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 and to Eva Huttova, eva.huttova@undp.org.

A. Details of the project

Project's title	Namibia's Third Biennial Update Report (BUR3 NAM) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
PIMS number	6084
Overall budget including GEF grant including co-financing	USD 402,000.00
Duration of implementation	2 years
Planned duration of project	2 years
Implementing partner	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Team Leader's name and contact details	Mr. Reagan Chunga, Cell: +264817839592, sibanga@gmail.com
Link to final report	https://unfccc.int/documents/192581

B. Project identification phase

Duration of preparatory phase (expressed in months) 6 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 project development process was done internally by the Project Coordinator of NCs/BURs, Mr. Reagan Chunga

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

The project preparatory process was done swiftly, and within a short period of time. This was mainly due to the prompt collaboration given by the implementing agency, in this case UNDP in providing comments and inputs and submission to GEF. The response from GEF was also done swiftly and key stakeholders participated actively and in a timely manner.

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

X	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
X	National universities	X	Environment or climate related NGOs
X	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?

The main objectives were:

- To identify areas of future collaborations;
- To identify data gaps;
- To raise awareness on climate change in generally and specifically on reporting requirements to the UNFCCC;
- To explain the roles and data requirements of key institutions in the implementation process;
- To get the high level and political buy-in;
- To strengthen the existing institutional arrangements.

What were the major challenges faced during this phase?

- Limited time
- Availability of key personnel due to their already heavy workloads
- Limited financial resources to reach other stakeholders like local governments

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

- The process helped to identify new stakeholders and sources of data for sectors not previously covered e.g. the HFCs, & PFCs, which has helped in the completeness off the report.

C. Project implementation phase

Technical components

1. GHG inventory

Base year of the GHG inventory: 2014

Base years used in previous GHG inventories: 2012

Expected outcome	National GHG inventory on emissions by sources and removal by sinks prepared for the year 2014
Expected output 1	Further capacity building and sector specific training of the existing GHG inventory working group, to fully cover the 4 IPCC sectors, namely: Energy; Industrial Processes and Product Use (IPPU); Agriculture, Forest and Other Land Use (AFOLU), and Waste
Expected output 2	Further sector specific consultations at high level to further strengthen the existing institutional arrangements in order to sustainably produce quality national reports to the convention
Expected output 3	Activity data for the energy, IPPU, AFOLU and waste sectors collected, quality controlled and fed into the 2006 IPCC software for the year 2016 and emission estimates generated including uncertainty analysis, and Key Category Analysis (KCA)

	with all the steps, procedures, and data documented and added to the existing database
Expected output 4	Emission factors for key source categories improved to represent national circumstance as far as feasible
Expected output 5	Constraints and gaps as well as further capacity building needs are identified and reported in the improvement plan
Expected output 6	A stand-alone National GHG Inventory Report (NIR) is produced and a GHG Inventory chapter for inclusion in the BUR3 is produced

Final outcome	A stand-alone NIR and GHG inventory chapter
Final output 1	2 Capacity building workshops undertaken
Final output 2	One-on-one high-level consultation undertaken
Final output 3	Activity data collected and feed into software, database in place
Final output 4	Country specific emission factor for Enteric Fermentation produced, the rest of the sectors still using default factors
Final output 5	Improvement plan produced and included in the inventory reports

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 project managed to meet all the expected outcomes and outputs as its evident in the BUR3 report submitted to the UNFCCC.

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

- The established GHG working group played a key role in collecting activity data covering the four IPCCC sectors with the coordination of the project coordinator. The data was then quality control from collection. Other data like on imports and exports of key commodities was collected from the Namibia Statistics Agency (NSA), which has its internal QC mechanism. The data was then computed into the 2006 IPCC software to generate results and a report produced by an external consultant. The draft report was shared with the working group, comments were provided and incorporated. A validation workshop was organised where the final report with outcomes and outputs were presented and validated. The whole process followed the 2006 IPCC guidelines.

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

- Its important to document all the steps and processes you go through as this will be very useful during the TTE review and also for the future project teams
- Stakeholder involvement is key to successful implementation of the project as this will make it easier for the data flow

2. Mitigation actions

Expected outcome(s)	Mitigation actions described and their effects investigated
Expected output 1	Further stengtherning the technical capacitiy of the established National Mitigation Working Group

Expected output 2	Consultation with key stakeholders to establish institutional arrangements to ensure for information flow on mitigation actions being implemented or planned by the key stakeholdrs
Expected output 3	Data collection and analysis of relevant information regarding the mitigation actions or group of actions being implemented and being developed and how that contributes to the NDC
Final output 4	Mitigation actions or groups of actions being developed or being implemented described, including, sector, coverage, objectives, methodologies, and mitigation potential estimates and how that contributes to the NDC GHG reduction targets
Final output 5	Investigate the effects of the mitigation actions on other sector
Final output 6	A stand-alone mitigation report produced and a chapter on mitigation for inclusion in the BUR3 produced

Final outcome(s)	Mitigation analysis conducted and report produced and included in final BUR
Final output 1	2 Technical workshops conducted and workshop reports produced
Final output 2	Mitigation chapter produced

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 project managed to meet all the expected outcomes and outputs as its evident in the BUR3 report submitted to the UNFCCC.

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

- The established working group played a key role in terms of data collection on the various mitigation actions, a mitigation analysis was then conducted by the consultant with the help of the working group. A working session was organized to share the draft results, comments and inputs were given and incorporated. The improved mitigation assessment was then circulated prior to the validation workshop where the working group members validated the final report.

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

- It's important to document all the steps and processes you go through as this will be very useful during the TTE review and also for the future project teams
- Stakeholder involvement is key to successful implementation of the project as this will make it easier for the data flow
- It's also important for the project team to familiarize themselves with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines and the various IPCCC reporting methodologies

3. MRV for BUR

Expected outcome(s)	Updated information on domestic MRV
Expected output 1	Support the process of strengthening the national institutional arrangement and frameworks for domestic MRV in relation to the identified mitigation actions
Expected output 2	Update the domestic MRV chapter for the BUR3

Final outcome(s)	Updated chapter on domestic MRV included in BUR3

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 project managed to meet all the expected outcomes and outputs as its evident in the BUR3 report submitted to the UNFCCC.

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

- This outcome was done together with the mitigation assessment as the go hand in hand so similar process was followed as outlined in the mitigation section above

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

- It's important to document all the steps and processes you go through as this will be very useful during the TTE review and also for the future project teams
- Stakeholder involvement is key to successful implementation of the project as this will make it easier for the data flow
- It's also important for the project team to familiarize themselves with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines and the various IPCCC reporting methodologies

4. Constraints and Gaps/Support needed

Expected outcome	Constraints and gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity needs identified and solutions identified
Expected output 1	Updated technology, financial and capacity needs for mitigation assessed
Expected output 2	Review and assess constraints, gaps, technology, financial and capacity needs
Expected output 3	Identify new constraints, gaps, technology, financial and capacity needs
Expected output 4	Indentify and propose solutions to the constraints, gaps, technology, financial and capacity needs
Expected output 5	Information updated on technology needs and technology support received
Expected output 6	Chapter on Constraints and gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity needs, completed and included in the BUR3

Final outcome	Chapter on Constraints and gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity needs, completed and included in the BUR3

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 expected outcomes and outputs of the constraints and gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity needs were all meet as outlined above and in the prodoc. No diversion was made from the original expected outcomes and outputs as evident in the submitted BUR3.

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

- This outcome was done together with the mitigation assessment and MRV as the go hand in hand so similar process was followed as outlined in the mitigation section above

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

- Its important to document all the steps and processes you go through as this will be very useful during the TTE review and also for the future project teams
- Stakeholder involvement is key to successful implementation of the project as this will make it easier for the data flow
- Its also important for the project team to familiarize themselves with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines and the various IPCCC reporting methodologies

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.

- To a certain extent yes, various trainings and capacity building activities were undertaken both locally and internationally. Working group members attend some of these initiatives, however challenges such as staff turn-over and shortage of staff in key stakeholders hindered the progress made in building capacity.
-

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

_____20_____% national consultants. _____70_____% international consultants and ___10_____% national staff.

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

- The GHG inventory was done by the international consultant due to limited capacity within the country and technicality it involves. Working group members saved as data providers.

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

- More training and capacity building is needed for the working group members to be able in the future to fully undertake the work currently been done by the consultants.

Additional remarks

_____

_____

_____

Institutional arrangements

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

- Like previous NCs and BURs, BUR3 was implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism where a Project Management Unit (PMU) was housed. The PMU was responsible for the day to day running of the project. The multi-sectoral National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) served as the project steering committee. Three working groups, namely: The GHG, Mitigation and V&A working group were established through nominations by the Executive Directors who saved as data providers and also gave inputs and guidance to the consultants undertaking the various assessments under the project.

Please, describe the composition of the project team.

- The PMU consists of: Project Coordinator, Project assistant, driver and project officer.

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

- Yes, project team still in place

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

- Not at that time as it was not a requirement, however a gender assessment has now been done

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

- The strength was that the PMU has managed to stay on since BUR1 and TNC that has made it easier and timely into transiting from BUR or NC to the next.
- BURs and NCs are also being managed under one PMU and utilizing the same working group and structures this has made it to be cost effective and take advantage of the synergies between the two.

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

- High level buy-in into the process is still needed in order to fully institutionalize. More awareness and consultations with heads of institutions to explain the importance of BURs and NCs and why the country needs to submit should be done on a regular basis
- Further capacity building and on-going refresher trainings should be conducted

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 center of excellence or above-mentioned body during the course of the project? If yes, please, specify the training event(s).

- Regional hands-on training workshop on identifying and reporting adaptation actions in national communications for the Africa region (Lome, Togo) – 23- 26 July 2018.
- Africa Regional Workshop on the Building of Sustainable National Greenhouse Gas Inventory Management Systems, and the use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Swakopmund, Namibia – 24 – 28 April 2017.
- Hands-on training workshop on the preparation and reporting of mitigation actions for the Africa Region Pretoria, South Africa 21–24 August 2017

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

- The training contributed a lot in terms of understanding the 2006 IPCC guidelines and software. Working group members and the PMU's understanding of the methodologies and guidelines has improved immensely due to their participation in these workshops thereby improving the quality of the BUR.

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

- The trainings helped cover some of the knowledge gaps and they were supplemented with local organized trainings, however data gaps as well as the QA/QC still remain of the key challenges.

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 Global Support Programme (GSP) has been providing support in reviewing the ToRs and also review the technical outcomes, especially the GHG inventory.

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

- Yes, The PMU as well as the ministry work very close with UNDP in project design, where by the prodoc is elaborated between the PMU and UNDP. UNDP has provided valuable support and comments in the prodoc

formulation in a timely manner this has enabled the country to access funding in a very short period from GEF.

D. Next steps

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

- The results are being disseminated at various platforms such as workshops, seminars and other awareness raising platforms and on need basis.

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

- Funding for the next report (BUR4) has already been secured and currently under implementation

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 NCs/BURs PMU staff members are all still on board

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

- Yes

E. Additional information

Date	10 March 2020
Name and e-mail address of person who completed this template	Mr. Reagan Chunga, email: sibanga@gmail.com
Others involved in completion of this template (names of individuals and their institutions)	See working group members below
In case a terminal evaluation report has been produced, please link it here.	
Other attachments	

Name	Institution	Sector
Mr. Petrus Muteyauli	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	National Focal Point
Mr. Reagan Chunga	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Project Coordinator - NCs/BURs
Mr. Rasack Nayamuth	Climagric	Resource persons
Ms. Susan Tise	Ministry of Mines and Energy	Energy
Mr. Edison Hiwanaame	NAMPOWER	
Mr. Abednego Ekandjo	Ministry of Mines and Energy	
Mr. Abraham Hangula	Namibia Energy Institute	
Mr. Natangwe Nekuiyu	Ministry of Works and Transport	
Mr. Naville Geiriseb	Ministry of Works and Transport	
Ms. Charlene Binga		
Mr. Frans Nekuma	Ministry of Industralization, Trade & SME Development	IPPU
Ms. Amalia Nangolo	Ministry of Industralization, Trade & SME Development	
Mr. Festus Oscar	Ministry of Industralization, Trade & SME Development	
Mr. Konzmann Tobias	Ohorongo Cement	
Mr. Paulus Shikongo	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	AFOLU
Ms. Sarafia Ashipala	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	

Mr. Edward Muhoko	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	
Mr. Josephat Katuahupira	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	
Mr. Tony Holbling	MEATCO	
Mr. Heinrich Lesch	Namibia Dairies	
Ms. Fransina Angula	Namibia Statistics Agency	Data Providers
Ms. Saara Niitenge		
Mr. Elijah Saushini		
Mr. Olavi Makutsi	City of Windhoek	Waste
Mr. Stellio Tsauseb	City of Windhoek	
Mr. Clive Lawrence	**Swakopmund Municipality**	