**ANNEX E. End of Project Report of Dominican Republic First Biennial Update Report (fBUR)**

Monitoring and Evaluation plans of climate change enabling activities for the preparation of National Communications on Climate Change and/or Biennial Update Reports do not require the production and publication of Terminal Evaluation Reports. Therefore, a number of intended purposes of such terminal exercises are not captured in full, including:

* The promotion of accountability and transparency, and the assessment and disclosure of the extent of the project accomplishments;
* A synthesis of lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities;
* The provision of feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio, attention needed, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and
* The contribution to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on the quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

The intent of this Final Report is not to propose an abridged alternative to the Terminal Evaluation Report. Instead, its purpose is to gather some insightful details about the process of preparing the mandatory report under the UNFCCC that can be of use to both the UNDP support teams, and the current and future national project teams. Its focus is therefore on providing:

* A synthesis of lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities; and
* Feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio, attention needed, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.

National project teams in charge of the future enabling activity for the preparation of the National Communication or Biennial Update Report can therefore rely on a valuable source of information from inception to closure of the project, and UNDP support teams can further disseminate lessons across borders, fully up-taking its guiding role as implementing agency and partner within the Global Support Programme (GSP, previously known as National Communications Support Programme).

The template has been designed with the purpose of collecting relevant information, without representing a time-intensive and human resource-intensive burden to the current national project team. It is therefore divided into three core sections – project identification phase, project implementation phase and project follow-up –with for each section a limited number of open questions.

The intention is to have the team leader, project manager or equivalent figure completing the template, in close collaboration with other team members within the last two months of project implementation. It is furthermore the intention of the completion of this Final Report to trigger the discussions of the upcoming National Communication and/or Biennial Update Report, taking advantage of the momentum created by the ongoing project, the presence of the core of the current national project team, and the renewed interest of national counterparts with the perspectives of an eminent or recent submission to the UNFCCC.

The completion of this template has been made mandatory and has been budgeted for in all projects that received approval post 2013 (3 working days equivalent of project manager’s time). You are kindly invited to send the completed template to Damiano Borgogno, [damiano.borgogno@undp.org](mailto:damiano.borgogno@undp.org) and to Eva Huttova, [eva.huttova@undp.org](mailto:eva.huttova@undp.org).

1. **Details of the project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project’s title | Dominican Republic First Biennial Update Report (fBUR) |
| PIMS number | 5819 |
| Overall budget  including GEF grant  including co-financing | 352,000 USD  397,000 USD (45,000 USD from Gov) |
| Duration of implementation | September 2017 – June 2019 |
| Planned duration of project | September 2017 – June 2019 |
| Implementing partner | UNDP Dominican Republic |
| Team Leader’s name and contact details | Rafael Berigüete  +18094968002  rafael.beriguete@undp.org / beriguete.re@gmail.com |
| Link to final report |  |

1. **Project identification phase**

Duration of preparatory phase (expressed in months) 4 months

**Was the project document developed by a national/international consultant? (Please, provide name if yes and expand on the satisfaction of this collaboration.)**

*The fBUR project document was developed by national consultant in close cooperation with UNDP programme manager, and national partners, primarily Ministry for Environment and Natural Resources (MoE) and the National Council for Climate Change and CDM (CNCCMDL). In addition, draft document was also discussed with other relevant institutions as the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development (MEPYD), National Statistics Office (ONE) and representatives of private sector (in relation to GHG Inventory data and the National MRV system).*

*In opinion of consulted representatives from above mentioned institutions, support from local UNDP office has been a key aspect of the success and all project partners are very satisfied with this collaboration. Consulted representatives were Mr. Ernest Reyna, Executive Vice-president of CNCCML and Ms. Patricia Abreu, International Cooperation Viceminister of the Ministry of Environment.*

**Please, shortly describe the milestones of this initial preparatory phase (e.g. consultation workshops held, telephone interviews with key stakeholders, among others)**

*During the initial preparatory phase consultations with the main project partners were organized at several occasions: inception and conceptual workshop, draft 1, draft 2, final document. This included mainly direct consultation meetings followed by e-mail correspondence with the representatives of the Ministry of Environment, including the Directorate for Climate Change of MoE and the Technical Directorate of CNCCMDL (both of them act as DR’s national focal points for UNFCCC). Also, it was discussed with ONE, MEPYD, private sector, local universities.*

**Where consultations made with one or more of the following stakeholder groups?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Ministry of Finance (or equivalent) |  | Women’s associations |
| X | Other Ministries (not being the Ministry in charge of climate change) - Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development |  | Youth movements |
|  | Local Governments |  | Indigenous peoples’ representatives |
| X | National universities |  | Environment or climate related NGOs |
|  | Domestic Research Centers |  | Other NGOs/CSOs |
|  | Media | X | Others (specify) private sector for IPPU and Energy |

**What were the main objectives for the project identified as a result of this preparatory phase?**

*There were three very important objectives covered by the proposal. The one was related to update of GHG Inventory for 2015, using 2006 IPCC Guidelines, and recalculation of previous years where needed. The second one was related to development of conceptual framework for national MRV system. The third one was related to capacity building.*

**What were the major challenges faced during this phase?**

*The challenge was to find common understanding about the data to be collected for GHG Inventory, barriers and gaps. As all institutions providing data uses their methodologies for data collection/report. In most of the cases this is relevant for GHG Inventory. However, in some cases there are additional requirements by IPCC regarding GHG inventory data, which had to be explained to technicians from MoE and CNCCMDL, and evidenced the need to include private sector and universities the in order to collect as accurate and useful data as possible and for QA/QC purposes.*

**Looking back, what issues that were identified and/or overlooked during this preparatory phase had an impact on *the successive implementation phase?***

*Due to the changes of top-level executive of MoE and CNCCMDL (and other relevant institutions) was necessary to include more efforts to create the appropriated ownership’ institutions. It was vital in this phase to explain importance of establishment of the national MRV system for any future reporting and transparency requirements.*

1. **Project implementation phase**

*Technical components*

1. **GHG inventory**

**Base year of the GHG inventory:** 2010.

**Base years used in previous GHG inventories:** 2010.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outcome | **National Greenhouse Gas Inventory - Summary report on National inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removal by sinks of all GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol updated for 2015.** |
| Expected output 1 | Data collection for 2015 according with 2006 IPCC Guidelines for a) energy, b) IPPU, c) IPPU and d) Waste. |
| Expected output 2 | Updated GHG inventory by sectors and by gas, key categories analysis, uncertainty analysis and QA/QC plan, all based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, prepared and verified. |
| Expected output 3 | Summary table of the updated inventory. |
| Expected output 4 | Activities to support the development of institutional arrangements to stablish a national system for GHG inventory, to ensure a continuous data collection process. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final outcome | **National Greenhouse Gas Inventory - Summary report on National inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removal by sinks of all GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol updated for 2015.** |
| Final output 1 | Data collection for 2015 according with 2006 IPCC Guidelines for a) energy, b) IPPU, c) IPPU and d) waste realized. |
| Final output 2 | Updated GHG inventory by sectors and by gas, key categories analysis, uncertainty analysis and QA/QC plan, all based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, prepared and verified. |
| Final output 3 | Summary table of the updated inventory prepared and revised. |
| Final output 4 | Activities to support the development of institutional arrangements to stablish a national system for GHG inventory, to ensure a continuous data collection process. |

**Please, shortly discuss the expected outcomes and outputs of the GHG inventory component, and compare to what was actually realized within the context of this project. If there was any diverting from the originally expected outcomes and outputs, please explain the causes (e.g. lack of data, risk of duplication of work done in the context of parallel projects, among others).**

*The most important output was to update GHG Inventory for 2015, using 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the utilization of IPCC GHG inventory software, which has been used also for purposes of capacity building and training activities. In addition, recalculation for the time series from 2000 was done where needed and possible.*

*To avoid duplicity, gaps and overlaps, project adopted a synergy approach, stablishing a coordination committee with key institutions and cooperation agencies, due to many of them were running similar initiatives. For example, IPPU inventory was developed with support from a cement/waste project leaded by CNCCMDL and AFOLU inventory was developed with support from a REDD+ project implemented by the MoE/World Bank.*

*In relation to output 4, related to support the institutions to strength their capacities to collect data and use country specific emission factors, there were few meetings and discussions between core technicians from institutions. No agreement has been made for this reporting period. However, fBUR did a strong synergy with ICAT project to ensure data collection and QA/QC protocols arrangement be drafted within the fBUR implementation. Its highly anticipate that all arrangement will be put in place for the next reporting period (which is development of NC4).*

**Can you describe the process(es) implemented to generate and validate outcomes and outputs?**

*Just as in the case of fBUR, the work on GHG Inventory was a result of cooperation between relevant institutions, as several sub-sectorial boards were established (i.e., energy, transport, cement, solid waste, wastewater, agriculture, livestock). With fBUR support all boards established their own work plan and distribution of roles and responsibilities.*

*All board were meet at least 8 times. Meetings were organized between MoE and CNCCMDL and made in partners with different offices, for different sectors, in order to find common understanding on data to be collected. All boards were coordinated by sectorial consultants and supported by ONE staff. Certain set of data were collected through regular activities and reporting (e.g. data from energy balances). However, there are sectors with higher uncertainty of data, e.g.: agriculture, waste. In cases where not values were available, it was used expert judgement.*

*Apart from the above, several expert in-country missions organized by different agencies/ projects were used in order to check the data collected and calculated, and to provide recommendations for future reporting (i.e., OLADE for energy, FICEM for IPPU. CfRN for AFOLU, ICAO for civil aviation, etc.). Some of the recommendations (mainly narrative explanations and QA/QC) were included already within fBUR, while most of the recommendations received will be included in the next reporting period, to be implemented within development of NC4, for 2015-2020 period.*

**What pieces of advice do you have for future project teams?**

*To be careful in the approach for to stablish a national GHG inventory team. It might be sometimes hard and time-consuming to find common understanding between sectorial experts and inventory technicians. However, it is worth investing in this cooperation, especially having in mind sustainability (as continuity of data collection, report, etc.).*

1. **Mitigation actions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outcome(s) | **Mitigation & MRV – Mitigation actions and their described effects** |
| Expected output 1 | Detailed update report for the national framework for mitigation policies. |
| Expected output 2 | Update of the mitigation actions descriptions, including (i) covering, (ii) objectives, (iii) activities, (iv) reached or projected emissions reductions, (v) methodologies and premises, (vi) carbon markets, and (vii) MRV. |
| Expected output 3 | Mitigation actions disaggregated by sectors (energy, IPPU, waste and AFOLU) and their expected mitigation contribution towards 2020 and 2030. |
| Expected output 4 | Operational guidelines for NAMA, CDM, national GHG inventories and NDCs interrelationship. |
| Expected output 4 | Complete the fBUR Mitigation & MRV section. |
| Expected output 5 | Design and to develop a web platform for the national registry of mitigation actions. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final outcome(s) | **Mitigation & MRV – Mitigation actions and their described effects** |
| Final output 1 | Detailed update report for the national framework for mitigation policies. |
| Final output 2 | Update of the mitigation actions descriptions, including (i) covering, (ii) objectives, (iii) activities, (iv) reached or projected emissions reductions, (v) methodologies and premises, (vi) carbon markets, and (vii) MRV. |
| Final output 3 | Mitigation actions disaggregated by sectors (energy, IPPU, waste and AFOLU) and their expected mitigation contribution towards 2020 and 2030. |
| Final output 4 | Operational guidelines for NAMA, CDM, national GHG inventories and NDCs interrelationship. |
| Final output 5 | Complete the fBUR Mitigation & MRV section. |

**Please, shortly discuss the expected outcomes and outputs of the vulnerability and adaptation measures and mitigation measures components, and compare to what was actually realized within the context of this project. If there was any diverting from the originally expected outcomes and outputs, please explain the causes (e.g. lack of data, risk of duplication of work done in the context of parallel projects, among others).**

*The analysis of potentials for mitigation conducted for the fBUR represent update of the mitigation polices, actions and measures presented in the NC3, as well as those specified within the key institutions plans and strategies and the technical document for the INDC. The analysis covered key IPCC sectors and key economy sectors, through sector-specific actions, under a predefined scenario aligned with the NDC, SDG and National Development Strategy.*

*For the purpose of this analysis, all mitigation actions were systematized in such a way as to identify for each action the sector it belongs to, the implementing body, the sources of funding, the timeframe for its implementation, the estimated energy savings and the emission reduction (where possible), investment costs and maintenance costs. Although there is a still weak national MRV system, this action was relatively easy due to CNCCMDL is the national NAMA coordinator (which collects and approves NAMA projects and submits them to the UNFCCC NAMA Register), and MoE is the national focal point for GEF, CTCN, GCF and other funds which open up opportunities for project funding.*

*To avoid duplicity, gaps and overlaps, project adopted a synergy approach, stablishing coordination meetings with ICAT and other projects, and also with the private sector, in order to create a common understanding of MRV. All actives were made according a common schedule. For example, capacity building activities for ICAT were designed under the fBUR day-to-day working methodologies and fBUR consultants performed and delivered under the ICAT agreements with top government institutions. Also, fBUR and ICAT left a “to do” list for further projects (i.e., CBIT) Cooperation agencies were invited to participate and to collaborate, due to many of them run similar initiatives.*

**Can you describe the process(es) implemented to generate and validate outcomes and outputs?**

*The fBUR strengthen the conceptual framework for a national MRV system (to cover mitigation, adaptation, finance, capacity building and support). Although the project just cover mitigation, it stablished MRV working groups with almost all institutions relevant to climate change. An international expert was hired to strength the conceptual framework for national MRV system proposed the project. With her expertise, two workshop six round tables were organised, in order to discuss all proposals and recommendations made from key institutions and other national counterparts (MEPYD, MEM, CNCMDL, INTRANT, ONE, etc.). In addition, two workshops (at the beginning and at the end) were held, in order to present the concept and explain roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders.*

*The mitigation analysis (both for policies and measures) was developed by national consultants, in cooperation with the key project partners and experts from companies and academia, who reviewed and commented the analysis. In addition, relevant national documents/strategies/technical documentation/action plans from the Ministry of Energy and Mining, MEPyD, Ministry of Treasury, Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment were review and taken into consideration in development of the analysis. Similar for decentralized agencies related to transport, water, etc.*

*Apart from developing the conceptual framework, an on-line tool for capturing information on mitigation actions, was developed and operationalized. The portal is provided as an example on how climate change related information can be gathered in one place and used for reporting requirements (NCs, BURs, and similar).*

*Project resources bring technical expertise to strength the institutional dialogue and later more political will regarding transparency and reporting. This approach ease to call for (and support later) the action towards a full implementation of national MRV system as part of an strategic tool for engaging stakeholders in action to achieve Dominican Republic ambitious national targets, as is outlined in the INDC. The INDC commits DR to a reduction of GHGs per capita by 25% by 2030 compared to the baseline year of 2010.*

**What pieces of advice do you have for future project teams?**

*In Dominican Republic, most of the GHG emissions come from two sectors: energy and agriculture. Thus, the mitigation actions should be mainly focused on those two sectors, which makes the situation notable clearer (especially in comparison to adaptation, where policies and measures are considerably more dispersed). That is, projects shall to include specific working packages to create more and better information related to mitigation in both sectors.*

*Also, the establishment of a national MRV system is of utmost importance for improving transparency, but also for satisfying national and international reporting requirements. In order to define national MRV system, national ownership and UNDP collaboration is essential. This is even more important in making the system fully functional.*

1. **Institutional Arrangements, National Circumstances and Others**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outcome | **Institutional Arrangements, National Circumstances and Others -** Identification, assessment and updates of national circumstances, institutional arrangements and others, as: constraints, gaps and needs related to financial aid and technology transfer provided, and received support, and capacity building and awareness. |
| Expected output 1 | National Circumstances of the Dominican Republic |
| Expected output 2 | Institutional Arrangements for the BUR |
| Expected output 3 | Constraints, gaps and needs and technical and financial capacities and needs |
| Expected output 4 | Needs and Support received on climate change activities is identified. |
| Expected output 5 | fBUR of the Dominican Republic prepared and submitted to UNFCCC, including publications and diffusion activities. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final outcome | **Institutional Arrangements, National Circumstances and Others** - Identification, assessment and updates of national circumstances, institutional arrangements and others, as: constraints, gaps and needs related to financial aid and technology transfer provided, and received support, and capacity building and awareness. |
| Final output 1 | National Circumstances of the Dominican Republic |
| Final output 2 | Institutional Arrangements for the BUR |
| Final output 3 | Constraints, gaps and needs and technical and financial capacities and needs |
| Final output 4 | Needs and Support received on climate change activities is identified. |
| Final output 5 | fBUR of the Dominican Republic prepared and submitted to UNFCCC, including publications and diffusion activities. |

**Please, shortly discuss the expected outcomes and outputs of the Constraints and gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity needs component, and compare to what was actually realized within the context of this project. If there was any diverting from the originally expected outcomes and outputs, please explain the main reasons (e.g. lack of data, risk of duplication of work done in the context of parallel projects, among others).**

*Following accession to the UNFCCC, DR has implemented several activities at the national level in order to meet the requirements under the Convention instruments (e.g., Kyoto, Copenhagen, Durban, Doha and Paris). However, with the changes made to the Convention mechanisms and the identification of new, modern mechanisms, methods and approaches, all of which require new expertise, it is necessary to be constantly developing capacity and upgrading expertise and skills to achieve a reduction in GHG emissions.*

*As a less developed country, DR has often asked for international assistance in the form of financial assistance, capacity building, technical assistance and technology transfer. This has been in order to help the country move towards meeting its obligations under the UNFCCC. The majority of the initiatives to date have addressed mitigation, i.e. reducing GHG emissions, and have primarily involved financial assistance, capacity building and technical assistance.*

*This analysis provides a starting point to make country-level decisions on effective climate action and the needs for that action to be implemented. Constraints on effective decision making have been identified and the requirements for an improved understanding of GHG trends and mitigation action, through MRV, were outlined.* *In addition, chapter on the MRV System also identified the improvements needed to sustainably monitor and support decision makers on the progress with GHG trends and the progress and options for climate action.*

**Can you describe the process(es) implemented to generate and validate outcomes and outputs?**

*Parallel to the development of conceptual framework for national MRV system and the national GHG inventory preparation, local and international consultants were hired to update the national circumstances and institutional arrangement and to gather data on financial, technical and capacity development constraints and gaps. Thus, just as the MRV concept, this was discussed with the national counterparts during the consultative process implemented.*

**What pieces of advice do you have for future project teams?**

*The biggest challenge was to involve institutions relevant for climate change finance and international cooperation and international finance (e.g. MEPYD, Ministry of Treasure, Central Bank) in order to obtain necessary data on financial support received. The data collected were mainly related to the specific projects supported by international institutions, but the dispersion of the information is still a challenge. Climate change finance is relatively new topic, there is not a centralized/systematized scheme to include, for example, projects under developments and/or before its finance. So, to sand it is essential to involve other stakeholders (apart from MoE and CNCCMDL) in this discussion.*

*Capacities and use of capacities*

**Do you believe the project has built - in a durable and cost-effective way - human and institutional capacities? Please, elaborate.**

*Yes. Apart from developing and validating important project outputs (as the conceptual framework for national MRV system, the web platform for mitigation measurements/actions, updating the national GHG inventory, and the implementation of the IPCC GHG inventory software), a comprehensive set of capacity building activities were organised. Namely, 3 international experts, 8 national experts, and 6 local consultants were at the disposal of the Directorate of Climate Change and the CNCCMDL during the period of 6 moths to discuss and train employees in any matter related to climate change (inventories, mitigation, finance, etc.). A local company leaded by and international national expert were through 60 days visiting and meeting institutions staff and technicians had an opportunity to be trained in populating relevant data into the web platform. Project support a Diplomat on GHG inventories and other in Mitigation and MRV.*

*It’s important to say project coordinator is also a high-level professional on climate change, so all teams (Mitigation and MRV, GHG Inventory, Needs and Support, web platform, and even communication) received permanent advice in in many other climate change related matters (e.g., projections), GHG inventory, mitigation measures, climate finance, gender, transparency, Paris Agreement, Rulebook, etc. Also, fBUR has established a national team for GHG inventories and the round tables for Mitigation and MRV. Also its supporting the private sector roundtable for climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the Roadmap of Cement Industry for a Low Carbon Economy.*

**Please, estimate the amount of work done by national consultants versus international consultants:**

45% national consultants, 20% international consultants and 35% national staff.

**What work was entrusted to international consultants and for what reasons?**

*International consultants were engaged to (i) coordinate GHG inventory process, (ii) the development of conceptual framework for MRV*, *(iii) needs and support, and (iv) web platform. However, they were working with local team members (national consultants, local experts, government officers and academics). In addition, the same group of consultants, national and international, was also engaged to compile the fBUR and to be reasonably available for mid/long-term consultations.*

**What would you have done differently, or do you advise the next project team to consider in this context?**

*The intention of the project team was to engage as many national experts as possible. However, number of experts has been very small in climate change area (contrary to environment protections, for example), so there are limited pull of experts to choose from. However, I had the opportunity to make the things different. That is, I would structured significant working packages and hired consortiums of local consultants, so it can reduce the administrative load to the project team, which could be invested more efficiently in substantive technical aspects of the project. An example could be to make a roadshow to empower the ministerial level (i.e., Energy, Agriculture, Economy, Treasury, etc.) for the fBUR outputs and to propose a national dialogue on mitigation based on GHG inventory and previsible climate finance.*

**Additional remarks**

The project accumulated a significant delay due to the lack of capacities to manage the project. I would recommend to the next project team to hire people with experience (as Gov. officers, ex-employees from national communities or mitigation projects, and people that shown a legitimate interest into be taken under consideration during project activities). Also, due to constant staff turn-over in national institutions, it is necessary to secure continuity in climate change policy development, so it could be good to create a national roster of climate professionals with all of them.

*Institutional arrangements*

**Please, summarize an overview of the institutional arrangements for the project implementation.**

*Project was managed and implemented by UNDP CO Dominican Republic, in line with the UNDP Programming for Results Management User Guide. The MoE act as the project implementing partner and CNCCMDL was the main implementing partners. UNDP CO acted as the executing agency.*

*The Project Board was established gathering representatives of Directorate for Climate Change (UNFCCC co-Focal Point) and the Viceminister for International Cooperation of the Ministry of Environment (GEF Focal Point) and the Technical Directorate of the CNCCMDL (where NAMA and CDM focal point sits). Altogether, 5 Project Board meetings were organized in order to review project progress, approve project work plans, approve major project deliverables.*

*The Project Team consisted of Project Coordinator and Technical-Administrative Assistant. The Project Coordinator (PC) managed the project on a day-to-day basis and served as a main coordinator of all technical teams/experts.*

*A comprehensive framework of public and private institutions has supported the project, including Ministry of Energy and Mines, National Energy Commission, Dominican Municipal League, Transport Institute, Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development, National Statistics Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Livestock, Dominican Corporation of State-owned Companies, Ministry of Treasury, Ministry of Women, Ministry of Youth, Ministry of Education, Universities (as PUCMM, UNPHU, INTEC, UAFAM, ISA and UASD), Cement Producers Association, Industries Association, Central Bank, Local Banks (as Popular, BHD and Reservas), private energy and public water utilities, forestry chamber, and many others. Also, the civil society and local NGOS identified under the national climate change framework (e.g., IDDI, Pronatura, Sur Futuro, Fundación Popular, Grupo Jaragua, etc.) participate actively.*

**Please, describe the composition of the project team.**

*The project team consisted of a Project Coordinator (PC) and a Project Assistant (PA). PC counts with over 10 year working in climate change and is a Ph.D. candidate, and PA assistance is a master degree with over 7 years of experience in environment issues. This team was leaded by Ms. Patricia Abreu, Viceminister of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. At UNDP CO level, project and the team were supervised and assisted by the Program Officer of Environmental Sustainability and Resilience UNIT: Ms. María Eugenia Morales and its Project Manager Mr. Roberto Vargas. From MoE was Ms. Kenia Féliz. Mr. Federico Grullón from CNCCMDL provided a lot of support when needed.*

**Will the team remain in place, even after the project has fully closed?**

*The team works on few proposals (for example, NC4 and BUR2 proposal), but its anticipated these such projects does not start immediately. However, Project Assistance already holds a position in MoE (she was assigned to the fBUR for 1 year after to win an internal contest) and has comeback in Environmental Quality Directorate. Project Coordinator will be referred to a local university to works on applied research and educational programs (for climate change mitigation, adaptation, and SDG). Both of them will most probably will come back to the office, if it is possible.*

**Were gender considerations taken into account during the project design and implementation? If so, how?**

*fBUR presents a step forward in relation to making linkages between gender and climate change. Although not be planned within the ProDOC, based on UNDP gender toolkit, a Gender and Climate Change in is preparation. The study pretends gather goods practices on gender and climate change, which can be linked to any other development climate change project. Among these such goods practices are to include women in project decision-making positions, access to information and identify opportunities for women within all aspects of the projects. The set of recommendations to be provided, should be taken into consideration in developing as NC4, BUR2, ICAT-A and CBIT.*

*In addition, trough and invitation of the CNCCMDL the project participated at local workshops related to gender and climate change. This resulted in development of gender action plan, which can be implemented it upcoming projects.*

**Which were the strengths and weaknesses of the institutional arrangements used?**

*The institutional arrangements used for this project followed usual practice of UNDP led project implementation. The model includes specifically project team working on its implementation, as well as close cooperation with the national partners. This proved to be very effective. It helped building national ownership (especially in the cases when national capacities are weak), provided certain level of necessary flexibility, but also helped creating linkages between relevant national authorities (which, although logical, does not come naturally). The weakness in this arrangement is related to the strong sense of ownership shown by MoE and CNCCMDL which makes (in some cases) compete but collaborate. This is not a bad sign, but it was necessary to manage a strong damage control approach to be successful.*

**What suggestions have you to make regarding the institutional arrangements for future NC/BUR work?**

*Since there were no shortcomings in implementation, it is suggested that the same approach in institutional arrangements is applied for future NC/BUR work. This proved to be working well in development of such documents. In addition, as mentioned above close cooperation with national partners is essential especially for building national ownership and raising capacities of national stakeholders to enable them to continue established practice in the future. If it’s possible for MoE and CNCCMDL they could dedicate at least 1 person to the project on a full –time basis.*

Additional remarks

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Technical support from GSP, CGE, or other bodies*

**Has the project team, or members of the project team, participated in national, regional or global training events organized by a centre of excellence or above mentioned body during the course of the project? If yes, please, specify the training event(s).**

*The project team participated in 1 regional workshops (Red-INGEI, which is supported by GSP) on BUR/NC preparation. In addition, the project has been invited to Cuba to exchange experiences with other countries on project issues of common interest. However, after such workshop, the ideas were brought up to include in next project to organise regional exchange meetings regularly (once, or twice a year) with the support of UNDP and other donors. It has not been formally proposed, due to the lack of previsible finance for this activities.*

**What has been the contribution of this participation to the project results?**

*The Red-INGEI countries (Latin-American) are more advances or (at least) at the same level of DR regarding international reporting. Exchange of experiences over the same issues was invaluable, since we have quite similar problems, institutional and legal arrangements, and consequently solutions are quite similar. fBUR supported institutions to be accepted by Red-INGEI and Red-INGEI participate in the national GHG inventory external revision.*

**What identified knowledge gaps holding back the proper implementation of the NC project could not be addressed by any of the above-mentioned bodies?**

*Some of the issues mentioned within NC3 (as projections, roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders within national MRV) were dealt with during implementation of fBUR. However, the elements that might be improved in the future regard improvement of GHG Inventory data, based on Red-INGEI and/or UNFCCC in-country visits, for example. Most of their recommendations will be included in the next reporting period, which coincides with development of NC4 and BUR3. This will tackle national emission factors, upgrade of Tiers in some sub-sectors etc.*

**In addition to capacity building support, what other assistance did the project team receive during project implementation? (E.g. review of draft report, technical backstopping of international expert)**

*The project coordinator received regular advice from GSP, specifically from Mr. Damiano Borgono, in relation to no be left behind, dissemination of information, experience exchange and similar. The GSP cooperation was especially valuable and project team is looking for opportunities to work with GSP/Red-INGEI. All information received were accurate, timely and reliable, which created an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect, as well as a sense of being part of something bigger. fBUR has motivated to DR counterparts to use the Red-INGEI due to its massive knowledge. Also, the project team received technical and administrative support from the UNDP CO (Environmental Sustainability and Resilience team and other UNDP Units such as Communications, Procurement).*

1. **Next steps**

**How will findings of the project be further disseminated, if at all?**

*The fBUR will be printed and disseminated to all relevant national institutions within the country. The findings from the Report will also be presented on relevant national fora, private sector, and academics and general public. Its anticipated to present main findings to the National Council for Climate Change and CDM and, possibly to the very Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Mr. Angel Estevez. In addition, findings and recommendations from fBUR will be used for development of new project proposals, including NC4 and BUR2.*

**Are balance funds available under the NC/BUR project going to be used to identify the strategy of the next report?**

*Yes. During the process of development of fBUR was identified the need to support/ finance any preliminary activities for next report (i.e., to prepare the PIF/PRODOC documents, validation workshops, etc.). This avoids temporal gaps and secure the work flows for institutions and all established teams, and avoid further duplicity with other funds also.*

**At full project closure, is there a person or institute to whom one can turn in case there are follow-up questions to the NC/BUR?**

*On the side of the Government:*

*Ms. Patricia Abreu: to* [*patricia.abreu@ambiente.gob.do*](mailto:patricia.abreu@ambiente.gob.do) */ cc: ruth.cedano@ambiente.gob.do*

*Mr. Ernesto Reyna: to* [*e.reyna@cambioclimatico.gob.do*](mailto:e.reyna@cambioclimatico.gob.do) */ cc:* [*despacho@cambioclimatico.gob.do*](mailto:despacho@cambioclimatico.gob.do)

*On the side of UNDP Dominican Republic:*

*Ms. María Eugenia Morales: to* [*maria.morales@undp.org*](mailto:maria.morales@undp.org) */ cc:* [*Roberto.vargas@undp.org*](mailto:Roberto.vargas@undp.org)

Also, Mr. Rafael Berigüete, fBUR Project Coordinator has expressed his availability and disposition to collaborate with all aspects regarding the fBUR and relevant works, documents and outputs. Mr. Berigüete can be emailed anytime to:

[beriguete.re@gmail.com](mailto:beriguete.re@gmail.com) o [rb@brightlineinstitute.org](mailto:rb@brightlineinstitute.org)

**Has the Government expressed interest to further work with UNDP on the next coming report? If no, please explain.**

*Yes, we are currently with MoE and CNCCMDL drafting the NC4 and BUR, specifically preparing the project proposals.*

1. **Additional information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | February 2019. |
| Name and e-mail address of person who completed this template | Rafael Berigüete  +18094968002  rafael.beriguete@undp.org / beriguete.re@gmail.com |
| Others involved in completion of this template (names of individuals and their institutions) | Maria Eugenia Morales (UNDP)  Roberto Vargas (UNDP) |
| In case a terminal evaluation report has been produced, please link it here. | n/A |
| Other attachments | n/A |