3.7 NGO Caribbean Institute: Mrs Maureen Silos (head; 550048; 08587027)

Friday 16/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- Small NGO with two full time and three part time staff. Member of CCSC and actively involved in CC issues and CC awareness building (NIMOS climate campaign; UNDP brochures, for example). Presently working in two projects in which climate change impacts play a role: Coronie development plan (coastal erosion, financed from Ramsar small grant fund) and Saramacca (organic agriculture).
- Expertise in working with local people; not (yet) with local agencies.
- Many NGOs in Suriname but few are working in areas related to climate (change) and none really interested to be involved in climate change related issues (requires research attitude and time).
- Environment and climate change attention in Suriname very much donor driven and does not yet have genuine response within government agencies. In spite of all actions and enthusiastic cooperations, no reflection in GoS planning and strategic documents.

- PRS. No or little climate (change) related poverty in Suriname. Most people have access to someone employed with Suriname government (60 to 70% of population has government job). No planned approaches. Poverty is not a survival issue in Surinam: “GoS organizes poverty”.

D.3.8 Waterloopkundige Dienst (Water Management Department Ministry of Public Works): Mr M.A. Amatali (head); Friday 16/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- Task: support preparation and implementation of civil engineering interventions. Three sections: scientific research (staff 12); measurements basic network (staff 29); and administration (staff 6). Before internal war and economic recession 75 measuring stations. Came to complete stop. Now only 12, only in the coastal area. Completely GoS financed. Scientific research section focuses on setting up information system basic data.
- Climate Change related burning issues:
 - ◊ general: integrated water management to make more water available in dry period;
 - ◊ evaporation expected to increase 25 – 30 %;
 - ◊ drainage problem coastal area Greater Paramaribo (more intensive rainfall and sea level rise);
 - ◊ Nickerie-Wageningen agricultural area of 48000 ha suboptimal utilized because of water shortage and salinization (insufficient rainfall, shortage of fresh water, sea level rise);
 - ◊ between Nickerie and Coppename River: depression and growing drainage problem (sea level rise); and
 - ◊ coastal erosion road Paramaribo – Corantijn (sea level rise).
- NCAP played major role in awareness process and data collection on coastal profiles but so far did not have impact on policy making and planning of Ministry. Mr Amatali important linking pin: involved in all important decision making of the Ministry and other projects such as 1st NC and NAP.

D.3.9 Royal Netherlands Embassy: Mrs Alexandra P. Valkenburg-Roelofs, First Secretary Tuesday, 20/11/2007 (RKO, SNA)

- RNE active observer of NCAP, attends CCSC meetings as observer. Are comfortable with impacts of NCAP. In revived CCSC (in discussion) RNE will continue to be observer.
- Unfortunate that forestry is not under environment (Min. of ATM).
- Suriname Development Plan 2006-2011 exists (Ministry of Planning and Development: PLOS) consist mainly of list of projects. Implementation is poor.
- Netherlands’ support under long term agreement is scheduled to end in 2009 but funds might be available up to 2010. Utilization of these funds exclusively through PLOS. WWF is supported from additional funds in preparation of Dutch involvement in the environmental sector after 2009/2010.
- Sector planning exists, e.g., agriculture. Implementation difficult.
- PLOS pays attention to environment, not to climate per se.
- World Bank not present in Suriname. Other donors: IDB, UNDP, EU, India, China, Japan and France.
- PLOS only policy making. Budgeting and implementation through Ministry of Finance and line ministries.
- RNE also involved in CDM capacity development with UNDP (not many possibilities in Suriname (no deforestation)).

D.3.10 NIMOS: Workshop on National Action Plan

Tuesday, 20/11/2007

- About 15 participants, including UNDP (Christine de Rooij), Director Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen, Hoofd Water Management Department. Presentations Becker (MDS) and SNA.
- Purpose is to make priority ranking of 10 identified adaptation interventions in preparation of a first draft of NAP.
- Discussion indecisive because of incomplete presentation of alternatives and criteria.

D.4 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Dr S. Naipal. Slideshow 39^{ste} dies rede Anton de Kom Universiteit: klimaatverandering en kustontwikkeling: aanpassingsvermogen van Suriname. Paramaribo; 1 november 2007.
- Different “huidige kustprofielen van Wanica en Paramaribo” made by NARENA (Natural Resources and Environmental Assessments). Most mid 2006.
- Dirk Noordam. Coastal issues. April, 20, 2006.
- Project proposal and related correspondence between October 2003 and August 2004.
- Cooperation agreement between ETC and ATM, February 2005.
- Country workplans, 2005-5-31 and 2005-9-27.
- Inception report, 2005-7-31.
- Report workshop 2005-7-5.
- Progress report January – June 2007, Adraan Tas, 2007-8-13.
- NCAP mission report Surinam, July 28 – August 5, 2007.
- Technische en beleidsaanbevelingen voortvloeiende uit de conferentie “Water en Toekomstige Ontwikkeling van Suriname”, Paramaribo November 5-9, 2007.

D.5 CONTACT DATA OF PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS VISITED

Name	Responsibility and institution	Address and phone	Email, website
Mrs Alexandra Valkenburg-Roelofs	First Secretary, Royal Netherlands Embassy	Van Roseveltkade 5 PO Box 1877 Paramaribo Tel: (597) 477211 Fax: (597) 421412	alexandra.valkenburg@minbuza.nl
Mrs Christine de Rooij	Project Coordinator, UNDP sub-office Suriname	Heerenstraat 17 Paramaribo Tel: (597) 420030/421417 Fax: (597) 425136	christine.de.rooij@undp.org.sr
Mrs Margret Kerkhoffs-Zerp	Acting Deputy Director Industry, Ministry of Trade and Industry	Haven complex, Paramaribo Tel: (597) 403022/ 402080 ext 240	odindustry@gmail.com
Mr Cedric Nelom	Director Environmental Monitoring & Enforcement, NIMOS	Onafhankelijkheidsplein 2 PO Box 12547 Paramaribo Tel: (597) 520043 Fax (597) 520042	cnelom@nimos.org www.nimos.org
Mrs Shelley R Soetosenojo	Environmental officer, Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment	Heerenstraat 40 Paramaribo Tel: (597) 475368 Fax: (597) 420960	milieu_atm@yahoo.com or srsoet@yahoo.com
Mr Siewnath Naipal	Scientific officer, Anton de Kom University of Suriname	Leysweg 86, Universiteitscomplex Paramaribo Tel: (597) 465558 ext 351	naipals@yahoo.com
Mrs Maureen Silos	Director NGO Caribbean Institute	Tel: (597) 550048 Cell: (597) 8587027	

Abbreviations:

ATM	Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Development
CCSC	Climate Change Steering Committee
GoS	Government of Suriname
IDB	Inter-american Development Bank
MDS	Meteorological Services Suriname
NAP	National Climate Action Plan
NFP	National Focal Point
NIMOS	National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname

APPENDIX E: COUNTRY TABLE OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Table 2: Country table of objectives and expected outcomes

Country	Name project/goal	Specific objectives / outcomes			
Bangladesh	Minimize risk CC and climate variability in coastal zone	Impacts on livelihoods understood	Local and national awareness raised	Adaptation in national actions recommended	
Bhutan	Reduce vulnerability Glacial Lakes Outburst Floods	GLOF hazard zonation maps produced	Integrated early warning system designed	Results among vulnerable communities disseminated	
Bolivia	Enhance understanding of the vulnerability and adaptive capacity of local communities in mountain semi arid regions	Adaptive capacity with respect to food systems and human health assessed and enhanced	Adaptation measures in coordination with local stakeholders developed	Contribution made to local and national policy making and global CC discussion	
Colombia	Build capacity to improve adaptability to sea level rise in to areas of the Colombian coast	Exposition and susceptibility biophysical and socio-economic elements assessed	Adaptation strategies and integration into national policies developed	Public awareness through community participation raised	
Ghana (=Mali)	Formulate CC policies consistent with PRS, facilitating mainstreaming in district and national plans	Capacity of Ghana to respond to CC improved	Appropriate responses to CC designed, incorporating existing experiences and models of good practice and a wide range of stakeholders	Plight of most vulnerable people to climate related threats examined	Awareness among policy makers, private sector and civil society raised
Guatemala	Increase the ability of local, regional and national players to respond to the impacts of variability and CC with emphasis on the dry region	Ability strengthened of key players and institutions to reduce vulnerability and to adapt to CC	Forestry and agro-forestry community projects and its potential for removing carbon formulated	Alternatives for improving income of the population of the dry region identified	
Mali (=Ghana)	Formulate CC policies consistent with PRS, facilitating mainstreaming in district and national plans	Capacity of Mali to respond to CC improved	Appropriate responses to CC designed, incorporating existing experiences and models of good practice and a wide range of stakeholders	Plight of most vulnerable people to climate related threats examined	Awareness among policy makers, private sector and civil society raised

Mongolia	Assess impacts of CC on food security and SLs of rural herder households and evaluate adaptation options	CC impacts on natural pastureland assessed and adaptation measures evaluated	Vulnerability and adaptation of water resources in rural Mongolia analyzed	Vulnerability of rural people to extreme climate events analyzed	CC impacts on food security and SL of rural people comprehensively assessed
Mozambique	Strengthen national disaster management	Pre-disaster planning and meta-evaluation of disaster activities reviewed	Contribution made to national policy dialogue and international commitments	Vulnerability at local level understood	
Senegal	Assess impacts of CC in relation to tourism and infrastructure as contribution to NAPA process	Databank on climatic sensitivities of development sectors and ecosystems established	Experience among developing countries on their strategy how to attack CC exchanged	NCAP and other national and international initiatives coordinated	Priority options on CC adaptation in within the frame of poverty alleviation identified and communicated
Suriname	Promote SL within the coastal zone with emphasis on Greater Paramaribo	Adaptation measures and need for financial resources developed	Government capacity built and supported	Awareness to all groups in the Coastal Zone raised	
Tanzania	Assess the capacity for adaptation to CC impact at community level (Rufiji Area; food systems, rural water supply and human health)	Current vulnerability and adaptation evaluated through integrative and participatory approaches	Adaptation strategy and measures formulated	Current policies and measures to enhance adaptive capacity evaluated and recommendations made for policy making	Capacity NGOs and researchers increased
Vietnam	Assess CC impacts in Huong River Basin and adaptation in its coastal district Phu Vang	Modeling river basin and participatory management tools coastal communes combined	CC impacts on water resources and on poor people's livelihoods studied	Awareness among all related stakeholders improved	Adaptation measures identified
Yemen	Contribute to NAPA and PRS implementation with a focus on vulnerable communities and social-based adaptation	Rapid rural appraisal for stakeholder analysis, multi-criteria analysis, water balance modelling tools and GIS used	Comprehensive set of adaptation strategies that address water scarcity in vulnerable communities identified	Comprehensive set of changes to existing policies and laws to facilitate CC adaptation identified in collaboration with NAPA	

CC
GHG
GLOF

Climate Change
Green House Gas
Glacial Lakes Outburst Floods

NAPA
PRS
SL

National Adaptation Programmes of Action
Poverty Reduction Strategy
Sustainable Livelihood

APPENDIX F: COUNTRY TABLES ON PROGRESS, RESULTS AND USE OF RESOURCES

EXPLANATION SCORES PROGRESS AND RESULT TABLES

Heading	Score	Description / observation
Continuation from NCCSAP"	Y or N	NCCSAP refers to the Dutch climate assistance programme, executed by IVM between 1996 and 2000.
Number of NCAP phases	1 or 2	NCAP refers to the Dutch climate assistance programme, executed by ETC between 2003 and 2008.
Names and periods of TA in NCAP")		TA: Technical Assistants, changes indicated if applicable.
Ministry/Organization National Focal Point		National Focal Points under UNFCCC, see http://maindb.unfccc.int/public/nfp.pl .
Contracting organization		Changes indicated if applicable.
Implementing organization		Changes indicated if applicable.
Focus of the project	<i>Main themes (Impact category)</i> <i>Scale</i> <i>Cross cutting issues</i>	<i>Main themes</i> refer to e.g.: , e.g.: agriculture; coastal zone (management); river basin (management); public health; tourism; infrastructure. <i>Impact category</i> refers to e.g.: drought, salinization, floods <i>Scale</i> : local or national. <i>Cross-cutting issues</i> refers to e.g.: - methods: approaches, data and modelling; - institutions: institutional arrangements; - disasters: linkages to disaster management; and - planning: strategies and action plans.
Progress	(0-100)%	Percentage of final results as committed through proposals and contracts.
DGIS objective 1: assist developing countries to implement the climate convention.	Indirect Direct: High, Medium, Low	This refers, for example, to contributions to the National Communications and NAPA. Scores reflect a comparative assessment among the 14 countries.
DGIS objective 2: to raise awareness of the problems of climate change.	High, Medium, Low	Scores differentiate between local and national level reflecting workshops, training and exchange programs. Scores are based on a comparative assessment among the 14 countries.
DGIS objective 3: increase the involvement of policy makers, scientists and broad layers of the population in the debate on climate change.	High, Medium, Low	Scores reflect a comparative assessment among the 14 countries. Policy makers refer to individuals or organizations involved in PRSP, national and sector development plans. Scientists refer to researchers and practitioners: those who prepare decision making. Broad layers refer to civil society: NGO's and community based organizations (this score differentiates between local and national level).
Extent of results influencing policy dialogue and operational decision making	0 = no impact 1 = awareness raised only 2 = concrete contribution to policy dialogue and operational decision making	This column specifies the involvement of policy makers (see column DGIS objective 3a).
Use of financial resources	(0-100) %	Percentage of transferred budgets. Percentages in last three columns add up 100%.

Table 3: Country table of progress

Country	Continuation from NCCSAP	Number of NCAP phases: one/two	Names and periods of TA in NCAP	Ministry/ Organization National Focal Point	Contracting organization	Implementing organization	Focus of the project	Progress (0-100%)
Bangladesh	N	2	Ian Tellam (entire period)	Ministry of Environment	IUCN Bangladesh	IUCN Bangladesh	coastal zone (floods, salinization) ; local; institutions - disaster	70
Bhutan	Y	1	Ian Tellam (entire period)	Ministry of Environment	Department of Geology and Mines	Department of Geology and Mines	river basin (glacial floods); local; method - disaster	90
Bolivia	Y	2	Bill Dougherty (entire period)	Ministry of Environment	Nur University	Nur University	mountain semi arid (drought, floods); local; institutions, planning	85
Colombia	Y	2	Tom Downing (entire period)	Ministry of Environment	INVEMAR	INVEMAR	coastal zone (floods, salinization) ; local; methods, planning	80
Ghana	Y	2	Annette Huber Lee, SEI Boston until mid 2006 then Bill Dougherty	Environmental Protection Agency	Environmental Protection Agency	Environmental Protection Agency	water resources, fisheries, agriculture, health, women's livelihoods; national; methods, institutions, planning	80
Guatemala	N	1	Tom Downing until mid 2006 then David Purkey	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)	MARN and FLACSO (FLACSO is contracted for the financial management)	MARN	river basin management (floods, droughts); national; methods, disasters, planning	80
Mali	Y	2	David Purkey (entire period)	Direction Nationale de la Météorologie	Secrétariat Technique Permanent du Cadre Institutionnel de la Gestion des Questions Environnementales (STP/CIGQE)	STP/CIGQE	river basin management (droughts); local; methods, planning	80
Mongolia	Y	1	Peter van der Werff (IVM) until end 2006 then Adriaan Tas	Ministry of Natural Resources	Ministry of Natural Resources	Ministry of Natural Resources	semi-arid grasslands (drought; winter storms); local; disasters, planning	80
Mozambique	N	2	Phil O'Keefe (entire period)	Ministry for Coordination of Environment Affairs (MICOA)	MICOA	MICOA	fisheries, agriculture, water resources (droughts, floods); national; methods, disasters, planning	60
Senegal	Y	1	David Purkey (entire period)	DEEC (Ministry of Environment)	DEEC and ENDA (ENDA is contracted for the financial management)	DEEC	tourism, infrastructure (drought, floods); national; planning	75
Suriname	Y	1	Ian Tellam until end 2006 then Adriaan Tas	Ministry of Labour, Technology and Environment	Ministry of Labour, Technology and Environment	Anton de Kom Universiteit	coastal zone management (floods); local; institutions, planning	60
Tanzania	N	2	Phil O'Keefe (entire period)	Ministry of Environment	CEEST	CEEST	agriculture (floods, drought); local; methods, disasters	80
Vietnam	N	1	Peter van der Werff (IVM) until end 2006 then Adriaan Tas	Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology	Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology	Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology	coastal zone management (floods); local; institutions, planning	60
Yemen	Y	2	Bill Dougherty (entire period)	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment	water resources, agriculture (drought); local; methods, planning	80

Table 4: Country table of results

Country	DGIS objective 1: to enable developing countries to implement commitments under the UNFCCC. For example, contributions to the National Communications and NAPA. (Indirect; Direct: High; Medium, Low)	DGIS objective 2: to create a greater awareness of climate change issues; score reflects workshops, training and exchange programs. (High, Medium, Low)		DGIS objective 3: to increase involvement (High, Medium, Low)				Extent of impact on policy dialogue and operational decision making (0 = no impact; 1 = awareness raised only; 2 = concrete contribution)
		Local level	National level	Policy makers (in connection with PRSPs, development planning and sectoral planning)	Practitioners and researchers	NGOs and Civil Society		
						Local level	National level	
Bangladesh	Indirect	High	High	Medium	High	High	Low	1
Bhutan	Indirect	High	Medium	Medium	High	Low	Low	1
Bolivia	Indirect	High	High	Medium	High	High	High	1
Colombia	Direct: high	Medium	High	High	High	Low	Low	2
Ghana	Direct: high	High	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	2
Guatemala	Direct: medium	High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	1
Mali	Indirect	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Low	1
Mongolia	Indirect	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	1
Mozambique	Direct: high	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	Low	Low	2
Senegal	Direct: high	High	High	Low	Low	Medium	Low	1
Suriname	Indirect	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	1
Tanzania	Indirect	High	High	Medium	High	High	High	1
Vietnam	Indirect	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	1
Yemen	Direct: high	High	High	High	High	Low	Low	1

Table 5: Country table of use of resources

Country	Budget available (in 1000 Euro)	Total budget transferred up to January 1, 2008 (percentage of available budget)	Budget spent (percentage of total budget transferred)		
			on thematic/sectoral studies and data collection	on awareness building and outreach (e.g. workshops/publications)	on contribution to National Communications, NAPAs, national development planning and coordination with other donors
Bangladesh	217	79	68	32	0
Bhutan	188	90	16	37	47
Bolivia	233	88	57	41	2
Colombia	159	78	67	8	25
Ghana	180	59	52	26	22
Guatemala	100	80	63	9	28
Mali	232	65	62	24	14
Mongolia	90	90	59	41	0
Mozambique	131	62	25	58	17
Senegal	76	55	61	39	0
Suriname	90	30	76	14	10
Tanzania	203	85	64	24	12
Vietnam	80	80	58	37	5
Yemen	116	69	71	9	20
<i>Average</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>15</i>

more than one third of the transferred budget is used for the purpose referred to in the column heading