# FINAL REPORT OF MONTENEGRO’S THIRD NATIONAL COMMUNICATION PROJECT

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).

## Details of the project

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project’s title | **Development of Montenegro’s Third National Communication to UNFCCC** |
| PIMS number | 5817 |
| Overall budget  including GEF grant  including co-financing | 580.000 USD  500.000 USD  80.000 USD (Government – in-kind) |
| Duration of implementation | May 2016 – May 2020 |
| Planned duration of project | May 2016 - May 2020 |
| Implementing partner | UNDP Montenegro |
| Team Leader’s name and contact details | Tomica Paovic – [Tomica.paovic@undp.org](mailto:Tomica.paovic@undp.org) |
| Link to final report |  |

## 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 TNC project document was developed in cooperation between national consultant and UNDP programme manager, and in close communication with national partners, primarily Ministry for Sustainable Development and Tourism (MSDT) – Directorate for Climate Change.*

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

*The project proposal was discussed with main national partners at three main project design stages: preparation phase, 1st Draft and Final Draft. The major project partners involved were:*

* *Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism – Directorate for Climate Change and Mediterranean Affairs – overall coordination and communication regarding all project activities*
* *Nature and Environment Protection Agency (NEPA) and State Statistical Office (MONSTAT) – activities related to GHG Inventory*
* *Ministry of Economy – mitigation*
* *Hydro-meteorological Institute – adaptation and climate data.*

**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) |  | Youth movements |
|  | Local Governments |  | Indigenous peoples’ representatives |
|  | National universities |  | Environment or climate related NGOs |
|  | Domestic Research Centers |  | Other NGOs/CSOs |
|  | Media |  | Others (specify) |

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

*There were five major objectives identified during the preparatory phase:*

* *Collect new GHG inventory data for two additional years, 2016-2017, and improve/recalculate previous time series where needed.*
* *Develop GHG emission projections up to 2030.*
* *Develop new climate models, and adaptation measures for specific selected sectors.*
* *Provide legal expertise to the Directorate for Climate Change in the process of transposition of EU legislation related to climate change.*
* *Provide support in raising awareness on climate change issues.*

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

*One of the challenges was to define whether and how the GHG emission projections will be developed, since there was quite limited experience in Montenegro on this, and there was no institution in charge of projections development on the national level.*

*The other challenge was related to finding the common ground between various players in relation to the adaptation sectors to be included in the project design.*

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

Importance of institutional positioning of GHG emission projections was well recognised during the planning phase, as well as importance of collecting new GHG inventory data.

## Project implementation phase

Technical components

1. **GHG inventory**

**Base year of the GHG inventory: 1990.**

**Base years used in previous GHG inventories: 1990.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outcome | **National GHG Inventory Updated** |
| Expected output 1 | Activity data, required by IPCC 2006 guidelines, collected and analysed, data gaps filled, and inventory and database improved where needed; |
| Expected output 2 | Emission factors for key source categories prepared and recalculated; |
| Expected output 3 | Through development of the annual data collection plan, the GHG inventory data collection and analysis process maintained and national data collection capability enhanced and strengthened; |
| Expected output 4 | GHG inventories under the NC for all sectors (energy, IPPU, AFOLU, waste) and all gases considered in IPCC 2006 guideline for the years 2014-2017 prepared; |
| Expected output 5 | An analysis of key GHG emitting sectors (energy, IPPU, AFOLU, waste) carried out, procedures and arrangements for collection and archiving of data and role of institutions involved in preparation of GHG inventory described, and uncertainty analysis conducted; |
| Expected output 6 | Improved input data and GHG inventory especially for AFOLU (agriculture, forestry and other land-use) sector; |
| Expected output 7 | Constraints facing national inventories per sectors reviewed; |
| Expected output 8 | Quality assurance and Quality control plan developed and procedures for the QA/QC for the inventory data applied. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final outcome | **National GHG Inventory Updated** |
| Final output 1 | Activity data, required by IPCC 2006 guidelines, collected and analysed, data gaps filled, and inventory and database improved where needed; |
| Final output 2 | Emission factors for key source categories prepared and recalculated; |
| Final output 3 | Through development of the annual data collection plan, the GHG inventory data collection and analysis process maintained and national data collection capability enhanced and strengthened; |
| Final output 4 | GHG inventories under the NC for all sectors (energy, IPPU, AFOLU, waste) and all gases considered in IPCC 2006 guideline for the years 2014-2017 prepared; |
| Final output 5 | An analysis of key GHG emitting sectors (energy, IPPU, AFOLU, waste) carried out, procedures and arrangements for collection and archiving of data and role of institutions involved in preparation of GHG inventory described, and uncertainty analysis conducted; |
| Final output 6 | Improved input data and GHG inventory especially for AFOLU (agriculture, forestry and other land-use) sector; |
| Final output 7 | Constraints facing national inventories per sectors reviewed; |
| Final output 8 | Quality assurance and Quality control plan developed and procedures for the QA/QC for the inventory data applied. |

**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).**

*All outputs related to GHG Inventory were achieved. GHG Inventory was updated for two additional years, using 2006 IPCC Guidelines, for all sectors (energy, IPPU, AFOLU and waste) and all gasses (not covered by Montreal Protocol). National emission factors were used, especially in energy sector (for lignite). For the first time State Statistical Office used national data from the national laboratory connected to the Thermo Power Plant, thus improving quality of data in energy balances and subsequently energy sector of GHG Inventory. In addition, whole time series were recalculated accordingly.*

*Data were significantly improved in AFOLU sector as well. State Statistic Office partnered with the Directorate for Emergency Management (within Ministry of Interior) and obtained new data on forest fires, as well on cutting the forest. Consequently, it turned that emissions from AFOLU were higher (and without sinks), which is the major change in comparison to previous inventories.*

*QA/QC was done by the international expert provided through the support of the Global Support Programme (GSP).*

*In addition, in November 2018, in-country visit of the UNFCCC experts was organised in Montenegro, with the aim to go through the existing GHG Inventory and provide recommendations for its improvement. As a result of one week in-country expert mission set of recommendations was provided, with the aim to overcome the gaps and improve reliability and accuracy of data. Some recommendations were included in SBUR, while the most of them were incorporated within the TNC.*

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

*Nature and Environment Protection Agency is in charge of GHG Inventory on national level. Input data were collected by both State Statistical Office and NEPA, while NEPA was then calculating GHG emissions.*

*For this reporting cycle, both NEPA and MONSTAT had to engaged additional expertise (apart from their employees) in order to cover specific sectors, like e.g. AFOLU and Waste.*

*In addition, recommendations from the UNFCCC in-country expert visit were used as well, in order to improve quality of data.*

*QA/QA was done by the international experts, with the support of GSP. Most of the recommendations were incorporated in this reporting period, while some will be included in the next reporting period (during preparation of TBUR).*

*At the end of the process GHG Inventory was updated with data for two additional years, 2016-2017, using 2006 IPCC Guidelines, previous series were recalculated, data were significantly improved in AFOLU sector, national emission factor was used in energy.*

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

*UNFCCC in-country expert visit was extremely useful for improvement of the quality of data. This should be repeated periodically in order to improve quality of national inventory report.*

1. **Mitigation actions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outcome(s) | **Climate Change Mitigation - Report on mitigation measures developed and analysis of mitigation options prepared** |
| Expected output 1 | Capacity assessment for emission projections and their institutional set up conducted and short list of at least three options for institutional set up for projections presented to decision makers for their review and decision. The proposed three institutional solutions for projections should be ranked. |
| Expected output 2 | GHG emissions and sinks projections for the period 2020-2030. Projections should account for energy and non-energy sectors in line with division to ETS and non-ETS sectors in order to benefit national planning and alignment with EU acquis. |
| Expected output 3 | Analysis and possibilities related to mitigation presented in the SNC/FBUR reviewed and upgraded, including progress on implementation of the National Climate Change Strategy. |
| Expected output 4 | Necessary data and relevant information for scenario development collected, analysed and used in the scenario development. |
| Expected output 5 | Mitigation scenarios with existing measures (WEM) and with additional measures (WAM) until 2030 for abatement of GHG emissions considering socio-economic trends developed. |
| Expected output 6 | A GHG emission abatement action plan until 2030 developed. |
| Expected output 7 | Long-term mitigation possibilities analysed and proposed. |
| Expected output 8 | Potential for GHG emission reduction paths updated and mapped out and forward-looking set of policy framework and recommendations outlined. |
| Expected output 9 | Improved assessment of GHG mitigation options, measures related to NC. |
| Expected output 10 | Capacity for collecting and analysing information on policy and mitigation measures strengthened. |
| Expected output 11 | REDD possibilities considered and evaluated. |
| Expected output 12 | Stakeholder consultation workshops, and awareness raising activities conducted, booklets and information materials disseminated, quarterly policy briefs in the form of 2 pager or infographics on various CC themes produced. |
| Expected output 13 | Redesign of the national climate change clearing mechanism i.e. [www.unfccc.me](http://www.unfccc.me) in order to reinstate it as the most important repository of climate change related knowledge on national level. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final outcome(s) | **Climate Change Mitigation - Report on mitigation measures developed and analysis of mitigation options prepared** |
| Final output 1 | Capacity assessment for emission projections and their institutional set up conducted and short list of at least three options for institutional set up for projections presented to decision makers for their review and decision. The proposed three institutional solutions for projections should be ranked. |
| Final output 2 | GHG emissions and sinks projections for the period 2020-2030. Projections should account for energy and non-energy sectors in line with division to ETS and non-ETS sectors in order to benefit national planning and alignment with EU acquis. |
| Final output 3 | Analysis and possibilities related to mitigation presented in the SNC/FBUR reviewed and upgraded, including progress on implementation of the National Climate Change Strategy. |
| Final output 4 | Necessary data and relevant information for scenario development collected, analysed and used in the scenario development. |
| Final output 5 | Mitigation scenarios with existing measures (WEM) and with additional measures (WAM) until 2030 for abatement of GHG emissions considering socio-economic trends developed. |
| Final output 6 | A GHG emission abatement action plan until 2030 developed. |
| Final output 7 | Long-term mitigation possibilities analysed and proposed. |
| Final output 8 | Potential for GHG emission reduction paths updated and mapped out and forward-looking set of policy framework and recommendations outlined. |
| Final output 9 | Improved assessment of GHG mitigation options, measures related to NC. |
| Final output 10 | Capacity for collecting and analysing information on policy and mitigation measures strengthened. |
| Final output 11 | REDD possibilities considered and evaluated. |
| Final output 12 | Stakeholder consultation workshops, and awareness raising activities conducted, booklets and information materials disseminated, quarterly policy briefs in the form of 2 pager or infographics on various CC themes produced. |
| Final output 13 | Redesign of the national climate change clearing mechanism i.e. [www.unfccc.me](http://www.unfccc.me) in order to reinstate it as the most important repository of climate change related knowledge on national level. |

**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).**

*All planned outputs were achieved through the process of development of Mitigation Chapter for TNC. The most important results are described below.*

*The specific excel tool for calculating GHG emission projections up to 2030 was for the first time developed for Montenegro. The starting point of the assessment was 2015 greenhouse gas inventory, while emission estimates under ‘without measures’, ‘with existing measures’ and ‘with additional measures’ scenarios were developed.*

*The mitigation measures assessed in the WEM and WAM scenarios were obtained from national strategic and planning documents as well as from stakeholder consultation. A total of 23 measures (12 in the stationary energy sector, 2 in the mobile energy sector, 2 in the industrial process sector, 5 in the AFOLU sector, and 2 in the waste sector) were prioritised and assessed for their GHG emission reduction potential and economic effectiveness.*

*Under the WAM scenario (which includes the impact of the WEM scenario), by 2030, annual GHG savings of 2,160 Gg CO2 are anticipated. The most effective measures are reducing the areas subject to wildfires and generating more power from renewable sources. This is an ambitious reduction in GHG emissions, but highlights what could be achieved if all the additional measures were put in place.*

*Options for reducing emissions through REDD+ were explored as well. For the time being Montenegro did not use such a programme. However, it may also be possible for Montenegro to explore further and reduce emissions through the REDD+ programme, which focuses on reducing emissions from deforestation and/or forest degradation, while supporting the conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.*

*Since the Projections were not institutionally placed in any of the national institutions, several scenarios were developed and discussed offering possible solution. Given options were thoroughly considered by the national partners, and the agreement was made with the Directorate for Climate Change and NEPA about one specific scenario.*

*During the lifetime of the project, legal expertise was provided to the Directorate for Climate Change for two major draft laws:*

* *Ratification of Paris Agreement in the national Parliament (ratified in November 2017) – for this purpose socio-economic analysis was conducting, showing budgetary and social implications of implementation of Paris Agreement and NDC.*
* *Development of the draft Law on Protection against Adverse Impacts of Climate Change (adopted in December 2019, including provisions related to ETS, MMR, as well as GHG emission projections).*

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

*International expert company was engaged to develop the excel tool relevant for Montenegrin circumstances. Input data for the agreed mitigation measures were obtained through broad national consultation processes, i.e. meetings with relevant national partners (e.g. Thermo-power Plant, Aluminium Plant, Ministry of Economy - energy and energy efficiency, Ministries in charge of waste, agriculture, forestry etc). Both the excel tool, and the report produced based on the tool were shared and discussed with number of relevant national partners/stakeholders in preparation phase, as well as at the level 1st and final draft.*

*At the end, national consultation workshop was organised in order to present the tool and inform all interested parties of the outcome of the process.*

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

*Input data are extremely important in the whole process. At the national level (at least in case of Montenegro), data can hardly be gathered without solid national expert, since most of the required data are not publicly available or are hardly accessible.*

1. **Vulnerability & Adaptation for NC or MRV for BUR**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outcome(s) | **Vulnerability Assessment & Adaptation to climate change (V&A)** VA for key priority sectors extended and for new identified sectors developed |
| Expected output 1 | Current climate change and the impact on socio-economic development of Montenegro described and analysed. |
| Expected output 2 | Climate change scenarios revised using appropriate models, expert’s capacity on modelling climate change scenarios strengthened. |
| Expected output 3 | Vulnerability assessments for all sectors (water resources, coastal area, biodiversity, agriculture and forests, public health) conducted. |
| Expected output 4 | Progress in implementation of adaptation actions proposed in the SNC assessed. The adaptation plan for most vulnerable sectors (water resources, agriculture and public health), including cost-benefit analysis prepared. |
| Expected output 5 | Develop models of possible hazards with related costs, as well as impacts (e.g. rise of the sea level), in order to increase adaptation capacities, i.e. define proper adaptation measures. |
| Expected output 6 | Framework for effective integration of adaptation measures into national strategies identified. |
| Expected output 7 | A public campaign - to inform and raise awareness among the population about the impact of climate change on health with a special focus on vulnerable groups conducted. |
| Expected output 8 | Adaptation of health sector to climate change in order to protect population health, including Vulnerability Assessment Study, National Heat Health Action Plan and National Health Climate Change Adaptation Strategy prepared. |
| Expected output 9 | Adaptation to climate change in water resources management prepared. |
| Expected output 10 | Adaptation to climate change in agriculture with special emphasis on drought and irrigation plan prepared. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final outcome(s) | **Vulnerability Assessment & Adaptation to climate change (V&A)** VA for key priority sectors extended and for new identified sectors developed |
| Final output 1 | Current climate change and the impact on socio-economic development of Montenegro described and analysed. |
| Final output 2 | Climate change scenarios revised using appropriate models, expert’s capacity on modelling climate change scenarios strengthened. |
| Final output 3 | Vulnerability assessments for all sectors (water resources, coastal area, biodiversity, agriculture and forests, public health) conducted. |
| Final output 4 | Progress in implementation of adaptation actions proposed in the SNC assessed. The adaptation plan for most vulnerable sectors (water resources, agriculture and public health), including cost-benefit analysis prepared. |
| Final output 5 | Develop models of possible hazards with related costs, as well as impacts (e.g. rise of the sea level), in order to increase adaptation capacities, i.e. define proper adaptation measures. |
| Final output 6 | Framework for effective integration of adaptation measures into national strategies identified. |
| Final output 7 | A public campaign - to inform and raise awareness among the population about the impact of climate change on health with a special focus on vulnerable groups conducted. |
| Final output 9 | Adaptation to climate change in water resources management prepared. |
| Final output 10 | Adaptation to climate change in agriculture with special emphasis on drought and irrigation plan prepared. |

**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 main reasons (e.g. lack of data, risk of duplication of work done in the context of parallel projects, among others).**

*The climate models were developed based on the official data from the Hydro-meteorological Institute and relevant methodology. In addition, individual studies on impacts of climate change in various sectors were developed, including set of adaptation measures for each of the segments selected. The studies refer to: adaptation measures for the protection zones of the water supply springs; forests in the national parks of Montenegro; invasive species in the Adriatic Sea; projections of the surface sea water temperature; agriculture with the focus on droughts; adaptation in the urban areas of Montenegro.*

*In relation to the health sector (Output 8), Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism and WHO agreed on development of the strategy on the impact of climate change on health. Consequently, based on the thorough discussion with the Ministry and Institute for Public Health, it was decided to proceed with the work on heat waves, which was very relevant for Montenegro (e.g. 44.8ºC was measures in Podgorica on 24th August 2007).*

*In relation to public awareness raising, training programme for primary and secondary school teachers was developed and accredited by the Bureau of Education. After that, training workshops were organised during 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 school year, for more than 200 primary and secondary school teachers from all Montenegrin municipalities. In addition, education manual for teachers was developed providing information on climate change (mitigation, adaptation, GHG emissions, weather, climate etc), with the focus on Montenegrin context as well as providing set of related exercises which could be implemented with pupils.*

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

*Just like in the process of SNC, the major national partner in implementation of this segment was Institute for Hydrometeorology and Seismology. They developed climate models, using relevant methodology and latest official data. They provided relevant information on changes in climate which could be expected in Montenegro (like: heat waves, rainfalls, storms, droughts etc).*

*The separate studies were developed by individual experts for their specific sectors. The content of the studies was agreed through the thorough consultations process led by the Directorate for Climate Change, having in mind that they were supposed to be step forward in comparison to information/measures covered within the SNC. At the end, data from all developed studies were compiled in the form of the Adaptation Chapter.*

*The process showed significant lack of expertise on the national level, especially in health, forestry and agriculture sectors. It was very hard to motivate experts in those sectors to be engaged, and even when engaged the monitoring of the quality of the reports was constant.*

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

*Institute for Hydrometeorology and Seismology is reliable partner in providing national climate data and developing climate models.*

*However, the whole process revealed that there are several sectors were significant capacity building would have to be done on the national level (e.g. forestry, agriculture, health). Any future vulnerability assessments would have to be done in combination with international expertise.*

*Hopefully, the development of National Adaptation Plan (NAP) will provide possibilities for raising capacities of national experts in various sectors.*

1. **Constraints and Gaps/Support needed**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outcome | **Description of constraints and gaps, financial, technical and capacity needs –** Chapter on technological, financial and capacity building needs and gaps developed |
| Expected output 1 | Needs, gaps and priorities for education, training and public awareness identified and programmes prepared. |
| Expected output 2 | Information on financial, technical and capacity needs and constrains associated with the fulfilment of the national obligations under UNFCCC updated. |
| Expected output 3 | Progress on actions expected or implemented to address the restrictions, gaps and needs identified for the fulfilment of the national obligations under UNFCCC on the basis of the previous NCs assessed. |
| Expected output 4 | Financial resources, technology transfer and technical assistance received from the GEF, Annex I Parties and other developed country Parties, the GCF and multilateral institutions for GHG mitigation activities assessed. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final outcome | **Description of constraints and gaps, financial, technical and capacity needs -**  Chapter on technological, financial and capacity building needs and gaps developed |
| Final output 1 | Needs, gaps and priorities for education, training and public awareness identified and programmes prepared. |
| Final output 2 | Information on financial, technical and capacity needs and constrains associated with the fulfilment of the national obligations under UNFCCC updated. |
| Final output 3 | Progress on actions expected or implemented to address the restrictions, gaps and needs identified for the fulfilment of the national obligations under UNFCCC on the basis of the previous NCs assessed. |
| Final output 4 | Financial resources, technology transfer and technical assistance received from the GEF, Annex I Parties and other developed country Parties, the GCF and multilateral institutions for GHG mitigation activities assessed. |

**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).**

*The chapter on constraints and gaps provides an overview of the limitations, gaps, and needs relating to the preparation of technical components for both this and future national reports, and for implementation of recommended measures for reducing GHG emissions and for adaptation to climate change. Some of the proposed measures imply stimulating different forms of research, the collection of data necessary for monitoring the impact of climate change, the development of models and projections, as well as strengthening inter-institutional cooperation.*

*This report identified constraints and gaps in how effectively Montenegro can:*

1. *Understand its key climate related risks and impacts and track progress and ambition and guide observers and decision makers on action. This is traditionally known as Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV).*
2. *Mobilise real climate mitigation and adaptation actions that will help Montenegro develop sustainably and meet a range of sustainable development goals.*

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

*The chapter was developed by the international expert company, engaged also for development of GHG emission projections. Thus, they had thorough insight into the Montenegrin circumstances related to lack of data, national capacities, national policies in place, various on-going projects etc.*

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

*Lack of data poses one of the main limitations for Montenegro in understanding the risks and vulnerabilities as well as viable mitigation options. This lack of data also poses problems in drafting reports with tangible, numerical details of mitigation options and their costs and returns on investment.*

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.**

*The general idea behind implementation of each and every activity was to try to increase capacities of national partners and experts. Thus, most of the activities under the adaptation segment were implemented by national experts. The situation was similar with the GHG inventory (external expertise was engaged just for few sectors).*

*In addition, the project worked on raising awareness of educators/teachers of primary and secondary schools, giving them sufficient information and tools to continue with teaching this topic in their classrooms.*

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

40% national consultants, 50% international consultants and 10% national staff.

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

*International consultants were engaged to develop GHG emission projection. There was quite limited experience in projections development in Montenegro (only once LEAP model was used in the process of development of INDC). Thus, it was inevitable to engage international expert support. The same company was also engaged to develop various scenarios for institutionalisation of the GHG emission projections.*

*International consultant was also engaged to work on GHG Inventory QA/QC, since there were no experts on the country level for this.*

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

*Having in mind the complexity of adaptation, as well as lack of National Adaptation Plan, and lack of national expertise, it might be useful for the next reporting period to consider engaging short-term international expertise for specific adaptation sectors.*

**Additional remarks**

*Due to the constant staff turn-over in national institutions, primarily MSDT and Directorate for Climate Change, it is difficult to secure continuity in climate change policy development. In addition, institutionally GHG Inventory team would have to be strengthened with more people (waste sector, compiler etc), so that they are eventually capable of performing reporting without external support, as the time progresses.*

Institutional arrangements

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

*Project was managed and implemented by UNDP CO Montenegro, within DIM authority, in line with the UNDP Programming for Results Management User Guide. UNDP CO acted as the project implementing partner (IP) and executing agency according to DIM.*

*The Project Team consisted of Project Manager and Project Assistant. The Project Manager (PM) managed the project on a day-to-day basis, served as a main coordinator of all technical teams/experts and was in charge of developing National Circumstances Chapter.*

*The Project Board was established gathering representatives of MSDT – Directorate for Climate Change (UNFCCC Focal Point) and Directorate for International Cooperation and EU Integrations (where GEF focal point sits), Nature and Environment Protection Agency, MONSTAT, Ministry of Economy, Hydrometeorological Institute and UNDP. Altogether, eight Project Board meetings were organized in order to review project progress, approve project work plans and approve major project deliverables.*

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

*The project team consisted of Project Manager and Project Assistant. The project team worked concurrently on other related projects, like Development of Second Biennial Update Report.*

*At the CO level, project and the team were supervised by the Team Leader for Environment, while the expert assistance was provided by the IRH RTA and GSP.*

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

*Yes, the team will continue to work on other similar projects, primarily Development of Third Biennial Update Report.*

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

*Yes, the Study on Gender and Climate Change in Montenegro was developed, gathering relevant existing gender disaggregated data. Based on data analysis, set of recommendations was developed, in order to enable development of gender sensitive policies and action plans in the area of climate change.*

*Furthermore, with the expert support of GSP, for the first time national and regional consultations of gender dimension of climate change were initiated. The consultations gathered representatives of both sectors (human rights-gender and climate change), with the aim to discuss points of joint interest, as well as concrete joint actions in the future. As a result of those consultations action plan on mainstreaming gender into climate change was developed.*

**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, i.e. DIM with UNDP being IP. This proved to be very effective, especially in cases were national capacities were quite weak. This enabled engagement of relevant international expertise when needed thus building further national capacities and ownership. In addition, the given structure, through existence of Project Management Board, but also implementation of specific activities, helped improving intersectoral communication and cooperation.*

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

*This proved to be a well working institutional arrangement model, and it is recommended for further implementation of NCs/BURs. The emphasis should be still on building national (technical/expert) capacities in order to overcome constant stuff turn-over, but also to enable specific institutions for future reporting eventually without external support.*

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).**

*Yes, national partners and project team participated in the regional exchange of experiences related to gender and climate change. Three regional trainings were organised, gathering national representatives of both sectors (gender and climate change). Furthermore, regular exchange of experiences was facilitated by the IRH and GSP among project teams from all countries in the region.*

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

*Regional cooperation on gender and climate change triggered national cooperation and consultation processes on this topic, gathering for the first-time national representatives from human rights sector and climate change sector. As a result of this cooperation action plan for mainstreaming gender into climate change was developed.*

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

*Political changes resulting in constant turn-over of staff in national institutions, as well as possibilities to employ new needed staff in the climate change sector (e.g. additional experts in GHG inventory team, Directorate for Climate Change 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)**

*Project team received regular advice and support whenever needed during the project implementation from both RTA and GSP, which was extremely valuable. In addition, GSP provided technical backstopping of international experts for QA/QC of GHG Inventory, as well as for mainstreaming gender into the climate change. Furthermore, GSP participated in provision of expert support during UNFCCC in-country visit for revision of GHG Inventory.*

**Has UNDP provided timely and valuable support during project design and implementation? Please explain.**

*In case of Montenegro, UNDP CO was in charge of designing the project proposal in close cooperation with the national partners and was acting as IP for the project through direct implementation modality.*

## Next steps

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

*The TNC will be printed and disseminated to all relevant national institutions within the country. The findings from the Report will also be presented at the national Working Group on Mitigation and Adaptation.*

*It will also be available on-line, as this is the document which is often very much quoted by various stakeholders.*

*As this is the year when NDC revision is planned, TNC (especially parts related to GHG inventory, GHG emission projections and adaptation) will provide input data for the NDC revision process.*

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

*A small amount of balance funds will be used for identification of lessons learned, as well as for providing recommendations for the next reporting period, i.e. Fourth NC.*

**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?**

*The contact person/institution on the side of the Government would be the Ministry for Sustainable Development and Tourism, i.e. Directorate for Climate Change, where UNFCCC focal point sits.*

*On the side of UNDP, the contact would be Team Leader for Environment, as well as the project team, which will continue to work on implementation of TBUR.*

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

*Yes, the Directorate for Climate Change will work further with UNDP on development of the project proposal for the Fourth NC.*
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