

END-TERM REVIEW REPORT ANNEXES

CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND PROJECTS SUPPORT

DATE:	AUGUST 2015
CONSULTANT:	NTU
NAVISION CODE:	UGA 09 0211 11
DGCD CODE:	NN 3008741



BTC

**BELGIAN
DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

UGANDA END-TERM REVIEW REPORT CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND PROJECTS SUPPORT

DGCD intervention number:	NN 3008741
Navision code BTC:	UGA 0902111
Partner institution:	Ministry of Water and Environment and Climate Change Department
Duration of intervention:	48 months extended to 60 months
Duration of Specific Agreement:	48 months extended to 60 months
Starting date of intervention	24 November 2010
Uganda contribution:	EUR 0
Belgian contribution:	EUR 200 000 + 221 130
Total contribution:	EUR 2 221 130
Intervention sector	Environment

Summary of the intervention

Overall Objective: To enable Uganda to benefit from the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol.

Specific Objective: To strengthen technical capacity on CDM project formulation and create awareness of investment opportunities under the CDM among government institutions and project developers including financing institutions.

Review Team

Dr Richard Pagett	International Lead Expert
Ms Rebecca Nanjala	National Non-Lead Expert

ANNEXES

Contents

1	Terms of Reference.....	4
2	End-Term Review Team Members.....	28
3	Methodology of the End-Term Review	29
4	Generic Evaluation Part A and Part B.....	30
5	Checklist 'Lessons Learned'	41
6	Logical Framework.....	42
7	Mission Itinerary.....	44
8	List of Stakeholders Engaged.....	45
9	Minutes of Meetings	47
10	Bibliography	72



BTC

**BELGIAN
DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

1 Terms of Reference

End-Term Review of the Intervention Capacity Development and Projects Support Project (CDM)

Uganda
UGA 090211

February 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 MANDATE

2 INTERVENTION

2.1 Indicative Cooperation Programme

2.2 Intervention Form

2.3 Background and Implementation Strategy of the Intervention

3 OBJECTIVES

4 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

4.1 Generic Evaluation Field

4.2 Specific Evaluation Questions

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Fields, Evaluability, Resource Persons

5.2 Approach

5.3 Quality Management

6 USERS CONCERNED BY THE REVIEW

7 ORGANISATION

7.1 Management and Steering of the Review

7.2 Evaluation Team

7.3 Period, Duration, Deliverables

Annex 1 Evaluation Field “Performance”

Annex 2 Key Resource Persons

Annex 3 List of Users

Annex 4 List of the Intervention’s Key documents Supplied

Annex 5 List of Models to be used and of Reference Documents pertaining to the Normative Framework

1 Mandate

Pursuant to the commitments made with the partner and the Belgian State, the interventions implemented by the Belgian Development Cooperation are systematically evaluated on two occasions: at mid-term and at the end of the implementation phase. Evaluation is conducted by means of the "review" instrument. This document constitutes the Terms of Reference for proceeding to the End Term Review of the intervention specified below as part of the development cooperation between Belgium and Uganda.

The Terms of Reference (ToRs) are part of the Tender Specifications of the framework contract BXL1404

2 Intervention

2.1 Indicative Cooperation Programme

ICP	Year 2005 – Year 2008
Partner country	Uganda
Priority sector(s)	Health & Education (This environment sector project is a stand-alone)

2.1 Intervention Form

Title of the intervention	Capacity Development and Projects support Project (CDM)
Navision code of the intervention	UGA0902111
Intervention zone	Nationwide
Total budget	2.221.130€ (2.000.000€ + 221.130€)
Partner institution	Ministry of Water and Environment, Climate Change Department
Starting date of the Specific Agreement	23rd November 2010
Closing date of the Specific Agreement	23rd November 2015
Starting date of intervention – Opening steering committee – JLCB 0	
Duration of the intervention and expected closing date of the intervention	60 months
Impact (Global Objective)	To enable Uganda to benefit from the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol
Outcome (Specific Objective)	To strengthen technical capacity on

	CDM project formulation and create awareness on investment opportunities under the CDM among governmental institutions, project developers, including financing institutions
Outputs (Results)	<p><u>Output 1:</u> The capacity of the main stakeholders¹ on CDM project formulation strengthened</p> <p><u>Output 2:</u> Accessibility and quality of information on CDM possibilities and procedures in Uganda improved</p> <p><u>Output 3:</u> The process for registration by the EB CDM of Ugandan CDM projects has been supported</p>

2.3 Background and implementation strategy of the intervention

Background:

Climate change has been high on the international agenda for almost 20 years. The Kyoto Protocol (KP) established binding targets for participating developed countries and established the flexible mechanisms for complying with the requirements of the KP. The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) was one of three flexible mechanisms established under the KP, the other two being Joint Implementation and trading of Assigned Amount Units between industrialized countries with an emissions reduction commitment.

The rationale behind the CDM is that emission reductions would be achievable at a lower cost in developing countries and that a market mechanism based on individual projects monitored by a UN institution and governed by the Meeting of the Parties would create a global market for carbon credits with the developing countries benefiting through transfer of technology and the developed countries benefiting from complying with their commitments at a lower price per ton CO₂-e.

However, the most developed economies among the developing countries namely countries of SE Asia, China and India have attracted 80 % of all CDM projects, while Africa counts for only 2.5 %. At the time of project formulation Uganda counted for 2 registered CDM projects out of a total of 2000+ projects.

Strategy:

Therefore, Uganda needs capacity building in order for her to benefit from the CDM. On this basis the Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda,

responsible for Climate Change issues in the country, proposed Belgium to include a development project supporting Uganda in benefiting from the CDM in the development cooperation between the two Countries.

The purpose of the CDM Capacity Development Project intervention is to undertake an innovative approach in a pilot project to support capacity building that will lead to Uganda benefiting from the CDM. The project intervention will strengthen the capacity of Ugandan public and private entities in identifying and implementing CDM projects that will lead to enhanced sustainability of economic development of Uganda. The project will include capacity building in terms of hands-on training in all stages of CDM project development.

Management approach:

The specific approach taken is innovative in several ways:

- 1/ The Project is implemented CCU with the support of a private consultancy consortia specialised in CDM development
- 2/ The Project recruited a number of young professionals (trainees) to work 2 years alongside the Consultancy Companies to become experienced CDM developers on real and concrete CDM projects in different sectors and stages of development. Through intensive coaching the trainees get acquainted with the different aspects of CDM development as well as with the new approaches to supporting mitigation in developing countries.
- 3/ The CDM projects to work on are selected on the basis of specific calls for Proposals. Associates in these projects also benefit from hands-on training by the experienced CDM developers.

Project updates:

The Project underwent a Mid Term Review (MTR) in June 2013 and subsequently a re-planning for activities in August 2013. This re-planning was reviewed and project management has realized that approved project activities cannot be completed within the originally planned duration (expiring in November 2014).

A request for the extension of the project by one extra year was recommended by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) of 28th March 2014 and a formal request forwarded to concerned authorities. The request for extension was approved and instead of ending on 23 November 2014, the project will close on 23 November 2015.

The project budget has also been increased by an extra EUR 221,130, a balance of funds from a closed project (Kampala Integrated Environmental Planning and Management Project/KIEMP).

3 Objectives

The Mid-term and End-term Reviews on the one hand and the monitoring instruments on the other hand form an interdependent and complementary system that ensure the implementation phase of an intervention to progress well. The Reviews differ because of the depth of analysis of the monitoring: as evaluation exercises, they provide answers to "how" and "why" questions and are essential for assessing the value of the results achieved and of the whole of the implementation process of an intervention.

Consequently, a Review's function is:

- i) To support **steering**. On the basis of in-depth analyses, the Reviews offer useful recommendations that are based on data (evidence-based). That way, the Reviews support the strategic and operational decision making, and consequently, the steering of the interventions.
- ii) To contribute to **learning**. By analysing the development process, the Review allows us to explain what works, what does not work and why, and to thus draw lessons for other interventions or for the elaboration of new policies, strategies and programmes.
- iii) **Accountability** to the donor, partner and other internal actors by supplying an external assessment of the progress made and the results achieved.

The learning requires a specific focus in order to draw useful lessons for other interventions or for new policies, strategies and programmes.

4 Evaluation questions

The Review will answer a generic evaluation field pertaining to performance.

The Review will also answer one or more evaluation questions targeting the specific needs of the intervention.

4.1 Generic evaluation field

Assess the performance of the intervention

The evaluation field pertaining to the performance will be evaluated by means of the "Performance" evaluation grid, which is included in Annexe 1 as a reference (all criteria to be evaluated).

The following criteria require specific attention:

Efficiency (was assessed highly problematic by the MTR), Sustainability (what exit strategy?) and Impact.

The Performance evaluation grid is used for every review of the bilateral development cooperation, hence its generic nature. The generic approach will allow easier exploitation of the information generated by this question and ensures an efficient follow-up of the performance of all interventions.

The reporting modalities are described in the *Report* model in annexe.

4.2 Specific evaluation questions

The hands-on training is certainly key in the project approach to reach its objective:

- To what extent this hands-on training approach actually contributed better (or not as good as) than another approach would have done, to the achievement of the overall objective of the project?
- What are the lessons that can be drawn from this hands-on approach for other capacity building projects to be implemented by the Government of Uganda and/or BTC

The modalities of implementation of this project –technically implemented by CCU and a private consultancy company but financially managed by BTC under the own-management modality) are certainly specific compared to the traditional modality set-up:

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of such a modality set up? What would gain to be replicated?
- Was the choice to continue the intervention after the Carbon market's implosion, relevant (with hindsight) considering the outcome (specific objective) of the intervention?

In the generic field the question of sustainability will be evaluate. This question is of particular importance and it is important that the evaluators analyse if it has been sufficiently addressed not only during the project execution but also in the project formulation.

5 Methodology

5.1 Fields, Evaluability, Resource Persons

Evaluability

MTR Report
Backstopping reports

Fields

The whole of the intervention is to be assessed.

The Project team is based in Kampala, at the office of the Climate Change Department (former Climate Change Unit). Under the projects support component the Project supports several CDM projects for which the physical activities are mostly located outside Kampala. Most of the project owners have offices in Kampala however. The Review Team will visit (a) project site(s).

Resource persons

The resource persons listed in Annexe 2 are listed on an indicative basis. The final choice of the people to be met falls under the full responsibility of the evaluation team in function of the needs of the review.

5.2 Approach

The evaluator is asked to submit a "start-up report" that proposes a methodology in function of the objective, evaluation questions and available means.

5.3 Quality management

The products as well as the processes will respect the norms and standards of the OECD's DAC for evaluation as well as BTC's normative framework (MoRe Results guidelines). The contracting party is accountable to the Brussels Operations department for the quality of the products delivered and for the evaluation process.

Any methodological issues that appear during implementation and that have had an effect on the analysis and conclusions will be mentioned in the "methodology" chapter of the report. However, any element that could jeopardize the quality of the review or the principles of independence, transparency or impartiality, must be brought to the attention of the manager of the review during the review implementation process, in order to be able to pro-actively remedy to it and limit its impact on the review's quality.

BTC has an Integrity desk where issues pertaining to independence, impartiality or transparency can be filed by the contracting party. See [FR - BTC/CTB Integrity Desk](#).

6 Users concerned by the review

The review will focus on the users in order to meet their needs. The role of the various users and their interest in the review are included in annex.

7 Organisation

7.1 Management and steering of the review

Review manager

Mrs Julie Hertsens, Operations Advisor, is the manager of the review. She ensures all coordination activities and manages the whole of the "review" process. Thus, she will ensure that the planning is complied with, that the expected deliverables are submitted, that a briefing meeting is organised at contract start-up as well as a debriefing meeting before the final report is submitted. She will do the necessary for experts to have access to the documents and other relevant sources of information and he/she is the focal point when any difficulties arise during the evaluation process (see Quality management).

As a manager, the Operations Advisor:

- Is the contact person for the "lead expert" evaluator;
- Grants positive advice or negative advice to modification requests pertaining to the ToR of this review;
- Compiles the information received by the various actors about the reports elaborated by the evaluators and forwards them to the evaluation team;
- Is responsible for the quality control of the deliverables submitted.

Reference Team

The Operations Advisor will chair a reference team that is composed of the following members:

BTC Head office

- Operations Advisor: Julie Hertsens
- Environment Sector expert: Claude Croizer

BTC Field

- Resident Representative: Nebeyu Shone
- Programme Officer: Rose Kato
- Programme Officer: Daniel Lubanga

The reference team is to:

- If applicable, validate the evaluation sub-questions and the methodology proposed by the lead expert;
- Provide comments to ToR modification requests, findings, analyses, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the evaluators.

7.2 Evaluation team

The evaluation team consists of the following members:

- a lead expert
- a non-lead expert(s)

Description of the profile and responsibilities of the lead expert

The Lead expert is an environment expert (EN)

The lead expert is responsible for the proper performance of the review and for the deliverables.

Description of the profile and responsibilities of the non-lead expert(s)

The non-lead expert is also an environment expert (EN)

7.3 Period, duration, deliverables

This review process will start at the latest on 15/05/2015 and the final report will be submitted at the latest on 18/07/2015. The dates are fixed in common agreement.

Steps	Lead expert	Non-lead expert (for)	Products to be submitted	To whom	Date
Documentary analysis (domicile)	2	2			
Briefing at BTC – head office (Brussels)	0.5	NA	Review start-up report	Operations Advisor	18 th May 2015
Briefing in partner country	1	1		BTC Representation , Belgian Embassy and project team	1 st June 2015
Collection and analysis of data in the field 5 days in Kampala and 3 days to visit a beneficiary company outside of the capital city	8	8			
Feedback workshop (preparation and workshop itself)	1.5	1.5	Power Point presentation	Field actors in Kampala	
Debriefing Representation	0.5	0.5	Aide-Mémoire	BTC Representation	12 th June 2015
Drawing up of report (domicile)	5	2	Review Report – draft version	Operations Advisor	29 th June.2015
Debriefing BTC head office (Brussels)	0.5	NA	<i>Presentation Review Report draft version</i>	Operations Advisor	3 rd July 2015
Finalisation of report (domicile)	2	1	Review report – final version	Operations Advisor	18 th July 2015
Total number of days	21	16			
Brussels	1	NA			
Domicile	9	5			
Partner country	11	11			

Annex - Evaluation Field « Performance »

Part A – OECD DAC Evaluation criteria

How to use this grid?

This grid is developed to provide guidance for assessing the performance of an intervention. The 5 OECD-DAC evaluation criteria are the corner stone of the assessment. However, being open to interpretation, the understanding of the definition is clarified by:

- A narrative “interpretation” of the definition of each DAC-criterion (how MoRe Results understands the definition);
- A limited number of sub-criteria, which highlight the aspects of the DAC criterion that are considered important in reviewing interventions;
- Questions that clarify the interpretation of the sub-criteria.

The grid is to be annexed to the Review Report. The analysis and the overall grade are integrated in the main part of the Report. Guidance on how to relate to the grid in the report, is provided in the template of the report.

1. Overall assessment grade for each DAC criterion.

Evaluators need to grade each criterion and include that overall assessment grade in the main part of the Review Report. Given that scores might lead to an over-simplification of a complex reality, with complex problems related to a given context, the grades are to be seen as a synthesis of the answers, and not the vice versa : the analysis is not the justification for the grade given.

2. Analysis of the DAC-criteria.

Each criterion is analysed by the evaluator. In order to highlight the aspects of the criterion that are important to report on, a limited number of sub-criteria are provided. The sub-criteria need to be covered in the analysis of the given DAC-criteria. It is up to the evaluator to decide how he/she will do this: analysing each sub-criteria in a different sub-chapter, or giving preference to a comprehensive narrative. In the main part of the Review Report, the evaluator will NOT provide grades for the sub-criteria. If he/she wishes to do so, sub-criteria are graded in this grid, annexed to the Review Report.

The questions that are provided under each sub-criterion have an indicative meaning: they clarify the meaning of each sub-criterion.

Above all, it is the quality of the analysis that is important. Therefore, the evaluator shall not limit his/her analysis to the sub-criteria raised in the table: if important elements arise, which are not part of these, but do relate to the DAC-criteria in general, the evaluator must report on them. If these elements would have an impact on the score, the evaluator will clearly mention this in this chapter in the report.

1. RELEVANCE: The extent to which a development intervention conforms to the needs and priorities of target groups and the policies of recipient countries and donors. (OECD-DAC)				
Interpretation of the DAC-definition				
Relevance addresses the needs-question of the intervention. It analyses the intervention in relation to the problems and needs of the beneficiaries, and their priorities. Furthermore, relevance analyses the consistency of the intervention with the policies of the partner and donor country.				
Relevance appreciates as such the value and usefulness of the intervention as perceived by the key-stakeholders, the extent to which the “response” of the intervention is technically adequate to meet the needs and priorities, the extent to which the intervention is a response to a real need of the partner-country or rather an adaptation to donor preferences. For innovative interventions that challenge established interests or existing practices, relevance is also about understanding to which degree they are well grounded in effective interests and priorities and will have a potential for replication or policy-influencing, so to what extent the double anchoring approach is relevant.				
RELEVANCE overall assessment	A	B	C	D

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA¹

1.1. Response to the beneficiaries' problems, needs and priorities	A	B	C	D
<p>Is the intervention in tune with the problems, needs and priorities of beneficiaries? Is the intervention strategy an adequate answer to the needs and to the reality/living conditions of the beneficiaries?</p> <p>In case of an experimental intervention, is it well grounded in the needs of beneficiaries and in their effective interests and priorities?</p>				
1.2. Consistency with partner priorities and policies	A	B	C	D
<p>Is the intervention in tune with the priorities and development policies the partner government at all levels (national and local), including transversal themes?</p> <p>Is it consistent with an approach that promotes complementarity to relevant other actors working on the same subject?</p> <p>In case of an experimental intervention, are the results likely to be relevant for policy-influence, for changing the existing system or for replication?</p>				
1.3. Consistency with donor priorities and policies?	A	B	C	D
<p>Is the intervention in tune with the relevant policies of Belgium?</p>				

¹ Grading the sub-criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so
 BTC, Belgian Development Agency
 End-Term Review Report
 Annexes

2. EFFICIENCY: Efficiency measures the results - qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which is used to assess the extent to which aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.				
Interpretation of the DAC-definition				
Efficiency mainly looks at the transformation efficiency of the intervention: how are inputs transformed into outputs (delivery of goods and services). Efficiency looks at this ratio as compared to alternatives: with the output as a given, were there alternative approaches that would have required fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results? Could more of the same result have been produced with the same resources by using an alternative approach? Efficiency also looks at the 'on time' implementation of activities: (Inputs on time?) where activities implemented as planned (on time) and consequently, outputs delivered on time? Efficiency also looks at the delivery and quality of products and services and the partner contribution/involvement.				
EFFICIENCY overall assessment	A	B	C	D

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA²

2.1 Inputs have been managed with reasonable regard for efficiency?	A	B	C	D
With the output as a given, were there alternative approaches that would have required fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results? The intervention is managed in a cost-efficient way, optimizing the quality and quantity of outputs? The ratio input-output is good?				
2.2 How well are outputs achieved?	A	B	C	D
All outputs delivered or likely to be delivered as scheduled (implying also the on-time implementation of activities)? In case of delays, have appropriate measures been taken? On time? Are all outputs of good quality (responding to pre-defined quality criteria whenever possible)? In case of problems with quality, or the follow-up of quality, have corrective measures been taken?				
2.3 How well is the Partner contribution working?	A	B	C	D
Is the partner contributing (financial/material/HR) as planned?				
2.4 Efficiency of execution modalities?	A	B	C	D
Are the execution modalities fostering an efficient use of the means of the intervention? Are the execution modalities organized in such a way that they convert inputs into outputs in an economical way?				

² Grading the sub-criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

3. EFFECTIVENESS TO DATE: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.				
Interpretation of the DAC-definition				
Effectiveness looks at the use of outputs and the likely achievement of the intervention's outcome. The use of outputs is the 'missing middle' between the delivery of products and services (outputs) and the outcome. It not only looks at the achievement of the outcome, but also reviews the relevance of the outputs: are outputs (products and services) being used as planned? Are they contributing to the achievement of the outcome as planned in the intervention strategy (is the intervention delivering the right outputs?)? The evaluation of these aspects gives a more complete idea of the effectiveness of interventions.				
EFFECTIVENESS overall assessment	A	B	C	D

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA³

3.1 To what extent are outputs being used and do they contribute to the outcome? _	A	B	C	D
All target groups have access to the outputs available so far? All target groups are using outputs as planned? Any factors that prevent the use of outputs? The use of the available outputs is contributing to the outcome as planned				
3.2 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the outcome to be achieved?	A	B	C	D
Achievement in terms of coverage and quality? Intervention adapted its strategy to changes in the context (assumptions and risks) whenever necessary in order to attain the outcome? Negative effects mitigated? Any unplanned positive effects? Contributions of these positive effects to the results of the intervention?				

³ Grading the sub criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so.
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

4. IMPACT: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. (OECD-DAC)				
<u>Interpretation of the DAC-definition</u>				
Impact has several interpretations. A <i>Review</i> needs to address the likely contribution to the intervention's Impact level (the General objective of the logical framework). The result at impact level is – exceptions might exist - a result of the strategic framework of partner government. Impact in this sense focuses thus on whether the intervention contributes to the strategic result the partner government intends to achieve. It addresses the link between the outcome and impact level of the results framework. This is a first interpretation of impact.				
A <i>Review</i> needs to address as well a second interpretation of impact, which is the entire range of effects brought about through by the intervention that occur in the longer term. These effects can be foreseen and unforeseen, and might affect people, organisations, societies and the physical environment outside the initially intended group of people or organisations. It differs from the effectiveness criterion in the sense that impact provides a corrective to the “narrow” preoccupation with the realisation of the results as stated in the results framework, and turns to target group and other stakeholders to find out if and how the intervention has affected their situation, positively or negatively.				
Impact answers as such the question if the intervention “was worth it” – by addressing the contribution to the higher result at the impact level, as well as the significant consequences of an intervention, negative as well as positive, which aren't necessarily related to the “impact level” of the results framework.				
IMPACT overall assessment	A	B	C	D

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA⁴

A	B	C	D
4.1 What are the direct prospects of the intervention at the Impact level?			
Which changes at impact level are apparent or likely to become apparent? To what extent can the changes at impact level be identified and measured and attributed to the intervention? What do beneficiaries and other stakeholders affected by the intervention perceive as effects of the intervention on themselves? Will the intervention contribute to the partner countries objectives, as targeted in the results framework at impact level? Are any external factors likely to jeopardise the contribution to the partner results?			
A	B	C	D
4.2 Are there/will there be unintended positive or negative effects of the intervention on the intended beneficiaries or on non-intended individuals and groups			
Have there been/will there be any unplanned positive or negative effects (i.e. environmental, social, cultural, gender and economic) on the intended beneficiaries or on non-intended individuals and groups? How do these affect the intended results at output – outcome and impact level? In case of negative effects, did the intervention take timely measures for mitigating those? What was the result?			

⁴ Grading the sub criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

5. SUSTAINABILITY: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time. (OECD-DAC)				
Interpretation of the DAC-definition				
<p>In the context of the review process, sustainability is the likelihood that the results and benefits of the intervention will be maintained at appropriate level and during a reasonable time after the closure of the intervention. In the context of the reviews, it is the potential for being sustainable that is assessed, and thus the likelihood that the impact will be lasting.</p> <p>The potential for sustainability is intervention specific. As such, the assessment of the sustainability of results will be done on another basis for post-crisis development interventions, than for interventions that is in a 3rd phase of a long term approach of sector support.</p> <p>Different factors are related to sustainability, like the embedding of the intervention in the strategic framework of the partner country, partner ownership and participation in the formulation and implementation, the integration of the intervention in the institutional and cultural context, the appropriateness of technologies regarding the specificities of the partner country, the influence of environmental factors on the intervention and the impact of the intervention on the environment, the partner country's capacities to maintain the results financially, the governance of the partner institution, the appropriateness of the exit strategy. This list is not exhaustive. It is important that the evaluator analyses this criterion from a large perspective, according to the specificities of the intervention.</p>				
SUSTAINABILITY overall assessment	A	B	C	D

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA⁵

5.1 Financial / economic viability?	A	B	C	D
<p>Do partners have the financial capacity to maintain the benefits from the intervention when donor support has been withdrawn? Is there a financial/economic phase-out strategy, that if so, is likely to be implemented?</p> <p>Are beneficiaries/partner institution able to afford maintenance or replacement of the services /goods/infrastructure introduced by the intervention? Are the results/benefits affordable for the beneficiaries at the end of the intervention?</p>				
5.2 Are requirements of local ownership satisfied and will it continue after the end of the intervention?	A	B	C	D
<p>Have partner and local stakeholders been involved in the planning and implementation process? To what extent are beneficiaries involved in decision making regarding the benefits of the intervention? Is the intervention consistent with an approach that supports partner government ownership?</p> <p>What is the likelihood that beneficiaries will continue to make use of outputs and outcomes? Do the beneficiaries have plans to continue delivering the stream of benefits and if so, are they likely to materialise?</p>				

⁵ Grading the sub criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so
 BTC, Belgian Development Agency
 End-Term Review Report
 Annexes

5.3 What is the level of sustainable policy support provided?	A	B	C	D
<p>What support has been provided from the relevant national, sectoral (and eventually local) policies, as well as from budgetary policies? How far is this influencing positively or negatively the intervention? Are the current policies likely to continue after the intervention has finished? If relevant, what input is the intervention able to give at policy level? To what extent do experiences and lessons learned on the ground feed into the policy agenda? Do changes in policies and priorities affect the intervention? How well is the intervention adapting to these changes?</p>				
5.4 Is governance supporting the potential sustainability of benefits and outcomes?	A	B	C	D
<p>How well is the intervention embedded in institutional structures that are likely to survive beyond the lifespan of the intervention? Is the institutional anchorage contributing to the sustainability of the intervention? Is the mandate of the implementing organization compatible with the role that it is expected to play? Are the relevant partner institution(s) characterized by governance capacities, including effective management and organization that enable sustainability of the benefits and outcome? If a new institution had to be created, how far have good relationships with existing institutions been established? How likely is it that it will be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the end of the intervention?</p>				
5.5 To what extent are conditions met for capacity development be able to contribute to sustainable development results?	A	B	C	D
<p>Did an assessment of the capacities take place at the start of the implementation? Are partner institutions being properly supported in their development and in their task to continue to deliver the intervention's benefits and outcomes after the end of the intervention? Are other relevant stakeholders supported in their development in order to continue to deliver the intervention's benefits and outcomes after the end of the intervention? Will adequate levels of suitable and qualified HR be available to continue the intervention's benefits and outcomes after the end of the intervention's implementation phase? Is the capacity development approach of the intervention carried out in a way that prepares the partner institutions and beneficiaries to maintain the benefits and results of the intervention after the closure of the intervention? Have they properly been prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially?</p>				
5.6 Socio-cultural sustainability	A	B	C	D
<p>Is the intervention in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits? If the intervention sought to bring changes in respect with local power-structures, beliefs, status systems, how well is the intervention strategy based on an analysis of such factors, including beneficiary participation in implementation? How well is the quality of relations between the intervention team and the local communities?</p>				

Part B – Transversal themes and horizontal aspects

Transversal themes - How to use the grid?

Explain the answers to the questions relevant to the intervention. Comment on lessons learnt if any.

GENDER

1. Were practical and strategic gender interests adequately considered in the intervention strategy? And did gender receive substantial attention in the planning of the intervention?
2. Has gender been mainstreamed during the implementation? Are results being delivered in a gender-equitable manner as planned, and have adjustments been made in the case this was needed? Is data collected disaggregated by sex, and has action been taken to address inequalities and shortfalls?
3. Is capacity being built within the intervention structure and among stakeholders to ensure gender equality achievements can be maintained after the end of the intervention?
4. Is gender budget scan being effectively used?

ENVIRONMENT

1. Have environmental constraints and opportunities been considered adequately in the intervention strategy? Did environmental mainstreaming receive substantial attention in the planning of the intervention?
2. Are good environmental practices followed in the intervention? Does the intervention respect traditional, successful environmental practices?
3. Has environmental damage been caused or likely be caused by the intervention? What kind of environmental impact mitigation measures have been taken?
4. Is the achievement of the intervention's results likely to generate increased pressure on fragile ecosystems and scarce natural resources?

Horizontal aspects – How to use the grid?

Explain the answers to the questions relevant to the intervention. Comment on lessons learnt if any.

RESULTS ORIENTED STEERING

1. Is the intervention analysing its progress towards the outcome and its likely contribution to the impact level at least annually?
2. Is the intervention making use of the recommendations of backstopping missions?
3. Is the intervention using progress information to report to the steering committee and to propose decisions needed to re-orient the intervention at strategic level, in case needed?
4. Is the steering committee steering the intervention on strategic level?
5. Is the intervention implementing decisions taken by the steering committee?

MONITORING

1. Is the baseline report complete and are monitoring data collected as foreseen?
2. Is the intervention results framework of good quality? Are the results levels clear and in harmony with MoRe Results guidelines? Is the outcome achievable at the end of the intervention?
3. Is the operational monitoring tool up to date?
4. Is the intervention regularly meeting with the RR on the progress of the intervention? Is reporting upwards done following the “management by exception” principle?
5. In case needed, has the results framework been adapted after the annual results reporting exercises? If this has been the case, does the report clearly sets out why modifications were needed? And do the minutes of the steering committee confirms the decision for modification?
6. Is the results framework reflecting the intervention strategy and is it able to measure the progress towards the results, as well as the results achievement on outcome level? And the achievement of the results at output level? Is there a need to change aspects of the results framework at this stage?

Annex 2 – Key Resource Persons

Name	Organisation and function	Contact details
The Project team		
	Project Manager	
	ITA (CAMCO)	
Martha Kasozi	NTA	
John Baptist Lusala	Project officer	
Mr. Ronald Twesigye	CDM Trainer	
Jovet Tweheyo	Project Finance & Admin	
James Kakeeto Martin Ojok	CDM Project officers	
Project Steering Committee members		
Mr Godfrey Ssemakula	Deputy Director Uganda Investment Authority, member of project Steering Committee	
Mr. George Sserunjogi	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	
Nebeyu Shone	BTC Resident Representative	
	Uganda Investment Authority (UIA)	
Dr. Gerald Musoke Samula	National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development, Ministry of Agriculture	
The Ministry of Water and Environment		
	Permanent Secretary	
M. Charles Okuraja	Under-secretary	
M. Paul Isabirye	Coordinator, Climate Change Unit (CCU)	
M. Paul Mafabi	Director of Environmental Affairs	
M. Joseph Eritu	in charge of the Internship Programme at the Ministry	
Ministry of Public Service		
Mrs. Jane Mwesigwa	Commissioner	
Belgian Embassy		
	Head of Mission Attaché	
BTC Representation Office		
Ms Rose Athieno Kato	Programme Officer	
M. Daniel Lubanga	Programme Officer	
Project Beneficiaries		
Project owners that benefitted from Project's support (the list and contact details to be provided by the Project team)		
Trainees		
A selection of stakeholders that attended one or more of the workshops organised by the Project		
Any other stakeholders the Review Team may consider important to the successful achievement of this evaluation		
Other Donor agencies involved in environment questions in Uganda		
	GIZ	
	UNDP	
	Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility, (EMLI). Representative of the NGOs in Climate Action –Network –	
Belgian Federal Ministry for the Environment		
Patricia Grobben	Project technical backstopper	

Annexe 3 – List of Users

User	Role	Interest in the review	Communication and feedback mechanisms
Steering committee	Steer the intervention towards the achievement of development results (outcome) by taking strategic decisions based on sound data (<i>evidence-based decision making</i>). Collect lessons learned that can be used for policies and strategies.	Steering, learning, accountability Clear conclusions on the progress made, the results achieved and the challenges of the intervention. Clear and realistic recommendations that are based on a solid analysis of the intervention. Ensure that the measures proposed will have a positive impact on the performance of the intervention and on the contribution of the intervention to the sector results (impact level). Relevant lessons learned for the policies and strategies.	The steering committee provides input for the Terms of Reference, accepts or rejects each of the recommendations and gives its final approval for the implementation of the actions proposed for each of the recommendations addressed to the intervention that was withheld. Committee members are invited to the briefing and debriefing that will take place in the field and they will provide comments about the aide-mémoire and the draft version of the report.
Intervention team	Responsible for the implementation. Take operational decisions and implement the strategic decisions taken by the steering committee. Be accountable for progress made and for the results achieved (accountability to BTC's head office).	Steering, learning, accountability Clear and realistic recommendations that can be made operational. Relevant lessons learned to support the sector strategies.	<i>Idem Steering committee</i>
BTC head office and Representation	Responsible for the follow-up of implementation (RR), support to implementation. The head office is accountable to the donor for the implementation and the results achieved.	Steering, learning, accountability Clear conclusions about performance. Clear and realistic recommendations that can be made operational. Relevant lessons learned for the next ICP or upcoming formulations of interventions. Identify additional support measures.	The BTC head office organises the elaboration of the ToR (OPS) and ensures that the various internal and external stakeholders provide input. The Representation organises the briefing and debriefing in the field, participates to it and gives comments on the aide-mémoire and the draft version of the report.
Donor	Follow up the implementation of the indicative cooperation programme (ICP) and its contribution to the partner's national strategies, ensure the policy dialogue, prepare a new ICP.	Accountability, steering, learning Conclusions and lessons learned can influence the content of the policy dialogue as well as the elaboration of a new ICP. Conclusions can help following up the potential contribution of the intervention to the results of the partner's sector strategy.	The Attaché and the head office of DGD receive the final versions of the review report.
Beneficiaries	Follow the changes made/supported by the intervention.	Accountability Information about the results achieved.	The summary of the report will be used for communication with the beneficiaries.

Annex 4 – List of the intervention's key documents supplied

Annex 5 – List of models to be used and of reference documents pertaining to the normative framework

- Review Report Template
- Guide MoRe Results

2 End-Term Review Team Members

The End-Term Review Team Members were:

- Dr Richard Pagett (International Lead Expert)
- Mrs Rebecca Nanjala (National Non-Lead Expert)

3 Methodology of the End-Term Review

The methodology consisted of two aspects; **examining documentation**, primarily related to the Project itself though also of other institutions, and **interviewing** as many available key stakeholders as possible. Considerable effort was expended in pursuing several lines of enquiry simultaneously in order to triangulate the responses.

The *Terms of Reference* (ToR) for the ETR called for assessing the intervention with two perspectives; a generic evaluation of performance and a more specific evaluation on the training aspects.

The generic evaluation grid is used for every review of the bilateral development cooperation, hence its generic nature. The generic approach allows easier exploitation of the information generated and should ensure an efficient follow-up of the performance of all interventions (see Annex 4).

The MTR had identified certain criteria as being problematic (e.g. *Efficiency, Sustainability and Impact*) and these have been subjected to a little more in-depth analysis during this ETR.

Regarding the question of sustainability, it is important that the ETR considers this from two perspectives; was it sufficiently addressed during the *Formulation* as well as during the Project execution.

Regarding the specific evaluation, the hands-on training was considered to be critical in the approach adopted by the Project to reach its objective.

Key questions to be considered include (see ToR):

- *To what extent was this hands-on training approach better than (or not as good as) any other approach in achieving the overall objective of the Project;*
- *What are the lessons that could be learned from this hands-on approach for other capacity-building projects to be implemented by GoU and/or BTC;*
- *Was the implementation modality of this project –technically implemented by CCU and a private consultancy company though financially managed by BTC under its own-management modality (regie) better than the more traditional BTC modality of co-management ~ what are the advantages and disadvantages of such a modality and are there gains to be obtained and thus should be replicated?; and*
- *Probably the most contentious question of all, was the choice to continue the intervention after the evident crash of the carbon market relevant (with hindsight) in view of the considering the required outcome (specific objective) of the intervention?*

4 Generic Evaluation Part A and Part B

Part A – OECD DAC Evaluation criteria

How to use this grid?

This grid is developed to provide guidance for assessing the performance of an intervention. The 5 OECD-DAC evaluation criteria are the corner stone of the assessment. However, being open to interpretation, the understanding of the definition is clarified by:

- A narrative “interpretation” of the definition of each DAC-criterion (how MoRe Results understands the definition);
- A limited number of sub-criteria, which highlight the aspects of the DAC criterion that are considered important in reviewing interventions;
- Questions that clarify the interpretation of the sub-criteria.

The grid is to be annexed to the Review Report. The analysis and the overall grade are integrated in the main part of the Report. Guidance on how to relate to the grid in the report, is provided in the template of the report.

1. Overall assessment grade for each DAC criterion.

Evaluators need to grade each criterion and include that overall assessment grade in the main part of the Review Report. Given that scores might lead to an over-simplification of a complex reality, with complex problems related to a given context, the grades are to be seen as a synthesis of the answers, and not the vice versa : the analysis is not the justification for the grade given.

2. Analysis of the DAC-criteria.

Each criterion is analysed by the evaluator. In order to highlight the aspects of the criterion that are important to report on, a limited number of sub-criteria are provided. The sub-criteria need to be covered in the analysis of the given DAC-criteria. It is up to the evaluator to decide how he/she will do this: analysing each sub-criteria in a different sub-chapter, or giving preference to a comprehensive narrative. In the main part of the Review Report, the evaluator will NOT provide grades for the sub-criteria. If he/she wishes to do so, sub-criteria are graded in this grid, annexed to the Review Report.

The questions that are provided under each sub-criterion have an indicative meaning: they clarify the meaning of each sub-criterion.

Above all, it is the quality of the analysis that is important. Therefore, the evaluator shall not limit his/her analysis to the sub-criteria raised in the table: if important elements arise, which are not part of these, but do relate to the DAC-criteria in general, the evaluator must report on them. If these elements would have an impact on the score, the evaluator will clearly mention this in this chapter in the report.

1. RELEVANCE: The extent to which a development intervention conforms to the needs and priorities of target groups and the policies of recipient countries and donors. (OECD-DAC)

Interpretation of the DAC-definition

Relevance addresses the needs-question of the intervention. It analyses the intervention in relation to the problems and needs of the beneficiaries, and their priorities. Furthermore, relevance analyses the consistency of the intervention with the policies of the partner and donor country.

Relevance appreciates as such the value and usefulness of the intervention as perceived by the key-stakeholders, the extent to which the “response” of the intervention is technically adequate to meet the needs and priorities, the extent to which the intervention is a response to a real need of the partner-country or rather an adaptation to donor preferences. For innovative interventions that challenge established interests or existing practices, relevance is also about understanding to which degree they are well grounded in effective interests and priorities and will have a potential for replication or policy-influencing, so to what extent the double anchoring approach is relevant.

RELEVANCE overall assessment	A	B	C	D
	✓			

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA⁶

1.1. Response to the beneficiaries' problems, needs and priorities	A	B	C	D
	✓			
<i>The CDM capacity-building project addresses Uganda's need to benefit from the UNFCCC Clean Development Mechanism as well as the larger climate change financing opportunities.</i>				
1.2. Consistency with partner priorities and policies	A	B	C	D
	✓			
<i>The CDM capacity-building intervention is in line with National Development objectives of Uganda and the National Climate Change Policy</i>				
1.3. Consistency with donor priorities and policies?	A	B	C	D
	✓			
<p><i>The Belgium Government, as part of the international community under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), is committed within the framework of “...common but differentiated” responsibilities where all countries are concerned and must unite their efforts to save the climate, though on a pro rata basis of their historical responsibility and their potential.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of mitigation, developed countries are required to take any tangible initiatives to promote, facilitate and finance access to or the transfer of clean technologies and know-how to developing countries</i></p>				

⁶ Grading the sub-criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so.
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

2. EFFICIENCY: Efficiency measures the results - qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which is used to assess the extent to which aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

Interpretation of the DAC-definition

Efficiency mainly looks at the transformation efficiency of the intervention: how are inputs transformed into outputs (delivery of goods and services). Efficiency looks at this ratio as compared to alternatives: with the output as a given, where there alternative approaches that would have required fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results? Could more of the same result have been produced with the same resources by using an alternative approach? Efficiency also looks at the 'on time' implementation of activities: (Inputs on time?) where activities implemented as planned (on time) and consequently, outputs delivered on time? Efficiency also looks at the delivery and quality of products and services and the partner contribution/involvement.

EFFICIENCY overall assessment	A	B	C	D
			✓	

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA⁷

2.1 Inputs have been managed with reasonable regard for efficiency?	A	B	C	D
			✓	
The inputs have not been managed efficiently with key personnel (ITA and support ITA) leaving the Project, due to difficulties in execution, although were replaced fairly quickly				
2.2 How well are outputs achieved?	A	B	C	D
			✓	
<i>There have been substantial delays in the execution of the Project activities that have led to a no-cost Project extension for one year. The Project that was officially to end on 23 November 2014 will end 23 November 2015. The outputs have been largely achieved, though the web site still requires updating.</i>				
2.3 How well is the Partner contribution working?	A	B	C	D
		✓		
<i>After the MTR, CCD began implementing the Project proactively together with CAMCO and BTC. Previous lack of clear roles and responsibilities among the implementing partners had led to some institution inertia leaving CCD feeling they had no control over the Project.</i>				
2.4 Efficiency of execution modalities?	A	B	C	D
				✓
<i>The modalities of implementation of this Project (technically implemented by CCD and CAMCO and financially managed by BTC under the own-management modality) are rather specific compared to the traditional BTC modality of co-management (cogestion). However, there were some flaws in the overall approach adopted, particularly regarding the roles and responsibilities which meant that the execution modality did not foster an efficient conversion of inputs into outputs.</i>				

⁷ Grading the sub-criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so.
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

3. EFFECTIVENESS TO DATE: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.				
<u>Interpretation of the DAC-definition</u>				
Effectiveness looks at the use of outputs and the likely achievement of the intervention's outcome. The use of outputs is the 'missing middle' between the delivery of products and services (outputs) and the outcome. It not only looks at the achievement of the outcome, but also reviews the relevance of the outputs: are outputs (products and services) being used as planned? Are they contributing to the achievement of the outcome as planned in the intervention strategy (is the intervention delivering the right outputs?)? The evaluation of these aspects gives a more complete idea of the effectiveness of interventions.				
EFFECTIVENESS overall assessment	A	B	C	D
		✓		

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA⁸

3.1 To what extent are outputs being used and do they contribute to the outcome?	A	B	C	D
		✓		
<i>After the MTR, the Project was back on track and began to deliver the required outputs, leading to overall outcomes.</i>				
3.2 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the outcome to be achieved?	A	B	C	D
		✓		
<i>With the institution of the JTF, the Project has progressed substantially towards its outcome, realising more outputs in a limited time frame and likely to lead to the required outcomes. Though sustainability is insecure.</i>				

⁸ Grading the sub-criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so.
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

5. IMPACT: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. (OECD-DAC)

Interpretation of the DAC-definition

Impact has several interpretations. A *Review* needs to address the likely contribution to the intervention’s Impact level (the General objective of the logical framework). The result at impact level is – exceptions might exist - a result of the strategic framework of partner government. Impact in this sense focuses thus on whether the intervention contributes to the strategic result the partner government intends to achieve. It addresses the link between the outcome and impact level of the results framework. This is a first interpretation of impact.

A *Review* needs to address as well a second interpretation of impact, which is the entire range of effects brought about through by the intervention that occur in the longer term. These effects can be foreseen and unforeseen, and might affect people, organisations, societies and the physical environment outside the initially intended group of people or organisations. It differs from the effectiveness criterion in the sense that impact provides a corrective to the “narrow” preoccupation with the realisation of the results as stated in the results framework, and turns to target group and other stakeholders to find out if and how the intervention has affected their situation, positively or negatively.

Impact answers as such the question if the intervention “was worth it” – by addressing the contribution to the higher result at the impact level, as well as the significant consequences of an intervention, negative as well as positive, which aren’t necessarily related to the “impact level” of the results framework.

IMPACT overall assessment	A	B	C	D
			✓	

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA⁹

4.1 What are the direct prospects of the intervention at the Impact level?	A	B	C	D
			✓	

There are clear gains in capacity building for CDM trainees and project developers. Assuming that CDM mechanism will be included in future protocols under the UNFCCC, this capacity could help Uganda see more CDM projects being developed, registered and CERs issued. However, the original intention was to develop consultants who would be able to go into the marketplace to assist future project developers. This has little prospect of happening.

4.2 Are there/will there be unintended positive or negative effects of the intervention on the intended beneficiaries or on non-intended individuals and groups	A	B	C	D
			✓	

Although the carbon market has almost crashed, with prices going below EUR 1, the CDM capacity building remains relevant as it provides the necessary skills to address any carbon offset scheme which is likely to be based on similar Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) principles. Currently, there is little evidence of market recovery.

⁹ Grading the sub-criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so.
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

5. SUSTAINABILITY: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time. (OECD-DAC)				
Interpretation of the DAC-definition				
<p>In the context of the review process, sustainability is the likelihood that the results and benefits of the intervention will be maintained at appropriate level and during a reasonable time after the closure of the intervention. In the context of the reviews, it is the potential for being sustainable that is assessed, and thus the likelihood that the impact will be lasting.</p> <p>The potential for sustainability is intervention specific. As such, the assessment of the sustainability of results will be done on another basis for post-crisis development interventions, than for interventions that is in a 3rd phase of a long term approach of sector support.</p> <p>Different factors are related to sustainability, like the embedding of the intervention in the strategic framework of the partner country, partner ownership and participation in the formulation and implementation, the integration of the intervention in the institutional and cultural context, the appropriateness of technologies regarding the specificities of the partner country, the influence of environmental factors on the intervention and the impact of the intervention on the environment, the partner country's capacities to maintain the results financially, the governance of the partner institution, the appropriateness of the exit strategy. This list is not exhaustive. It is important that the evaluator analyses this criterion from a large perspective, according to the specificities of the intervention.</p>				
SUSTAINABILITY overall assessment	A	B	C	D
			✓	

ANALYSIS SUB-CRITERIA¹⁰

5.2 Financial / economic viability?	A	B	C	D
			✓	
<p><i>The uncertainty surrounding the carbon market; continued erosion of the CER prices, whether the CDM mechanism will be included in future UNFCCC protocols together with lengthy and very costly CDM procedures threaten the sustainability of the intervention. In addition, the trainees are not operating as "CDM consultants" either they are in other donor projects, other non-consulting professions or are working for CCD. In theory, the knowledge acquired under the Project, could continue to benefit CCD, assuming some of the trainees are retained by CCD.</i></p>				
5.2 Are requirements of local ownership satisfied and will it continue after the end of the intervention?	A	B	C	D
			✓	
<p><i>Key stakeholder (CCD) involvement and participation in the planning and implementation process was critically limited prior to the MTR with participation only limited at PSC level. However, with the institution of the Joint Task Force (BTC Uganda, CCD and Project Team) CCD involvement and participation increased and Project saw real progress in terms realisation of results and potential longer term capacity-building benefits to CCD.</i></p>				

¹⁰ Grading the sub-criteria is not compulsory. It is up to the evaluator to decide to do so.
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report
Annexes

5.3 What is the level of sustainable policy support provided?	A	B	C	D
	✓			
<p><i>In terms of enabling environment, the intervention is well embedded in the strategic framework of Uganda including the National Development Plan (2010/11-2014/15), the Uganda Vision 2040 and the National Climate Change Policy</i></p>				
5.4 Is governance supporting the potential sustainability of benefits and outcomes?	A	B	C	D
		✓		
<p><i>The intervention is implemented by the Climate Change Department of the MWE which is the Designated National Authority. The intervention therefore satisfies the requirements of the local ownership in relation to the Kyoto Protocol.</i></p> <p><i>The Climate Change Unit Of the MWE has been upgraded to a department-CCD. It is expected that this will raise the institutional profile of the climate change sub-sector. It is hoped that the ministry will institute strong coordination mechanism and see improvement in harmonisation of donors and their activities.</i></p>				
5.5 To what extent are conditions met for capacity development be able to contribute to sustainable development results?	A	B	C	D
			✓	
<p><i>Although the selection process of the trainees and CDM Hub Associates (CDM project developers) was transparent, the training was not based on an explicit capacity needs assessment and it lacked a structured programme that trainees and other beneficiaries could refer back to after the end of the Project. There is also the question of the trainees not being the CDM consultants as originally envisaged. Also there is no formal or official recognition of the training to give confidence and authority of the training in the labour market.</i></p>				
5.6 Socio-cultural sustainability	A	B	C	D
		✓		
<p><i>The intervention was aligned originally with local perception of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits. This was increasingly questioned though as the carbon market crashed. Initially, the beneficiary participation was lacking. After the MTR, this relationship improved when parties began to cooperate within the Joint Task Force.</i></p>				

Part B – Transversal themes and horizontal aspects

Transversal themes - How to use the grid?

Explain the answers to the questions relevant to the intervention. Comment on lessons learnt if any.

GENDER

1. Were practical and strategic gender interests adequately considered in the intervention strategy? And did gender receive substantial attention in the planning of the intervention?

Apart from the mention of the National Gender Strategy and National Action Plan for Women, neither the Formulation nor the Technical and Financial File (TFF) adequately analyse the gender dimension of the Project so that that could be taken into consideration in the logframe.

2. Has gender been mainstreamed during the implementation? Are results being delivered in a gender-equitable manner as planned, and have adjustments been made in the case this was needed? Is data collected disaggregated by sex, and has action been taken to address inequalities and shortfalls?

Project results are not reported on in a gender-focused manner possibly because the logframe did not explicitly set gender disaggregated targets and indicators.

3. Is capacity being built within the intervention structure and among stakeholders to ensure gender equality achievements can be maintained after the end of the intervention?

The criteria for recruitment of CDM trainees did not give special attention to gender consideration. The advertised criteria include: Ugandan nationality, University qualification, English-speaking, Computer skills, good communication skills, be interested in climate change and reducing emissions, and an interest in sustainability.

4. Is gender budget scan being effectively used?

From the design of the Project, this is not considered applicable.

ENVIRONMENT

5. Have environmental constraints and opportunities been considered adequately in the intervention strategy? Did environmental mainstreaming receive substantial attention in the planning of the intervention?

The CDM capacity building Project in itself contributes to environmental sustainability through reduction of emissions (this is potentially significant given the scope of the Project). In the short term, the Project could have some negative effects, though not significant, such as an increase in emissions due to the flights for the various Project personnel and backstopping activities; and excess paper usage

6. Are good environmental practices followed in the intervention? Does the intervention respect traditional, successful environmental practices?

Through support of projects to meet CDM requirements, the Project contributes to sustainable environment management. Examples include pollution control from waste water, solid waste from landfills and inefficient cook stoves. In addition, the Project financed the installation of the solar PV on the roof of the new CCD building.

7. Has environmental damage been caused or likely be caused by the intervention? What kind of environmental impact mitigation measures have been taken?

As indicated above, to a very minimal extent the Project could contribute to emissions due to flights for various Project personnel and backstopping, and excess paper usage

8. Is the achievement of the intervention's results likely to generate increased pressure on fragile ecosystems and scarce natural resources?

No

Horizontal aspects – How to use the grid?

Explain the answers to the questions relevant to the intervention. Comment on lessons learnt if any.

RESULTS ORIENTED STEERING

1. Is the intervention analysing its progress towards the outcome and its likely contribution to the impact level at least annually?

The Formulation, the TFF and Specifications were all silent on the management practice of result-oriented steering (ROS). The general intention of ROS is to assist interventions and the relevant “steering committees” to focus “...their dialogue on results and take timely “evidence-based” decisions in order to re-orient interventions....” It was not until the institution of the JTF, as recommended by the MTR, that the Project started to undertake quarterly progress reviews through a special JTF meeting to ensure that quarterly execution reports reflect verified progress based on the detailed work plan and clearly this approach has yielded substantial results in form of progress towards the outcome.

2. Is the intervention making use of the recommendations of backstopping missions?

Both the MTR and the backstopping missions noted the lack of result-oriented management by the Project team reflected by poor follow-up to recommendations and delayed decision making for addressing challenges and issues. Project actions identified by the backstopping were frequently ignored by the Project.

3. Is the intervention using progress information to report to the steering committee and to propose decisions needed to re-orient the intervention at strategic level, in case needed?

The Project team reports to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) after every six months. The time lapse between each PSC meeting is too long to make corrective decisions in case of any need to re-orient interventions at the strategic level.

4. Is the steering committee steering the intervention on strategic level?

The Project saw laxity in decision making at PSC level to address challenges (such as the high rate of labour turnover among the Project). Even when the PSC resolved that CDM training accreditation be followed up, the Project team did not follow it up. It is not surprising that the MTR recommended to the PSC to meet as soon as possible (after the MTR) and approve the updated work plan (based on the MTR) and to monitor project progress more closely, particularly the quarterly progress milestones.

5. Is the intervention implementing decisions taken by the steering committee?

In a general sense, the Project does not deliberately ignore PSC decisions, though the accreditation interest could have been followed up more diligently. The PSC simply meets too infrequently to have a profound effect on the Project.

MONITORING

7. Is the baseline report complete and are monitoring data collected as foreseen?

It is clear in the TFF that the baseline was not complete for most of the result areas on which to base the targets set. Actually the TFF indicated "...it is at this stage too difficult to set up a specific target number of registered projects or number of issued CERs to be used as an indicator of success for the project.." This should have called for an inception phase of the Project at which stage project baseline would be established and targets modified in line with the baseline. This was not done.

8. Is the intervention results framework of good quality? Are the results levels clear and in harmony with MoRe Results guidelines? Is the outcome achievable at the end of the intervention?

The MTR recommended revision of the results framework to address the existing key weaknesses; lack of adequate indicators and milestones to measure progress, and a better vertical logic between results and specific objective; and ensure that it is used for reporting overall progress at results level. The results framework was revised, however, the reporting was still problematic with too many reporting templates sometimes giving different information and difficult to synthesise.

9. Is the operational monitoring tool up to date?

The Project monitoring tool had no traction within the Project despite considerable guidance by BTC. Many of the classic project management errors could have been avoided very early on in the Project by recognising, through monitoring, that there was poor implementation between the nominally cooperating parties (CCD, BTC Uganda and the Project delivery team).

10. Is the intervention regularly meeting with the RR on the progress of the intervention? Is reporting upwards done following the "management by exception" principle?

Assuming "RR" means the Resident Representative, the Project would meet at the Resident Representative at the PSC meetings and at times when Project delays and institutional inertia warranted this higher level contact. Ordinarily, the Resident Representative would delegate Project responsibilities variously to the BTC Programme Officer, the Assistant Programme Officer or the Project Administrator who would all be familiar with the Project status on at least a weekly basis.

11. In case needed, has the results framework been adapted after the annual results reporting exercises? If this has been the case, does the report clearly sets out why modifications were needed? And do the minutes of the steering committee confirms the decision for modification?

The results framework was updated on the recommendation of the MTR and presented to the PSC for approval. This included work plans and resources required.

12. Is the results framework reflecting the intervention strategy and is it able to measure the progress towards the results, as well as the results achievement on outcome level? And the achievement of the results at output level? Is there a need to change aspects of the results framework at this stage?

Given this is an End-Term Review it is too late to change aspects of the results framework

5 Checklist ‘Lessons Learned’

FOR THE INTERVENTION	
Multiple Contract Documents	Advisable to have a single bridging document that ties all other documents together with unequivocal definitions and commitments of all parties
Unique concepts such as a “ <i>de facto</i> CDM School” or a “ <i>CDM Hub Associates</i> ”	Advisable to ensure that concepts are thoroughly thought through prior to implementation
Ensure clear aspirations are adhered to (e.g. CDM Consultants)	It is advisable to ensure that requirements are not changed through oversight
Build in sustainability	... into the Project design
FOR A FUTURE INTERVENTION IN THE SAME SECTOR	
It is understood that there is to be no further intervention of this nature	
FOR THE PARTNER INSTITUTION	
Climate Change Department	Needs to be a willing partner
Deficits within Department	...were not adequately appreciated by the Project early on and remedied
Web site	Keeping the web site up to date was not done despite several CCD staff being trained to be able to do this Department has to learn to deliver its part and take responsibility
FOR THE PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE	
Responsible for steering the Project	...needs to take ownership of its own commitments and deliver Should think critically about institutional inertia and be intolerant to unnecessary time-wasting A committee that meets every six months cannot steer anything
FOR THE BTC REPRESENTATION	
Legacy issues between it and CCD were reflected in day-to-day matters such as lack of cooperation, institutional delays	...should have recognised this and communicated to those able to correct the problem. Project was beginning with a sub-optimum Project Team
Many warning signs of a Project under-performing	...requires training in project management ... lack of a Project <i>Exit Strategy</i>
FOR BTC BRUSSELS	
Clear from the backstopping mission reports that all was not well with the Project	...implementation was already moving away from the formulated Project design
	...lack of cooperation and this was leading to challenges in making decisions and significant progress by the time of the MTR
...many warning signs of a Project under-performing	BTC Brussels either thought it was not their responsibility to effect change, or did not know how. ...lack of a Project <i>Exit Strategy</i>
FOR THE DONOR	
...months of delay in having the project approved	...should have given this ownership issue more reflection before pushing for, or demanding, approval.

6 Logical Framework

Modified Logframe as proposed by MTR

Intervention logic	Indicators	Source of verification	Assumptions
Overall objective; To enable Uganda to benefit from the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol			
Specific Objective To strengthen technical capacity on CDM project formulation and create awareness of investment opportunities under the CDM among governmental institutions, project developers, including financing institutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 6 additional Ugandan CDM projects appear on www.unfccc.int as registered CDM projects at end of project 2. CCU promotion capacity as illustrated on website 3. At least 5 National CDM consultants registered on CCU website and/or engaged in relevant professional activities at end of project 	www.unfccc.int Final Report	<p>Registration regime for CDM projects at CDM EB is in place also after 2012</p> <p>Alternate sources of carbon finance available to Uganda project developers</p>
Result 1 The capacity of the main stakeholders on CDM in Uganda to manage opportunities, project cycle and finance strengthened	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CCU able to provide adequate information on CDM opportunities, eligibility criteria and processes; provide adequate instruments such as grid emission factor; issue letters of approval; and other required functions. 2. UIA able to provide adequate information and linkages to potential investors on carbon market opportunities. 3. Other relevant institutional staff able to promote CDM in Uganda 4. At least 5 Ugandan experts adequately trained in CDM project cycle and ERPA negotiations through theoretical training, key involvement in support to selected CDM projects (result 3) and institutional exposure, with proper accreditation by end of programme in August 2014. 5. At least 8 staff of project proponent institutions and private companies adequately trained in CDM project cycle and ERPA negotiations by end of training programme in August 2014. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Project Progress report · Workshop and training courses evaluation reports · Meeting minutes · Interviews 	GoU and development partners address the needs for institutional strengthening of CCU in a coordinated way Institutional stakeholders maintain participation in training programme, and provide key persons
Result 2. Improved availability of key national information and tools for CDM development in Uganda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Website of CCU operational, with adequate maintenance and stable or increasing number of visits 2. Key information uploaded including such as screening report of potential projects in Uganda , LoA/LON eligibility criteria uploaded on website , Updated Grid Emission Factor for Uganda national energy grid uploaded on website, Procedures on LoA/LoN [sic] application uploaded, Standardized baselines etc 3. Website actively used by CCU to link stakeholders and to promote CDM and other carbon finance alternatives 	Website established including	MWE/CCU commit resources to maintenance and continued improvement of website

Intervention Logic	Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Result 3. New proposals supported for registration by the EB CDM and instruments developed to facilitate the process</p>	<p>1. At least 8 potential CDM projects in Uganda supported by the project, involving consultants of the "CDM school", to develop relevant stages of CDM applications all the way to registration and ERPA negotiation stages: at least 2 feasibility studies, 1 to 2 methodologies, 2 to 4 PDD, 5 to 6 projects validated, 4 projects supported for monitoring, including 1 POA (NEMA), 5 projects to be supported in negotiating ERPAs.</p> <p>2. National grid emission factor updated by Q3 2013</p> <p>3. Standardized baselines developed for 3 sub sectors by end 2014</p> <p>4. Proposals for funding mechanism to support CDM project cycle in Uganda developed and validated considering also other climate finance mechanisms that are currently designed and discussed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Project Progress reports · Evaluation reports · Minutes of meetings · PINs submitted for issuing of LoN · LON issued by DNA · PDDs submitted for LOA · LOA issued by DNA · PDD submitted for validation · Validation reports 	<p>Projects proponents maintain commitment to access CDM and alternate carbon finance schemes through adequate information and motivation</p>
<p>1.1. Support capacity building on all stages of the CDM project cycle in the CCU, UIA, financial institutions and at project proponents and Ugandan CDM consultants through contracting of business oriented, managerial/financial ITA.</p> <p>1.2. Support program management and all stages of CDM project development through own and ST inputs as well as managing other consultancy services provided by project (includes screening report)</p> <p>1.3. Create de facto CDM "School" through cap. dev. of Ugandan experts to be involved in drafting of PINs and PDDs and participating in ERPA negotiations and a potential for expanding activities to other EA countries as potential market.</p> <p>1.4. Include monitoring capacity development for existing and new CDM projects in Uganda to increase CER value and enhance subsidy basis for developed experts over beyond PDD writing and create confidence among buyers that monitoring will be according to requirements.</p>			
<p>2.1. Establish Website on the Designated National Authority as a sub page of the website of the Ministry of Water and Environment with state-of-the-art front page and links.</p> <p>2.2. Describe and upload information on national institutional setup, procedures and eligibility criteria for issuing of Letters of No Objection and Letters of Approval to inform buyers and project developers</p> <p>2.3. Uploading 2.nd National Communication of Uganda to the UNFCCC on emissions of greenhouse gases to supplement the present communication which is based on figures from 1993/96 when it is available from the ongoing UNEP-GEF project on this issue.</p> <p>2.4. Uploading of screening report on CDM potential in Uganda</p> <p>2.5. Uploading of latest Grid Emission Factor for the Ugandan National Power Grid</p> <p>2.6. Support participation by project staff, CCU staff and IUA [sic] staff in Carbon expo and/or other international carbon market exhibitions/conferences with a national stand for Uganda.</p>			
<p>3.1. Update existing national grid emissions factor for the Ugandan national grid</p> <p>3.2. Establish funding mechanism for CDM project support (capacity issues, all stages of transaction + other capacity)</p> <p>3.3. Funding of all steps of CDM project development (PIN, PDD; validation; support to ERPA negotiations and monitoring).</p> <p>3.4. Relevant financial institutions trained in understanding how they can contribute to making a potential CDM project bankable.</p>			

7 Mission Itinerary

June		
27	Saturday	International Expert arrives
28	Sunday	
29	Monday	Review Team Meeting, Embassy of Belgium, BTC Briefing, Project Team
30	Tuesday	Meetings: Former CCD (Project) Coordinator, UNFCCC RCC, UNDP
July		
1	Wednesday	Meetings: Embassy of Belgium, UNDP-CCD, Project Officers (ex-trainees)
2	Thursday	Meetings: PSC members, ex trainee (USAID project)
3	Friday	Meetings: NEMA, GIZ, Nutrimix Feeds Limited
4	Saturday	
5	Sunday	
6	Monday	Meetings: CCD, MWE, CCD, Project, CCD, Trainees, UIA
7	Tuesday	Meetings: MWE (Internship), Jinja Municipal/NEMA Composting Site, CAMCO
8	Wednesday	Meetings: UpEnergy Limited, UIA, Ugandan Carbon Bureau, Nat. CDM Specialist
9	Thursday	Preparation for BTC pre-PSC briefing, PSC briefing and Feedback Workshop
10	Friday	Preparation presentation, BTC pre-PSC briefing, CCD, PSC cancelled
11	Saturday	
12	Sunday	
13	Monday	Feedback Workshop, De-Briefing with BTC, PSC not required
14	Tuesday	International Expert departs

8 List of Stakeholders Engaged

NAME	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE
	Belgium			
Julie Hertsens	Belgian Technical Cooperation (BTC)	Operations Adviser	julie.hertsens@btcctb.org	
Claude Crozier	BTC	Environmental Adviser	claudio.crozier@btcctb.org	
Patricia Grobben	Ministry of Environment	Climate Change Unit	patricia.grobben@milieu.belgie.be	
Sam Vanuytsel	Embassy of the Kingdom of Belgium	Attaché International Cooperation	samjozef@diplomel.fed.be	
Nebeyu Shone	BTC Uganda	Resident Representative	nebeyu.shone@btcctb.org	+256 772 700 740
Rose Athieno	BTC Uganda	Senior Programme Officer	rose.kato@btcctb.org	+256 772 487 624
Daniel Lubanga	BTC Uganda	Programme Officer (Appointed Project Contact)	daniel.lubanga@btcctb.org	+256 414 230 543
	Government of Uganda			
David Obong	Ministry of Water and Environment	Permanent Secretary	ps@mwe.go.ug	+256 772 702 416
Paul Mafabi	MWE, Environmental Affairs	Director	paul.mafabi@mwe.go.ug	+256 772 503 255
Paul Isabirye	Ministry of Water and Environment	Climate Change Department (former head)		+256 7725 920 32
Gerald Sawula	National Environmental Management Agency	Deputy Executive Director	gsawula@nemaug.org	+256 772 574 326
Stephen Muwya	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	UNCCD National Focal Point	smuwya@yahoo.com	
Christopher Mwa	Ministry of Works and Transport	Engineer Civil Construction	krissoywa@yahoo.co.uk	
Denis Muggaga	Ministry of Finance, Planning, Economic Development	Economist	denis.muggaga@finance.go.ug	
Chebet Maikut	Climate Change Department	Head/ UNFCCC National Focal Point	chmaikut@gmail.com	+256 752 609 414
Henry Bbosa	Climate Change Department	Mitigation Officer		
Godfrey Ssemakula	UIA	Deputy Director	semakula@ugandainvest.go.ug	+256 712 583 729
Joseph Eritu	MWE	Head Internship	josepheritu@gmail.com	
Dan Kibuuka	NEMA	PM, Municipal Solid Waste Composting Programme (MSWCP)	dkiuuka@nemaug.org	+256 775 074 849
Richard Mukasa	NEMA	Env. Assess. & Monitor. Officer, MSWCP	rmugambwa@nemaug.org	+256 773 770 164
Morris	NEMA	Intern		
Benjamin	NEMA	Intern		
	Project Team and Trainees			
Stephen Mutimba	Camco	Managing Director, Kenya	stephen.mutimba@camcocleanenergy.com	+254 722 721 680
Martha Ntabadde Kasozi	Project (based in CCD)	National Technical Advisor	martha.kasozi@ccu.go.ug	
James Kakeeto	BTC trainee in CCD	CDM Project Officer	james.kakeeto@ccu.go.ug	+2567 52 612 249
Martin Ojok	BTC trainee in CCD	CDM Project Officer	martin.ojok@ccu.go.ug	+256 782 172 695
Sheila Kiconco	BTC trainee (did not complete training)	USAID Project as Climate Change Officer	sbkiconco@gmail.com	
Irene Kyekwoti	CCD	Officer for GHG Inventory	kyekwotiirene@gmail.com	
Arthur SSebuggaa Kimeze	UIA	CDM Technical Advisor	askimeze@ugandainvest.go.ug	+256 772 407 233
Ronald Twesigye	Camco	National CDM Specialist	ironnie@gmail.com	+256 756 880 140

NAME	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE
Project Developers				
Gimoro Laker-Ojok	NutriMix Feeds Limited	CEO and Managing Director	nutrimixltd@gmail.com	+256 712 564 477
Rita Laker-Ojok	NutriMix Feeds Limited	Director of Finance and Administration	rlakerojok@gmail.com	+256 753 550 958
Izaare George	Jinja Municipality	Deputy Mayor		
Jofram Waidhuuba	Jinja Municipality	Town Clerk		
Ernest Nabihamba	Jinja Municipality	Environmental Officer	enabi65@gmail.com	
Andrew Mukasa	Jinja Municipality	Site Manager, Composting Site		
Mark Mutaahi	UpEnergy Limited	Country Director	mark@upenergygroup.com	+256 774 395 639
Bill Farmer	Uganda Carbon Bureau	Chairman	billfarmer@ugandacarbon.org	+256 752 644 611
Development Partners				
Timothy Cowman	UNFCCC Reg. Collaboration Centre	Acting Team Lead	tcowman@unfccc.int	+256 752 138 606
Ritah Rukundo	UNFCCC Reg. Collaboration Centre	Research Associate	rrukundo@unfccc.int	+256 417 112 900
Onesimus Muhwezi	UN Development Programme	Team Leader, Energy and Environment	onesimus.muhwezi@undp.org	+256 414 233 440
Martha Bbosa	UNDP	PM, Low Emission Capacity Building Project	martha.bbosa@undp.org	+256 772 289 159
Gloria Namande	DeutscheGesellschaft für InternationaleZusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Technical Officer, CDM and Climate Change Mitigation	gloria.namande@giz.de	+256 783 392 409
Gloria Namazzi		Technical Officer, CDM and CC Energy Progr	gloria.namazzi@giz.de	+256 712 316 978

9 Minutes of Meetings

LOCATION	Brussels/Skype	DATE	9 June 2015	TIME	09:00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Julie Hertsens	Belgian Technical Cooperation (BTC)	Operations Adviser	julie.hertsens@btcctb.org		
Claude Crozier	Belgian Technical Cooperation	Environmental Adviser	claude.crozier@btcctb.org		
Patricia Grobben	Ministry of Environment	Climate Change Unit	patricia.grobben@milieu.belgie.be		
Richard Pagett	NTU Consultant	Team Leader	secure@richardpagett.com		+44 7973 501 590
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS (received ✓)		WHO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief introductions from BTC (PG has been providing technical backstopping) Brief introduction to the assignment and to the Project to be assessed (mostly re-stating what is in Technical and Financial File [TFF] and ToR) Unusual for BTC to have an “environment” project; first CDM project for BTC (and for Uganda) No specific expertise in BTC in CDM Project issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not co-managed with BTC (as usually is the case) because too expensive to appoint a BTC manager long term, plus no in-house skills Simply a managed contract (but turned out that contractor needed much more support) Little or no long term planning; Training component and Project Selection became mis-aligned Mid Term Review proposed changes and adjusted log frame Some activities have been accomplished Recognise that should have co-managed; after MTR essentially had a Joint Task Force (BTC, Project, Partner) Need to see how the MTR findings were subsequently implemented; has the deliverable really contributed to “development” Because UGA receives a lot of donor attention, the project had to find its way and also to ensure no duplication Has helped BTC to be seen as a CDM supporter in east Africa with visibility with UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre Interested to know how the private sector has been engaged Climate Change Unit in Uganda now a Department Letter of Invitation (Lol) requested (for visa application) 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents to be sent ✓ Lol to be sent ✓ Ensure contact is made with UNFCCC Reg Centre 		BTC BTC (UGA) RP

LOCATION	Embassy	DATE	29 June 2015	TIME	10:00 – 10:25
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Sam Vanuytsel	Embassy of the Kingdom of Belgium	Attaché International Cooperation	samjozef@diplobel.fed.be		
Nebeyu Shone	Belgian Technical Cooperation	Resident Representative	nebeyu.shone@btcctb.org	+ 256 772 700 740	
Daniel Lubanga	BTC	Programme Officer (Appointed Project Contact)	daniel.lubanga@btcctb.org	+256414 230 543	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although called to meeting at short notice (before the briefing with BTC) ambassador not available so will re-schedule • Environment not priority sector for bilateral cooperation for BTC • There is no second phase for the project , the project was a one-off project • Prefer to work at strengthening national systems rather than a vertical approach; no further activity in CDM • Beginning a climate change action with FAO • There is an exit strategy for the Project • Next cooperation will be drafted 2016/17 ~ this ETR will provide valuable lessons for this. • During the next cooperation, they could consider integration of environment. However, there will be need to assess whether there is enough in-house expertise for any project to be undertaken • The CDM project was a technically complicated project 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Belgian Technical Cooperation	DATE	29 June 2015	TIME	10:45 – 12:10
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Nebeyu Shone	Belgian Technical Cooperation	Resident Representative	nebeyu.shone@btcctb.org	+256 772 700 740	
Rose Athieno	BTC	Senior Programme Officer	rose.kato@btcctb.org	+256 772 487 624	
Daniel Lubanga	BTC	Programme Officer (Appointed Project Contact)	daniel.lubanga@btcctb.org	+256 414 230 543	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project originally conceived in 2005 and began in October 2011 due to approval issues (pushed by ambassador) CDM project approval faced a number hurdles including underground tension that need ministerial level attention for approval On the side of GoU, the government had not yet conceptualised how to streamline government support for private investments in environment BTC had supported another programme -a wetlands programme that “aborted prematurely” BTC drafted the CC policy that was approved in April 2015 with DANIDA (funded by another project) CC is cross-cutting in all projects ~ do not foresee another project like this Referred to a FAO project on adaptation First time BTC outsourced to a private company ~ several resignations which affected the activities Backstopping by the Belgian Fed Ministry of Environment under a framework contract Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) chairs the PSC which met last week (draft minutes requested from Project) CCU now CCD is the focal point for the project. With limited staff and physical infrastructure, it is involved in a lot donor-funded programmes and projects. Need to establish what impact upgrading of CCU to CCD has on project sustainability Government does not harmonise the donors' work One of the project trainees has gone to the Uganda Investment Authority Project has three areas of Results: Capacity building through training, Updating information and website Web site ~ need to check status Currently MWE and CCD representatives are abroad back next week Discussions on meetings to arrange and projects to visit (NEMA and Nutrimix in Kampala and NEMA landfill in Mukono) 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract documents (three of them): CAMCO Contract Check exact title of FAO project on adaptation Web site ~ need to check status <p>Documents Received:</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>RN RP/Project Contact at BTC RN</p>	

LOCATION	Climate Change Department	DATE	29 June 2015	TIME	13:45 – 15:00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Martha Ntabadde Kasozi	Project (based in CCD)	National Technical Advisor	martha.kasozi@ccu.go.ug		
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Been in the Project about 2 years and 9 months and in charge for the last 9 months • Requested CVs for Stephen, Martha, John, Rachel; Project Manager is coming in 5-10 July • Used to have a permanent International TA now only periodic • Subcontracted Carbon Africa to provide training (feeling that training not as robust as could be) • CA had a full time trainer - Carlos • CA pulled out after the MTR ~ seems to be mostly about complaints from training; Project stable until then • In the TFF, Section 4, activities for result 1, activity 3 mentions creation of de facto CDM School • There is no report about the closure of the CDM School; new trainer was recruited-Ronald Twesigye • Stephen has been involved right from the beginning but is also the CEO of CAMCO (how big is this company see Selection documents) • Apparently, the ToR was not so strong on how capacity-building might be accomplished so bidders offered solutions (BTC originally was going to use a separate consultant to design the project) • Seems to have been administrative and technical burdens that were not initially disclosed • Although considered that those who were trained meant the Project was a success, clearly there were issues related to training (possibly not clear to trainees what was expected of them) • PSC decided to have two more stakeholder workshops to obtain wider benefits • Exit Strategy is still to be drafted; report on training not written yet; Final Report being drafted • CAMCO contract finished 31 July and is finishing up a few things until November 2015 • Need to check what GIZ role is • Joint Task Force established (BTC, Project and CCD) to gain momentum and reports monthly • Project due to finish November 2014 and decision taken in Q 3 2014 to extend until November 2015 • There is a proposal by BTC to recruit a consultant to offer support up the end of Project after contract for CAMCO ends by 31st July 2015 • Need to find out from BTC why CAMCO contract ends before project end. • Need to have sight of how the trainees were screened, interviewed and brought into the Project • PSC recommends solution ~ OK • No focal point in BTC then DL assigned the role of Project Contact person, and Henry Bbosa for MWE • Audit Report done around the same time as MTR • Thought NEMA (Office and site) and Nutrimix (office) OK 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Manual • Logframe • Project Team CVs • List of Project Owners • Report of a Stakeholder Workshop • Draft 11thPSC MoM • JTF reports 2013, 2014 and all from 2015 • At least one PIN and PDD done by the trainees • MonOp report example • 2014 Invoicing Report • Audit 2013 Report • Draft Final Report • Evaluation/ selection report of trainees • Invoicing report • Annual/ Result report 2013 • Quarterly reports <p>Documents Received:</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>MK</p>	

LOCATION	Uganda National Metrology Authority	DATE	30 June 2015	TIME	09:00 – 09:30
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Paul Isabirye	Climate Change Unit (at the time)	Head		+256 7725 920 32	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formerly the Climate Change Unit (now CC Department) UNFCCC Focal point; now is the alternate Was familiar with Project from inception (Oct 2011) to Sep 2014 Felt that perhaps the MTR gave a false impression Three strong stakeholders (MWE, BTC and CCD Focal Point) Noted that MWE did not have full control; perhaps should have had a contract to supervise Needed a more elaborate mechanism so MWE could manage the contract day-to-day Although the PSC was in charge of project steering, did not have day-to-day interaction with project team Felt that CAMCO had some weaknesses that could have affected project implementation and was overstretched with other engagements being consultancy firm that left the NTA almost on her own CCU brought the issues surrounding management of the project to the attention of the PSC and BTC A letter was written to BTC requesting for the inclusion of CCD staff in the training Agrees that the MTR was useful and proposal to create a JTF to help overcome many external factors MWE approved the Formulation Administration of the Project by BTC whilst CCD hosted the Project After the MTR the CCD appointed a person to part of the trainees CCD view was that either some CCD staff were trained or the trainees worked (as interns) in the CCD This proposal was placed on the PSC agenda and a letter sent to BTC yet apparently no response Some CCD staff attend some sessions when talking about CCD and at other <i>ad hoc</i> times Almost half way the training programme, CCD staff were brought on board for the training programme One trainee joined USAID another UIA and a third left for personal reasons Two trainees have since joined CCD as CDM Project Officers Two-year training has been beneficial and has helped beneficiaries to do own projects Felt that CAMCO was overstretched with other projects; work plan kept changing and apparently BTC discussed the problem of personnel changes; PSC just considers this state to be quite normal Felt that the project has to a great extent realised the results Cited the CDM capacity building programme as the first one of its nature in Uganda being a long term training (2 years). They had been receiving short term training at most two weeks The project has also built capacity of project owners in PIN and PDD development Felt that this strengthened the sustainability mechanism for CDM in Uganda 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter from CCD to BTC regarding the training of CCD staff or using the trainees within the CCD <p>Documents Received:</p>	RN	

LOCATION	East African Development Bank	DATE	30 June 2015	TIME	14:10 – 14:45
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Timothy Cowman	UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre	Acting Team Lead	tcowman@unfccc.int	+256 752 138 606	
Ritah Rukundo	UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre	Research Associate	rrukundo@unfccc.int	+256 417 112 900	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNFCCC RCC was established in 2013 and is active in east and southern Africa (23 countries) Its remit is to build capacity and provide technical support to governments, project developers, consultants and others, providing information on climate finance options It is a collaboration between UNFCCC and the East African Development Bank With BTC have participated in stakeholder workshops and provide presentations on request Reflecting on the BTC Project, thought that the grid emission factors were a great success Acknowledges that unlike other African countries, Uganda has young enthusiastic Ugandans involved in CDM activities Noted that Uganda has a lot of investment generally, particularly in climate change Pleased to note project developers considering innovative schemes (wave, water purification, Nutrimix) Suggests a closing meeting that will bring out the status of the project and gaps for engagement so that outputs can be supported after the Project (already planned) For the future, it would be good to concentrate at the policy level (particularly across the sectors) so that projects could benefit from some climate finance from Green Climate Funds or others, as the Project investment is unlikely to be recovered 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	UN Building	DATE	30 June 2015	TIME	15:30 – 16:00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Onesimus Muhwezi	UNDP	Team Leader, Energy and Environment	onesimus.muhwezi@undp.org	+256 414 233 440	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little involvement with BTC Project Used the project for co- financing some component of the GEF-funded Charcoal project UNDP moved out of CDM projects and focussed on Low Emission Capacity Building project (arranged to see tomorrow) based in CCD Not clear if UNDP represented at BTC stakeholder workshops (to verify if Project Officer participated in the stakeholders workshops) 			Documents Requested: Documents Received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF Project Document received 		

LOCATION	Embassy	DATE	1 July 2015	TIME	09:30 – 10:15
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Sam Vanuytsel	Embassy of the Kingdom of Belgium	Attaché International Cooperation	samjozef@diplobel.fed.be		
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SV focuses on health though has some knowledge of the environment in respect of Belgian development cooperation Government of Uganda seems to focus on economic development and all other sectors tend to be underfunded; the budget reflects this resourcing issue MWE is under-resourced with many positions unfilled The CDM project start up took a long time BTC the Execution Agency for the Belgian Government signed a contract with the Belgium Ministry of Foreign Affairs; BTC has capacity to implement projects Ministry launched the Resource Centre at CCD and handed out diplomas to successful trainees of the BTC programme Belgian government is working on a GCCA project with FAO funded by the EU/Belgium There is some donor coordination specifically EU CC meeting though there is some room for improvement for coordination across the environmental themes Health holds a monthly coordination meeting and a monthly meeting with Ministry Belgium prefers a transverse approach to development cooperation and even though this can be more challenging, Belgian believes a better outcome is achieved In terms of sustainability, a project cannot be handed over to another donor though could be transferred to another BTC project BTC has a contract with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it always tends to carry out the environmental programme on behalf of the Belgian government which normally works well and can be faster than many other donors There are several lessons to be learned from current project one of which may be to say “no” The following are working in climate change: DFID GIZ, AFD, EU and there could and should be some linkages between these, for instance DFID is working with FAO and so is Belgium yet there is no linkage between the two activities Environment should be part of the key sectoral activities of Belgium Government support but not stand alone Recommends BTC to have monthly meets with Ministry Recommends establishment or strengthening a CC platform for bilateral donors 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <p>Documents Received:</p>		

LOCATION	Climate Change Department	DATE	1 July 2015	TIME	10:45-1130
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Martha Bbosa	UNDP	Project Manager (Low Emission Capacity Building Project)	martha.bbosa@undp.org	+256 772 289 159	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on the LECB project began in 2013 to encourage the development of NAMAS, GHG inventories and MRVS (also part of the Green Growth Strategy of the Government) also supporting the government on INDC on mitigation • Has collaborated with the CDM project and noticed the “team dwindling” noting that project delivery is all about relationships and the need to understand what the Government wants; and linking with Government; they appear to have been many niggling issues which cause frustration; an important aspect is to get the original design correct and if issues arise to deal with them quickly • Noted that effective working with project steering committees often relies on having pre-meetings and getting agreements in place • There should have been some synchronising of the BTC project with the UNDP project; for instance there was an agricultural sector scoping study on assessment of GHG and carbon stock to facilitate the preparation of CC mitigation measures including NAMAs. A lot had already been done by the UNDP-LECB project, thus no need to repeat some of the studies • There is a National Climate Change Policy Committee • Noted rigidity by some of the consultants for adjustment following suggestions proposed by CCD • Felt that the project had contributed to capacity building by producing a group of CDM experts 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <p>Documents Received:</p>		

LOCATION	Climate Change Department	DATE	1 July 2015	TIME	11:30 – 12:15	
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE		
James Kakeeto	BTC trainee in CCD	CDM Project Officer	james.kakeeto@ccu.go.ug	+2567 52 612 249		
Martin Ojok	BTC trainee in CCD	CDM Project Officer	martin.ojok@ccu.go.ug	+256 782 172 695		
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590		
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426		
MEETING RECORD					ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Began in September 2013 after the MTR Project has had good impact though because CDM is no longer readily viable some of the training has not been relevant though can provide a foundation on climate finance generally Some issues of motivation within trainees and challenges experienced by the project team The 1st year was the theoretical whilst the 2nd was practically based with project development Offered an employment contract, J K was paired with Isaac Although not successful at the 1st screening of applications, was contacted when other trainees began to drop out Training materials are available on Sugar Sync though are now being archived onto the BTC/CCD servers Project Officer role is to support PDD, Designated Operational Entity (worked at NEMA, Nutrimix, National Water) Irene now a CCD staff member focusing on mitigation, Isaac is in private practice Contract expires in July 2015 and currently there is no guarantee of take-up by CCD, in addition the government procedures take a long time, yet the purpose was to embed trainees in CCD There was no training needs analysis conducted when recruited initially; first-year trainees were interviewed by an International Technical Adviser, and BTC; 2nd year trainees interviewed by National Technical Advisor and BTC CAMCO project manager seems to be in the project every quarter and typically dealt with concerns expressed by trainees, though there was no formal training evaluation and no opportunity to design future training There were opportunities to share experiences with others and Ronald Twesigye, the trainer acted as a “mentor” PSC did not talk to any of the trainees; Government salary is four times less than that provided by BTC Backstopping was effective; remote support offered by Rachel Child (UK); project manager undertook tracking MO worked on PoA for Uganda Energy Credit Capitalisation Company (UECCC), hydropower project and the feasibility study for e-waste composting with the Ministry of Information and Technology There was a problem whereby a 3rd party UECCC signed a memorandum of understanding with BTC project but the project owner was working closely with another technical support consultancy (Get-Fit) on hydropower and the latter did not want the inconvenience of the CDM aspect. Although the feasibility study presented to the Ministry of Information and Technology was not viable the work could not have been undertaken without the support of the BTC project Trainees were evaluated every quarter although there was opportunity for the trainees to evaluate the trainers Matching of the old trainees with new one on CDM project supported, was beneficial for learning The stipend for the trainees was effectively delivered on time; trainees backstopping was also done by Rachel, assistant to the PM Project is assisting Uganda Carbon Bureau in paying for DOE post-registry changes of their cook stove PoA 					<p>Follow up on the issue of existence of positions in the CCD structure for possible take-up by the trainees in CCD structure from PS</p> <p>Evaluation reports for trainees from PM</p> <p>Documents Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training materials - from NTA <p>Documents Received:</p>	RN

LOCATION	BTC	DATE	2 July 2015	TIME	09:30-11:00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Dan Kiguli Kibuuka	NEMA	Project Manager, Uganda Municipal Solid Waste Compost Program	dkiuuka@nemaug.org	+256 775 074 849	
Stephen Muwaya	MAAIF	UNCCD National Focal Point	smuwaya@yahoo.com		
Christopher Mwa	Mo W & T	Engineer Civil Construction STD			
Denis Muggaga	MoFPED	Economist	denis.muggaga@finance.go.ug		
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not always have replacements to send to PSC meetings, though do have two-week notice of meetings plus date is agreed at previous PSC; receive copies of agenda and relevant papers, including work plan • Aware of activities requiring decisions, able to comment on documents between meeting; no decision outside PSC • Did not seem surprised at the Project Team personnel turnover • PSC does not seem to realise it has power and influence on the Project; seems to have needed permission from the MTR to give them opportunity to influence the Project • No guarantee trainees would be taken on by CCD as the appointment to Public service is outside the Project scope • Trainees are highly skilled they can effectively compete for positions in CCD • GoU is also a competitive employer for trainees • Some interaction trainees at PSC meeting; some trainees went to Namibia Africa Carbon Forum • Even if trainees obtain future employment regionally it still reflects well on Uganda • Good to have hands-on training to appreciate the challenges on the ground • PSC does not seem to have ownership of the project and does not feel the Project is part of GoU • Project should have had a component that targeted the CCD • PSC was aware that Project expenditure was lagging behind and waited until MTR to re-adjust • Considered that there were several stalled BTC projects and this was just another • Trainees were provided with relevant skills • Outputs in Formulation not well specified and PSC was aware of this; perhaps 80% now complete • Ownership of the Project by MWE is less; PSC committed to the recommendations of the MTR • BTC Own Management modality is effective; MTR was a wake -up call and facilitated decision making by PSC that translated in more control of the Project and demand for delivery on results • Lessons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project could have been adjusted earlier and MTR gave PSC permission to be do this ○ PSC benefits from a multi-stakeholder/ multi-disciplinary composition ○ PSC needs to hold Project more accountable • Funding arrangements between BTC and Government not clear • Commitment from the stakeholders contributed to realisation of results post MTR 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	GIZ	DATE	3 July 2015	TIME	11:00:1145
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Gloria Namande	GIZ	Technical Officer, CDM and Climate Change Mitigation	gloria.namande@giz.de	+256 783 392 409	
Gloria Namazzi	GIZ	Technical Officer, CDM and Climate Change Energy Programme	gloria.namazzi@giz.de	+256 712 316 978	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme 2015-2018 focussing on supporting East African member states to governments and the public towards participation in the carbon market • Have done studies for CCD, UIA and energy companies to indicate the value of the carbon markets • Holding a Carbon Fayre in July 2015 bringing together consultants and developers to discuss and understand new mechanisms and COP 21 • GIZ has an MoU with UIA and placed Arthur from the BTC Project to look at the portfolio of UIA projects for potential CDM project • GIZ and BTC have been discussing how GIZ could continue the BTC outcomes via an exit strategy (though no exit strategy yet drafted) and perhaps extending the work e.g. a standard baseline in another sector e.g. transport and a methodology for a different sector • Exit strategy will need to be integrated with the Public Service Commission and CCD • All inward investment comes through UIA and so Arthur's role is to see if these can accommodate CDM development • Seem to think that CCD would be taking on the trainees • In 2013 UNFCCC Reg Collaboration Centre worked with GIZ and BTC to take NEMA through verification • GIZ favours joint planning with MWE and execute plans jointly and did this with the Uganda Carbon Bureau Cook Stove project • With UIA, GIZ provides financing and UIA provides materials in-kind • Seemed to think CCD advised trainees to go elsewhere rather than consider a post in CCD • Having to provide six copies of trainee application form was excessive and put off potential trainees • At the beginning of the training, trainees looked at templates but did not have opportunity to complete; this changed later • Resource Centre in CCD ~ three PCs and will be on-line • Donor Thematic Group on Climate Change meets quarterly and invites CCD when appropriate • FAO has provided an advisor to CCD to support the Department on donor coordination and policies • Felt that the project delivered on building capacity of Ugandans in CDM processes • Felt that trainees should have been selected from the institutions to build institutional capacity • Collaboration with BTC was through consultations and sharing of concept papers 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <p>Documents Received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme Factsheet 		

LOCATION	BTC	DATE	3 July 2015	TIME	15:00:15:45
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Gimoro Laker-Ojok	NutriMix	CEO and Managing Director	nutrimixltd@gmail.com	+256 712 564 477	
Rita Laker-Ojok	Feeds Limited	Director of Finance and Administration	rlakerojok@gmail.com	+256 753 550 958	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Had been working on a methodology (basically reducing methane due to better nutrition) for dairy animals for perhaps 10 years and had gone through three technical reviews by UNFCCC In 2010 a small-scale methodology was issued and NutriMix re-formulated the programme of activities using a technical advisor from the US and redrafted using baseline data Answered the 1st Call for proposals for direct assistance by BTC Requested technical assistance and financial support; not successful because they did not have an approved methodology so were offered some technical assistance; consisted of two meetings with NTA The 1st MoU (2013) included technical support to the submission, processing and approval of methodology, preparation of documents, business development and finance-raising The 2nd MoU (2014) included financial support for baseline collection and an agreement to cover the cost of validation since there was an approved methodology; no trainee input was offered A climate finance workshop took place last year at which NutriMix presented their project NutriMix attended an African Carbon Forum in Morocco paid for by BTC NutriMix seems to have experienced difficulties in knowing exactly what was required: Some advice suggested an environmental impact assessment was required and others seemed to think not For their stakeholder consultation they received some guidelines a month before meeting; no further support At some stage the PSC came to visit though NutriMix was not clear on what they wanted and the visit seems not to have been facilitated On the whole NutriMix seems to be left in the dark and not really supported Not provided with the overall process and no systematic approach to setting up their involvement In particular there seems to be very little additional networking value given there are several project developers involved in the BTC Project There is a contract for the validation although it appears not to be very detailed CCD has visited the project site only once as part of the PSC visit Previously, UIA had initiated support for CDM project development that seem more involving for project owners and networking The PoA-PDD has been posted for UNFCCC review and comments A stakeholders' meeting was organised on the 29th June, no CCD or District Local Government representation (District Environment Officer) turned up 			<p>Comments: Need to find out from CCD how the District Local Government staff are tied into the CDM capacity building project and how they can support the programme</p> <p>Documents Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st MoU 2nd MoU Validation Contract Emails streams <p>Documents Received:</p> <p>As above</p>	RN	

LOCATION	Ministry of Water and Environment	DATE	6 July 2015	TIME	09:25:09:55
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
David Obong	Ministry of Water and Environment	Permanent Secretary	ps@mwe.go.ug	+256 772 702 416	
Paul Mafabi	MWE, Environmental Affairs	Director	paul.mafabi@mwe.go.ug	+256 772 503 255	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<p>PS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered that when the project was scoped initially there was no CDM experience, so project was timely • Capacity has been built ~ the “school” via 8 trainees though about 180 had applied • Even though trainees have gone elsewhere (than CCD) that is fine as they are still in Uganda • Aware of 10 projects plus the GEF supported; capacity in CCD has been improved and BTC has supported COP 20 and will for Paris; CCD has been able to participate in the COP negotiations • Project also supported national institutions in CDM development such as NEMA, UIA, MAAIF and Ministry of Energy • Even though the carbon market had collapsed by the time the Project began there was hope it would pick up • It is to be expected that projects will have difficulties; not clear on any specific challenges - would have to check minutes though did refer to former CCD (U) head (No feedback after reviewing minutes) • Referred to a “complex” project and the start being a bit “bumpy” put down to project design • Employing the trainees in CCD will be considered for two more (one already hired as staff) though only on contracts for now perhaps for one or two years) until positions will be declared to Public Service for filling <p>Director Env Affairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM Had worked on the BTC Wetlands project • Problem with this project was structural about who makes decisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funds from donor (Belgium Government) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implemented by BTC ▪ Delivered by the Project Contractor ▪ Supposed to be GoU doing the implementation • PSC can make proposals but has to go through the various Project partners Project and only proposals that do not affect objectives or budget; basically it is fixed until the MTR • Complex project dealing with capacity-building, public and private sector; there was an inception period but has no copy • Trainees were supposed to be 8 but reduced to 6 due to budgetary constraints • PSC occasionally meets in field; trainee issues were brought to PSC; since they did not re-occur assumed they were fixed • The old CCD building was refurbished for the trainees and moved to CCD in February 2015 • CCD structure approved by PS in June 2014 but no funds to operationalise • Lessons: more direct involvement of the MWE (similar issues with JICA, USAID) • Need to remember this is not a BTC project it is a GoU project; need clear definition of roles of each player 			<p>Comments:</p> <p>PS would review minutes and revert</p> <p>Documents Requested:</p> <p>Documents Received:</p>	PS	

LOCATION	Ministry of Water and Environment	DATE	6 July 2015	TIME	11:00:12:00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Chebet Maikut	Climate Change Department	Head/ UNFCCC National Focal Point	chmaikut@gmail.com	+256 752 609 414	
Henry Bbosa	Climate Change Department	Mitigation Officer			
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several attempts to meet CM will re-schedule HB ~ Mitigation and attends PSC; also focal person for the project in CCD Trainees (Martin, James and Irene with CCD, Arthur with UIA, Isaac in private practice part-time with Meteorology, Sheila with USAID project, and Sunday with Parliament after one year) No copy of training programme ~ will send Clear that the Project was “not straight” as GoU was not properly involved (having financial control and accountability) Felt that at the project start in 2011, there was limited participation from the government side Asked for GoU agreement with BTC ~ will send All OK after the MTR and the setting up of the Joint Task Force; JTF role is to follow up on roles and responsibilities of the players, set targets for the activities and follow up actions required 			Comments: Documents Requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training programme GoU agreement with BTC Documents Received:	RN	

LOCATION	Climate Change Department	DATE	6 July 2015	TIME	11:30 – 12:00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Martha Ntabadde Kasozi	Project (based in CCD)	National Technical Advisor	martha.kasozi@ccu.go.ug >		
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because there was insufficient time to re-plan after the MTR there are a series of work plans in different formats Viewed a plan for Nutrimix but there is no elapsed follow-up Although there was an extension to complete outstanding tasks, there were also extra projects in order to use the funds School closed in September 2014 Dates of when PSC visited sites are being forwarded by John Baptiste Project signed in Oct 2010 and began in Oct 2011, at that time Adriaan ITA was 100% but because he could not be 100% Carlos was hired in as Support to ITA, at the time the NTA was Bernard but left shortly after the Project started. When Adriaan left, Rachel Childs became the ITA but because the training was over, she did not visit and provided support remotely, Ronald was also taken on to do some training After July 2013, NTA Martha took on more project management and BTC provided 100% administrative support after the MTR (before it was 60%) Certificates to: Martin, James, Irene, Arthur and Isaac Joel left first and went to an NGO, then Sunday who went to Parliament, then Sheila (USAID project) Moses left for personal reasons There was no agreement to stay until the 2nd round of trainees when it was required (not for Moses) No real Nutrimix support as quite different, some support after 3rd Call PSC supposed to meet 2/year NTA administrative role was to approve consultancy reports 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dates of when PSC visited sites are being forwarded by John Baptiste Will send lessons learned (Martha) <p>Documents Received:</p> <p>Dates of when PSC visited sites received</p>	<p>RN</p> <p>MK</p>	

LOCATION	Climate Change Department	DATE	6 July 2015	TIME	12:30 – 12:50
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Irene Kyekwoti	CCD	Officer for GHG Inventory	chekwoti.irene@gmail.com	+256 706 899 409	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training was very good and contributed to what she is now • Skills gained from the training important for the GHG inventory • Trainees were provided with a laptop each • Changing trainers was disruptive; one was clearly not in regularly, sometime replacement that seemed to be learning on the job; no overall programme or any coherent structure • Tiny training room six desks pushed together • Had opportunity to choose their projects and had plenty of support and opportunity to visit the site • Primary trainer 1 -3 month intervals and for one week each time • Many stakeholders so unclear on who is responsible for what • Took concerns to BTC but in the end trainees just decided to take what they could from what was on offer 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Uganda Investment Authority	DATE	6 July 2015	TIME	14:00 – 14:30
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Godfrey Ssemakula	UIA	Deputy Director	semakula@ugandainvest.go.ug	+256 712 583 729	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was involved with the Project from the beginning and participated in trainee screening and project selection • Felt that the inherent costs of CDM are too high and probably put off a lot of potential projects • Not clear on the personnel changes • Aware of an exit strategy to be discussed at the next PSC • Trainee is being funded by GIZ for two years (not sure that this will be extended or made a permanent position) • UIA was involved in CDM through networking and general awareness since 2004 but finding a problem to get to the next stage due to lack of funds • Even though it was clear that the market had crashed well before the Project began there was hope that it would recover or the skills obtained could be used anyway • Awareness on CDM has been created but what is missing is the finance to take projects to registration and generation of CERs 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Ministry of Water and Environment	DATE	7 July 2015	TIME	09:20 - 9:45
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Joseph Eritu	MWE	Head Internship	josephepitu@gmail.com		
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participated in interviews and is an observer on the PSC • Formerly Capacity Development Officer, MWE Support Outreach Division of CCD • Project was a good concept, promising interviewees • Did not follow the training <i>per se</i> though interfaced with the NTA • Appreciated the approach and discipline of the trainees though drop-out was higher than expected • Wished there had been proper documentation; methodology so that it could be roll-out as best practice and had mentioned this to NTA and also the former head of CCD (U) • Training was not accredited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Process is too long (despite a four-year project) ○ Never tried (lack of coordination from the Project and never pushed ("<i>everything has to be pushed</i>") 			Comments: Documents Requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation process (not written down) Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Jinja	DATE	7 July 2015	TIME	12:45-13:30
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Izaare George	Jinja Municipal Council	Deputy Mayor			
Jofram Waidhuuba		Town Clerk			
Ernest Nabihamba		Environmental Officer	enabi65@gmail.com		
Andrew Mukasa		Site Manager			
Dan Kibuuka	NEMA	Project Manager, Uganda Municipal Solid Waste Composting Program	dkiuuka@nemaug.org	+256 775 074 849	
Richard Mukasa	NEMA	Env Assessment & Monitoring Officer, Municipal Solid Waste	rmugambwa@nemaug.org	+256 773 770 164	
Morris	NEMA	Intern			
Benjamin	NEMA	Intern			
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have undertaken 1st Verification and 1st Issuance (23 000 USD after NEMA takes 50%) • Began in 2007 and was first to have CPA registered • Trainees Isaac and James did the monitoring report • Had training workshops on ERPA writing and negotiation, and on CDM Carbon Finance at which the trainees facilitated; there was no programme as such, just invited • Employ site manager a data clerk to keep the records and a supervisor • Town Clerk regularly visits site • Estimate incoming waste volumes based on standard-sized trucks and moisture content • Data are collected on oxygen, temperature, moisture etc and use this to determine when to turn the composting material • Also measure fuel usage by the collecting trucks • Residential collection is free and commercial properties pay a small sum, contractor is paid for collection • Composting takes 8-12 weeks depending on original composition, 20 people can sort 4 trucks/day • Compost was originally given out for free, now some payment (gardening, landscaping etc) at about 40 UGX per kg of manure • Important health benefits, CDM revenue does not offset the investment • Originally the site was 20 acres now the composting is undertaken on 5 acres • Require more equipment (earthmover) for proper management of waste • Collect 70 MT of waste a day • Provide energy saving cook stoves to the neighbouring community as an incentive for project buy-in and also to reduce carbon emissions 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Private	DATE	7 July 2015	TIME	16:30 - 1745
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Stephen Mutimba	Camco	Managing Director, Kenya	stephen.mutimba@camcocleanenergy.com	+254 722 721 680	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CarbonAfrica established in 2009 (one person) • Submitted tender but advised could not be a joint bid so Camco became the apex contractor • Awarded contract but expected a contract rather than a combination of documents (TFF does not specify deliverables and milestones) • Adriaan initially stayed for three weeks to set up the Project and found the process exhausting as BTC requested help with the basic set-up yet discarded this as did not conform to BTC procedures • The original NTA (Bernard) stayed a year and then got fed up with the Project machinations • ITA (Adriaan) went to see BTC BRU • BTC gave the project an admin person though probably too challenging • Carlos joined to support ITA because ITA felt it was all taking too long, technical backstop agreed (and also knew Carlos) • Took nine months to contract the trainees (2012) and training began in July 2012 with ITA Andrew and Carlos; a training manual was to be developed for the remaining period • By the end of 2012 there were six projects; MTR in July 2013 • ITA Adriaan not available for MTR; neither was Stephen and a representative was sent from Kenya • Under the previous CCU Head the project seemed well supported • They expected to do an Inception report and is the equivalent of the 1st Quarterly Report • ITA Andrew was to complete the screening report (ITA Adriaan started this but was unable to finish) • Trainees are well trained and a good number of projects are supported • Screening Report was completed by Carlos • Lessons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use consultants to do the procurement ○ Need a proper scope, budget and timeline ○ Training manual was not part of the TFF ○ BTC should be more flexible to use home-procurement rules 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	UpEnergy	DATE	8 July 2015	TIME	16:30 - 1745
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Mark Mutaahi	UpEnergy Limited	Country Director	mark@upenergygroup.com	+256 774 395 639	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributes cook stoves (55 000 to date); has sister company Impact carbon ~ makes the stoves • Active on CDM since 2011 and have Gold Standard; Verification next year • Have been generally in touch with the UNFCCC process and with the DNA • Responded to the 3rd Call in August 2014 and awarded support in Nov 2014; actually started in March 2015 due to issues with MoU and ToR (other parties slow to respond and had to go back and forth until ToR was OK; used a template but since had only expertise needed a bit of time to get everything aligned) • It is a costly process so needed the BTC support to pay for the various UNFCCC registration fees • Ronnie was the face of the support though James and Martin were in the background • The trainees helped in getting the letter of approval • BTC paid for verification, CPA inclusion and DOE auditing fees • Had previous bad experience; received an LoA from Government (CCD) ~ was rejected by UNFCCC • Participated in three workshops organised by the Project • Attended a 2-day workshop on CER Registrations in Oct/Nov 2014 (presented by a South African lawyer from CarbonAfrica and the ITA Adriaan) • UNEP had arrangement with the Frankfurt School; gave a workshop on CDM Funding in May 2015 • Africa Carbon Forum in Morocco (April 2015) with other project developers (only opportunities to network) • Success of the Project will depend on how CCD utilises the trainees to improve support to the project owners • Lessons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trainees will be the people to interface with in CCD ▪ Complicated process, BTC made a good job of training ▪ Needed a high level of knowledge to get the best of the Frankfurt school ~ had a structured training programme and manual ▪ Future depends on the trainees, going through UNFCCC is a gruesome process ▪ Not aware why there were delays ~ bureaucracy "it is what it is" ▪ Need to build the capacity of local players in the CDM process. 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reason why not respond to 1st or 2nd Calls <p>(apparently they never knew about it)</p> <p>Documents Received:</p>	MM	

LOCATION	Uganda Investment Authority	DATE	8 July 2015	TIME	10:00 – 10:30
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Arthur SSebuggaa Kimeze	UIA	CDM Technical Advisor	askimeze@ugandainvest.go.ug	+256 772 407 233	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successfully trained; feels as if fast-tracked to this new learning • Fresh from University and had done a dissertation on C Trading and Small Farmers • Found the MRV GHG inventorying very useful • Felt that recruited trainees came with an expectation of a job and also considered “trainee” pejorative • Considered it was a full-time post (trainers considered this too) looked at it as an income • Andrew was first ITA then Adriaan and Carlos (latter was pushing, perhaps too much for some) • Participation in climate change events was tagged to performance • Things really took off after Oct 2012 • Projects supported: Biofuel, National Water, AMST • Started with Nutrimix though stopped when it was clear there was already a US consultant helping • Lessons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perhaps older and working trainees found it more difficult to adapt ▪ Take trainees out of existing institutions (that needed CDM training) and then they go back ~ the trainee allowance would then be a bonus ▪ Even if done a different way there would still be challenges 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Uganda Carbon Bureau	DATE	8 July 2015	TIME	15:00 – 16:15
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Bill Farmer	UCB	Chairman	billfarmer@ugandacarbon.org	+256 752 644 611	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had an MoU with BTC BRU through GIZ but stalled after 6-9 months for unknown reasons • Had signed a confidentiality memorandum with BTC at some stage • Applied to all three Calls, successful on the last one; disappointed about the other two especially since it was adding a new methodology • Noted that a previous head of CCU (D) was rather critical at the MTR • BTC supported the payment for audit fees • Recommends that donors should be flexible while implementing projects 			Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Private	DATE	8 July 2015	TIME	17:00 – 18:00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Ronald Twesigye	Camco	National CDM Specialist	jronnie@gmail.com	+256 756 880 140	
Richard Pagett	NTU	M & E Expert (international)	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joined with the new trainees and did orientation and close coaching • Helped to select projects on 3rd Call (together with NTA Martha, trainees, BTC Daniel and Henry Bbosa) • HB often delegates to trainee Martin as he is both Project Officer and a CCD representative, and Henry is over-subscribed • Worked with nearly all the projects, often trainees needed to be pushed to complete tasks • Worked two days/week and then increased to three days/week; contract concludes this month • Considered that technical backstopping also was decision-making, questioning the PSC • Trainees should have been required to report their progress; still not at an independently functioning level • Trainee Moses left very quickly for reasons very unclear and without completing the leaving formalities • Web site intern had no admin rights so web site not updated • Trainee management was challenging as they could leave tasks unfinished yet still be paid as a matter of course • Trainees not always maintain interest or good at time-keeping • Thought there may be 120 000 EUR left with 60 000 EUR being ring-fenced for skills development in CCD • Project had achieved results in terms of trainees and projects supported • Project officers' role was to pursue the projects and bring issues identified at all levels of the project to conclusion 			<p>Documents Requested:</p> <p>Documents Received:</p>		

LOCATION	Climate Change Department	DATE	10 July 2015	TIME	11.30:12.00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Chebet Maikut	Climate Change Department	Head/ UNFCCC National Focal Point	chmaikut@gmail.com	+256 772 609414	
Rebecca Nanjala	NTU	M & E Expert (national)	nanjareb@gmail.com	+256 392 840 426	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS	WHO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project was formulated in 2008 by then he was the Principal Officer in Charge of Mitigation Took lead in presenting the final project for approval by Ministry of Finance During the approval process, three project execution modalities were proposed: Full ownership and implementation by MWE; co-ownership and management by BTC and MWE and BTC own management BTC commissioned a study to identify and recommend the best modality TFF then adopted the BTC Management modality with a consultant to take up the technical aspects Project had challenges in approval; he represented MWE in the selection of the consultancy firm (CAMCO) It had been anticipated that MWE and BTC would work very closely with BTC but that was not the case at least for the first half of the Project duration; BTC has never shared the CAMCO contract with CCD Later he learned that CAMCO was in charge of recruiting the ITA and NTA: what is the role of CCD in that process? Apart from sharing the office block with CAMCO, there was no communication or co-management with CAMCO It seems the PSC is constituted as the co-ownership and management of the Project Project Selection Committee was instituted (CCD, BTC, ITA/NTA & UIA) to undertake selection of CDM projects Brought out the need to have the PSC approve the outcome of the selection committee but that was rejected leaving the selection committee as an independent committee No mechanism in Project document -TFF that promoted CCD involvement and co-management other than the PSC Participated in selection of trainees, advocated for increase in number from 6 to at least 15 but this was dismissed Advised a training programme with clear course content be developed; CAMCO did not do it; CCD had no control over CAMCO Felt that the Project has not realised the capacity building result because actually only three trainees out of the 6 or 5 who claimed to have been trained completed the whole two years of the training (Arthur, Irene and Isaac) No mechanism in the Project document to ensure capacity of DNA is built Sometimes the guidance from the MWE leadership was not accepted; and rigidity of BTC and CAMCO led to implementation inefficiencies in the Project Ministry of Finance in the minutes of approval gave good guidance on the execution modality but not reflected in TFF Commends BTC for implementing the MTR recommendations that have brought some level of success to the Project in particular the institution of the JTF <p>Lessons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In future for any BTC support, BTC should look at Project on a case-by-case basis before generalising and isolate issues Need for clear governance structure for the Project to facilitate transparent decision-making processes Underscores the need to have clear agreements and MoUs with deliverables and responsibility actions 			Comments: Documents Requested: Documents Received:		

LOCATION	Royal Suites Hotel	DATE	13 July 2015	TIME	09.30:12.00
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION		
Nebeyu Shone	BTC Resident Representative	Martha Ntabadde Kasozi	Camco, Project NTA		
Rose Athieno	BTC Uganda Programme Officer	Ronald Twesigye	Camco, Project National CDM Specialist		
Daniel Lubanga	BTC Project Contact Point	Sarah Torthuade	UNFCCC RCC		
Jovet Tweheyo	BTC Project Administrator	Dan Kibuuka	NEMA, Project Manager, Municipal Solid Waste Compost Programme		
Henry Bbosa	CCD/ Focal Point	Richard Mukasa	NEMA, Env Assessment and Monitoring		
Irene Kyekwoti	CCD, Officer for GHG Inventory (former trainee)	Mark Mutaahi	UpEnergy, Country Director		
James Kakeeto	CCD, project officer, (former trainee)	Henry Okinyal	National Senior TVET Adviser		
Godfrey Ssemakula	UIA, Deputy Director	Richard Pagett	NTU (End-Term Review)		
Arthur SSebuggaa Kimeze	UIA, CDM Technical Adviser (former trainee)	Rebecca Nanjala	NTU (End-Term Review)		
FEEDBACK RECORD					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ETR Team presented key Lessons Learned • Eng. Okinyal explained the history, complexity and time needed to accredit a training programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To award a certification requires a recognisable standard to be achieved (Uganda does not have one for CDM training) ○ Spoke about the Business, Technical Vocational Education and Training Act 2008 and the link to the Directorate of Industrial Training (DIT) ○ Unwritten law that a course needs to be at least nine months in length and an assessment made of competencies against a known standard ○ National Council for Higher education should handle university level but law is not explicit ○ Suggested that Ministry write to DIT for retrospective; have used an MoU between DIT and relevant ministry ○ Status of those trained would be enhanced by a recognised qualification of some sort ○ Felt that CDM training falls under non-formal education which is recognised as one of the methods of acquiring skills and knowledge ○ The DIT is responsible for accreditation • Project Team commented that feedback was objective and accurate, and good to focus on the key lessons rather than detail; acknowledged that the web site needs to be brought up-to-date as soon as possible and engage CCD to do that on a regular basis • Trainees felt accreditation not necessary though advertising that there are trained CDM professionals available would be helpful; considered the quality of training and trainers to be very good and mentioned the NTA by name and concluded that the trainees had the right attitude to learn • BTC Uganda noted there was an MoU between BTC Brussels and the Federal Ministry for backstopping; this is called in on an as-need basis; if Project Team identifies a specific need ~ more of trouble shooting and when BTC found they need assistance on decision-taking • The Exit Strategy would be raised with the PSC and noted that this project was a pilot of the new way of managing projects 					

LOCATION	Brussels/Skype	DATE	15 July 2015	TIME	09:40
PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	EMAIL	MOBILE	
Patricia Grobben	Ministry of Environment	Climate Change Unit	patricia.grobben@milieu.belgie.be		
Richard Pagett	NTU Consultant	Team Leader	secure@richardpagett.com	+44 7973 501 590	
MEETING RECORD			ACTIONS/COMMENTS (received ✓)		WHO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a general Collaboration Letter between BTC BRU and Federal Ministry with individual ToRs for each missions (attached to mission reports) • It was both technical and project management backstopping right from the start • Actions were carrying over from one mission to the next • It was not realised initially that the TFF would cause difficulties among the parties • Had to make basic recommendations such as planning one for the next month and then following up • Project did not seem to appreciate what was needed to be done • First mission seemed good with effective discussions with Adriaan Tas who had good ideas; he considered to do SBLs and the NutriMix methodology as added value beyond CDM • Current NTA turned the Project round after the MTR • It was clear that the original NTA was not up to the task; by the 2nd mission some four months later ~ no real progress • It was clear there were management issues right from the start; task and responsibilities not assigned, no one felt responsible • Issues between the two contracted companies and their internal sub-contract • Although the messages/findings were in the mission reports perhaps the conclusions could be clearer/stronger • Although BTC Uganda also appreciated the issues no one seemed able to take action until the MTR • BTC Uganda and CCU (D) not really discussing things between them • BTC Brussels were aware of the issues; two or three previous operations advisers at BTC • Consultant brought in to do the Formulation and the TFF, Specification done with BTC Uganda ~ had to be re-issued as initial one disclosed the budget • Transfer of extra budget after MTR was merely to find a way to use the budget, previously committed to GoU, the Project did not really need it 					

10Bibliography

YEAR	INSTITUTION	TITLE
	Government of Uganda	
2010	Min Finance, Planning & Econ Dev	Agreement with BTC (20 November)
2011	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (1 st) 24 October
2012	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (2 nd) 4 April
2012	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (3 rd) 3 October
2013	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (4 th) 26 March
2013	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (5 th) 27 September
2014	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (6 th) 21 February (extraordinary)
2014	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (7 th) 28 March
2014	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (8 th) 5 September
2014	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (9 th) 16 December
2015	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (10 th) 23 February
2015	Project Steering Committee	Minutes of Meeting (11 th) 25 June (draft)
2015	Nat. Env. Management Authority	List of certified and Registered Environmental Practitioners
	Belgian Technical Cooperation	
2010	BTC Brussels	Formulation Report (September)
2010	BTC Brussels	Technical and Financial File (October)
2011	BTC Brussels	Project Specification (as put out to tender) (May)
2011	CAMCO Clean Energy	CAMCO Offer
2011	BTC Uganda	Letter: Contract award
2012	BTC Brussels and Federal Ministry	MoU with Federal Ministry
2011	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (October)
2012	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (February)
2012	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (June)
2012	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (November)
2013	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (March)
2013	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (October)
2014	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (May)
2014	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (November)
2015	Backstopping	BTC Mission Report (April)

YEAR	INSTITUTION	TITLE
2014	Belgian Embassy	Letter: Extension of Project Funding and Addendum
2014	Belgian Embassy	Letter: Belgium Support for Secure Safe Water for Developing Countries Programme of Activities
2015	BTC Brussels/Uganda	ToR: End-Term Review of the Intervention CDM Capacity Development and Projects Support Project
	Project Documents	
	CVs Project Team	Stephen Mutimba, Adriaan Tas, Andrew Jakubowski, Carlos Guerrero Martha Ntabadde Kasozi, John Baptiste Lusala, Rachel Child, Ronald Twesigye
	Joint Task Force	Minutes of Meetings
2014	Camco Advisory Services	CER Commercialisation and ERPA Negotiation Manual (November)
	Project Management Reports	
2011		Work Plan, Timeline and Revised Budget (October)
2011		Annual Report
2012		Progress Reports Q1, Q 2, Q3, Q 4
2012		Execution Report
2012		Results Report
2012		Financial Planning Q 2
2012		Execution Report Q 4
2013		Revised Work Plans to assist project developers
2013		Execution Report Q 1, Q 2, Q 3, Q 4
2014		Screening Report
2014		Revised Project Work Plan (December)
2015		MONOP Q1
2015		Executive Report (April)
2015		Final Report
	Trainees	
	Selection	Applications Received
		Trainee Shortlist 2012
		Selection Notes Round 1
		Selection Notes Round 2
	Orientation	First and second tranches of trainees
	Evaluation	Several trainees
	Project Work	Examples of Quick Assessments for various projects, Stakeholder Consultation Manual
	Training	Induction, training documentation (templates, presentations, meeting notes, other courses etc)
2014	Africa Carbon Forum	Namibia 2-4 July, single report
	Workshops	
2013		Report of NEMA Training Workshop to support Uganda Municipal Waste Compost Programme, October 2013

YEAR	INSTITUTION	TITLE
	Project Developers	
		3 rd Call for Proposals
2013	Nat Water and Sewerage Corp.	Example methane calculations
2013	Nutrimix	Application, MoUs 1 and 2, ToRs, certification, DOE
2013	Whave Solutions Limited	Validation Report
2015	Secure Safe Water in Developing Countries	Registration
2015		Programme Design Document
2013		Grid Emission Factor
2015		List of Project Owners (developers)
	Development Partners	
2010	GIZ	Climate Change Actors' Landscape
2014	GIZ	Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency: <i>Programme: Mitigating Climate Change in Uganda</i>
2014	UNDP-GEF	Addressing barriers to adoption of improved charcoal production technologies SLM ¹¹ practices through integrated approach (2014-17)

¹¹ sustainable land management
BTC, Belgian Development Agency
End-Term Review Report Annexes