Mid-Term Evaluation of The NAMA Facility

Technical Appendix Series

Submitted to GIZ by LTS International Ltd.

25th November 2016

LTS International Ltd
Pentlands Science Park, Bush Loan
Penicuik, EH26 0PL
United Kingdom

Tel. +44 (0)131 440 5500 | **Fax.** +44 (0)131 440 5501 | **Email.** mail@ltsi.co.uk
Web. www.ltsi.co.uk | **Twitter.** @LTS_Int

Registered in Scotland Number 100833

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Technical Appendix Series Structure

The technical appendix series follows the appendix structure used in the main report. It provides detailed technical analysis for key findings from the MTE work streams. This technical appendix series includes the full MTE methodology and survey documentation.

1 Appendix 1: Inception Report of the NAMA Facility Mid-Term Evaluation

Separate file "Final Inception Report NAMA Facility MTR.pdf"

2 Appendix 2: Full Evaluation Design and Methodology

This appendix details the evaluation approach adopted by the MTE team.

2.1Context of the Evaluation

As programmes evolve, it is important to run independent evaluations to ensure learning and accountability. The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) took place in a very dynamic environment. Its preparation took place over an extended period of time. During this time, the NAMA Facility itself went through a transitional phase. This included fundraising for the fourth call and a leadership transition.

Before and during the preparation of the MTE, the TSU and the Board identified a number of challenges (for example, relating to the project cycle). These were included in the MTE TORs. However, between its third and fourth call the Facility took significant steps towards restructuring. The project cycle has changed significantly and the evaluation of the Outlines has been outsourced to a third party. These changes addressed some of the better understood challenges to pipeline development, project selection and appraisal.

The evaluation has been taking stock of these and other ongoing changes, and has tried to assess to what degree the changes to the Facility's procedures are likely to influence the Facility and its operations. But it is clear that the associated evidence base for this is limited as no practical experiences have been collected yet.

This means that in this phase of dynamic evolution of the evaluandum, it was possible to collect a significant amount of evidence for the challenges that the evaluandum is facing. It was also possible to collect evidence for the fact that the evaluandum is learning and adjusting. However, it was not possible to collect evidence for the question of whether the current strong adjustments will manage to move the Facility in the right direction.

This issue of change/direction has been discussed repeatedly with all stakeholders; in particular with the TSU and the Board. It has also been discussed in some of the interviews with external stakeholders.

2.2Evaluation Framework

2.2.1 ToRs and Evaluation Questions

2.2.1.1 Scope of the evaluation

The ToRs formed the basis for this MTR, with the approach discussed and agreed during the inception phase. The Inception Report (and ToRs annexed) are reproduced in Appendix 1. They contain several groups of different types of statements, evaluation questions and quasi-evaluation questions describing the scope and objective of the evaluation:

- Objectives ("to understand and improve the understanding of ...)
- General Questions ("In general, the evaluation must answer the following questions...")
- An evaluation focus ("the evaluation shall focus on whether the current ....
- Specific evaluation questions, including for the consideration of the TOC
- Evaluation tasks and associated examples of questions (3 pages)

In addition, the ToR defines the share of the attention that shall be given to each of four fields of interest (governance, management, selection and implementation of NSPs and cross-cutting issues). The internal consistency between the evaluation tasks and the overarching questions was not immediately clear without a much deeper understanding of the Facility.

This large number of potentially methodology-defining questions and directions was developed into manageable work streams for the evaluation team. In this process, all evaluation questions, including the examples, were vetted and associated with at least one work stream. However, the concentration into work streams means that some of the example questions might not be fully answered in a direct fashion; instead it means that answers need to be extracted from broader contextual findings across work streams. Generally, in cases of doubt, the evaluation team took its guidance from the overarching evaluation objectives, and decided against a detailed response to some of the detailed questions, in particular those that were characterised as example questions. An overall ('high-level') matrix is presented as Table 1 below. The detailed work stream matrices and instruments were nested under this overall matrix which served as the basis and guidance for the work. In addition, it provided a template for the work stream specific collection of evidence and ultimately the triangulation matrices that serve as supporting internal documentation.

2.2.1.2 Size of the evaluation

In terms of the size of the evaluation, the evaluation team were asked to use 120 consulting days to conduct the MTE.

Table 1 High-level evaluation matrix

Key Questions	Work Stream and Method	Data source	Data level
• Are the strategic objectives of the NAMA Facility as originally described in the KfW and GIZ programme offer being met? (the amended programme offers shall be taken into account e.g. regarding the log frame and theory of change)	multiple methods in the work streams:		
	Portfolio analysis	desk review and interviews	project level
	TOC analysis		programme level
	Climate Finance Gap analysis		global level
• Is any potential (which could be used for improving effectiveness) being missed and/or are any limitations regarding the intended objectives being encountered?	Portfolio analysis	desk review and interviews	project level
	TOC analysis		programme level
	project cycle mapping		programme level
	Climate Finance Gap analysis		global level
• Why do so many project proposals submitted to the NAMA Facility score low on eligibility and feasibility? If projects are deemed to be insufficiently ready to receive funding, what are the main reasons for this, and what are the options for addressing this?	project cycle mapping	desk review and interviews	programme level
	Portfolio analysis		project level
• How is the NAMA Facility being perceived by relevant stakeholders?	perception analysis	desk review and interviews	global level
• What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current project cycle/funding practice?	project cycle mapping	desk review and interviews	programme level
	Portfolio analysis		project level
	ISR		programme level
	TOC analysis		programme level
• What are the main challenges that projects face when going from pre-approval to final approval?	project cycle mapping	desk review and interviews	programme level
	Portfolio analysis		project level
• What are the early challenges faced by NSPs in the first six months of implementation? How can the NAMA Facility change to further support NSPs in the future?	Portfolio analysis	desk review and interviews	project level
	Climate Finance Gap analysis		global level

2.2.2 Work Streams

In order to systematically analyse the various aspects of the Facility, the Evaluation Team defined several work streams. These arose from the discussion of the various levels of evaluation questions and objectives and their regrouping into manageable chunks. The ordering paradigm was that each work stream should look at the system "NAMA Facility" with the specific lens that either describes the portfolio or that describes how the respective aspect of the system (e.g. the underlying theory of change, the institutional system, and the project cycle) influences the ability of the NAMA Facility to reach its objectives.

The following work streams were distinguished:

- TOC
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Institutional Systems Review
- Portfolio Assessment
- Project Cycle Review
- Perception Analysis
- Climate Finance Gap analysis

These work streams were harmonised as far as possible in terms of joint scheduling (of interviews and surveys), but analysed the issues and how well they are supported by evidence, independently. This enabled analysis of issues that might arise from more than one aspect, and strengthened the evidence base for the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Differences in the approaches taken to the evaluation of the work streams arose during the implementation of the evaluation and are discussed in each work stream section.

2.2.3 General Methodological Approach: Hypothesis Updating

Overall, the evaluation is highly qualitative in nature. It is strongly orientated towards the assessment of processes, relationships, policies and politics as well as perception. The approach was formative and utilisation focused, so as to encourage reflection, learning and the production of recommendations that are practical and constructive.

Each work stream followed a similar set of approaches, first focusing on **internal** perspective and then an **external** perspective. Both internal and external elements included document review, key informant and stakeholder interviews, and surveys, but to varying degrees depending on the thematic scope of the work stream. Separating internal and external views and documentations allowed the team to distinguish clearly between perceptions and factual evidence, which was particularly important in this case. It also allowed the internal stakeholders to develop their views and give their opinions in an environment that did not confront them with the more contentious outside view from the start. This allowed the evaluation team to maintain a positive and constructive spirit with the evaluandum throughout the evaluation.

The treatment of evidence and formulation of findings draws on the contribution analysis methodology. From its assessment of the ToC, the evaluation team set a series of hypotheses to be tested through the work stream evaluation exercises. So rather than the evaluation focus being a set of questions, the focus are hypotheses derived from the theory of change, and questions help focus the study on the analysis of evidence to confirm or deny the hypotheses. The basis for these hypotheses were typically that the Facility is running according to plan and optimally suited to fulfil its objectives. These hypotheses were then associated with evidence from the other data collection steps (internal interviews and surveys, document analysis (see reference Appendix 7), external interviews and survey). This evidence could confirm or reject the hypotheses, or provide more detail and differentiation. If and only if the evidence was strong enough, it served for an update of the hypothesis. This update consisted in a reformulation of the hypothesis in the way that was supported by the evidence.

- The existing portfolio adequately meets the NAMA Facility's strategic objectives overall, with NSPs that reflect a balance of the three main strategic objectives.
- The Project Cycle is time efficient
- The project cycle does not harm the "level playing field" for all Delivery Organisations.
- The set-up and application of the selection criteria lead to "balanced" NSPs and a balance of TA and FA DOs.
- The NAMA Facility is funding proposals for which no other funding source is currently available.
- In the Post-Paris World, financing NAMAs will not be important anymore and the NAMA Facility can shut down

While it is not always explicitly documented in the work streams, the hypotheses were only updated when there was necessary and sufficient evidence for updating (see Table 2). Primary data collection was through key informant interviews, for which triangulation was required for strengthening the evidence. Triangulation used document sources and corroboration from alternate respondents. Where less than 2 interviewees expressed consistent opinions or where there were strongly divergent views, these may have been stated in the evaluation narrative if they were considered relevant, but these singular opinions did not influence the revision of hypotheses.

In other words, mere qualitative indications, without triangulation or confirmatory evidence were considered insufficient for updating a hypothesis. Only where the evidence was considered strong, would the hypothesis be updated. This meant that explanation of issues was built into the design, so findings include reasons why (a real value of theory based approaches). For example, the persistent perception ("outsiders hypothesis") that the outline selection process is tilted towards GIZ could not be supported by any evidence in the project cycle documents or selection criteria. Therefore, the rigorous use of hypothesis updating forced the team to move away from just opinion-based inference and go through other information sources to find evidenced explanations for the existing GIZ bias in the portfolio.

Ultimately, most hypotheses then developed into one or more findings that were well evidenced and could serve as the basis for the formulation of conclusions and recommendations. The Strength of Evidence Protocol from the Inception Report (see below) together with the evaluation question work stream matrix served as the basis for evidence triangulation. The evaluation team prepared work stream specific triangulation matrices that document and identify clearly who said what. The triangulation matrix was used to keep track of the consistency between statements by interviewees. This means that from the full set of triangulation matrices, quotes are attributable to interviewees. These full triangulation matrices are therefore not submitted with the report, to maintain the confidentiality of the interview respondents.

2.2.3.1 Strength of Evidence Protocol

The Strength of Evidence Protocol was applied to the Triangulation Matrix to assess the strength of evidence of findings as they emerged. The protocol included an assessment of the confirmatory strength of evidence in relation to confirming or refuting the change hypothesised through the theory of change.

Emerging findings were monitored iteratively at the end of each data collection phase to enable the team to identify when there is sufficient evidence for an emerging finding to be considered a final result. This meant that subsequent data collection could be focused on data gaps and building strength of evidence against evaluation questions where emerging findings remained unclear. At the end of data collection, a final Strength of Evidence Assessment was made against each final result to ensure that only results that are sufficiently triangulated and supported by evidence are included in the final report. Table 2 summarises strength of evidence protocol.

Table 2 Strength of Evidence protocol

Strength of Evidence	Criteria
High	Triangulation secured through multiple sources, no conflicting alternative findings emerging. High levels of confirmatory evidence.
Moderate	Triangulation of at least two sources; alternative findings present but poorly supported by confirmatory evidence.
Low / Non-Viable	Insufficient triangulation; conflicting alternative findings; insufficient evidence for a clear overarching finding. No confirmatory evidence.

2.2.4 Interviewee Selection

The TORs envisioned 50 interviews. The inception report laid out the sampling strategy for interviews. It was based on a stakeholder analysis that also was the basis of the phasing of the evaluation in internal and external phase. It identified three types of stakeholders to be considered in this mid-term evaluation: 'Insiders', 'Outsiders targeted for interviews' and 'Outsiders potentially relevant for outreach'. The 'Insiders' and 'Outsiders targeted for interviews' groups formed the population of informants from which the sampling strategy of this Midterm Evaluation has been drawn.

2.2.4.1 Insiders

Consistent with the sampling defined in the Inception report, the stakeholder group that the evaluation team termed "insiders" included the ESG, the TSU, and NAMA Facility implementing agencies, and successful applicants, all of which were targeted in the data collection phase. The numbers in parentheses are rough estimates of the population size.

- ESG/funders (4): DE:BMUB, UK:DECC, DK:MEUC, European Commission
- NAMA Facility Delivery Organisations (2): GIZ, KfW Development Bank
    - TSU staff and consultants (~13)
    - Embedded experts within GIZ and KfW Development Bank who interact with or advise the TSU (<10)
    - UDP staff who supported the last selection process (~ 2)

- Successful applicants for the 12 NSPs who are in the pipeline at different stages from calls 1-3, including:
    - Partner ministries in the government (~25)
    - Delivery Organisations (~6 organisations, but probably 12 responsible individuals)
    - Implementing partners (~90)
    - National/International consultants supporting NSPs in pipeline who are not formal delivery or implementation partners (~10, including, *inter alia*, Ecofys, ECN, WRI, CCAP)

2.2.4.2 External stakeholders targeted for interviews

External stakeholders include agencies and organisations associated with unsuccessful NSPs and their consultants, eligible countries that have not submitted NSPs, and current and potential NAMA funders, as well as the International governmental organisations and groups with particular expertise in NAMAs, including those supporting readiness. A subset of these were targeted in the data collection phase. "Outsiders" include:

- Unsuccessful applicants for the 124 NSPs from calls 1-3, including (>500):
    - Partner ministries in the government (up to 250)
    - [potential] Delivery Organisations (unknown, >15 international organisations plus national organisations)
    - [potential] Implementing partners (>250)
    - National/International consultants that supported unsuccessful NSPs who were not formal delivery or implementation partners (NA)
- International organisations with specialized knowledge (25+ organisations, with overlaps):
    - International governmental organisations: UNFCCC, UNDP, UNEP (incl. UDP)
    - Current and potential funders of NAMA readiness and/or implementation: Global Environment Facility (GEF), Green Climate Fund (GCF), CIFs, GIZ Climate Finance Readiness (CF Ready), Denmark's Facilitating Implementation and Readiness for Mitigation (FIRM) implemented through UNDP, IADB, Japan's ODA for Climate Change Measures, Spanish NAMA Platform, Austria's Support for Sustainable Forest Management, as well as other international development funds and other International and Local Development Banks.
    - Collaborations/Partnerships: Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR), NAMA Partnership or the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- Specialised think tanks and consultants, such as the Centre for Clean Air Policy, GNESD and CTCN Network members, World Resources Institute, CDKN, Climate Policy Initiative, Ecofys, ECN, etc.

The resulting sampling scheme is represented in the first four columns of Table 3.

2.2.4.3 Adjustments to the sampling scheme over the course of the evaluation

Over the course of the evaluation, this sampling scheme became increasingly impractical and did not provide the necessary answers. Some of the groups for internal interviews were expanded beyond the original scope, others were reduced. The external interview strategy was altered completely. In some cases, sticking to the original scheme would not have provided representative answers. For example, the critical case sample would have required 27 interviews with country governments, and/or the associated DOs. This was considered infeasible, but a smaller sample would not have given sufficient coverage. Therefore, the number of country and DO interviews was drastically reduced and complemented by an online survey to a sample of ca. 200 individuals who had been associated with submissions of Outlines to calls 1 and 2 (Table 3).

Changes to the Internal Interview Scheme

The interviews with the TSU staff were extremely rich and informative and considered highly efficient for information gathering and triangulation, so it was important to receive full coverage among the technical staff of the TSU, instead of the original subset of TSU staffers. The evaluation team decided to expand the TSU interviews that for that reason, and in particular to understand whether the sense of a personal conflict of interest varied in degree for KfW vs. GIZ staff in the TSU. In short, the complexity of information that was provided through the TSU had been underestimated and the sampling scheme needed to be adjusted.

When learning more about the facility, the border between internal and external stakeholders started to shift. For example, as it became clear that the NSPs under implementation were minimal, it also became clear that the Ministries and DOs associated to NSPs were not necessarily to be considered insiders. They were moved in the second phase to the category for providing outsiders' views.

Changes to the external interview scheme

Primary outsiders that were actively approached for interviews included agencies and organisations associated with successful NSPs and their consultants. Secondary outsiders included non-governmental organisations and groups with particular expertise in NAMAs, including those supporting readiness, as well as unsuccessful submitters. A full list of interviewees can be found in Appendix 6.

In contrast to the expectations in the Inception Report, the primary "outsiders" group ultimately did not include eligible countries that had not sought funding or the wider climate change community. There were a number of reasons for this. One important reason was to avoid confusion as the fourth call for proposals was ongoing in parallel to the evaluation. The broader community that visited the NAMA Facility website was invited to comment and contribute through a banner on www.nama-facility.org that allowed them to get in touch with the evaluation team. This opportunity was taken up by one stakeholder.

When selecting external interviewees, two approaches to data collection from, and interviews with, outside stakeholders were considered and rejected. These include a broad opinion survey among the climate community, e.g. through climate-l, and a direct approach to counterpart governments. The rationale for not including eligible country counterparts contained several reasons. Among them were the limited resources of the evaluation team which had to cover so many different work streams, and the compressed schedule. But there were also other reasons that became clear over the course of the evaluation. Due to some of the sensitive issues that are relevant in the context of the NAMA Facility, including the actual or perceived conflicts of interest and GIZ biases, it was decided that approaching outside stakeholders in specific manners – e.g. through a representative survey – would potentially bear the risks of additional reputational costs to the evaluandum. Therefore the evaluation team treaded carefully and decided not to conduct a public opinion survey – since the interviews were already providing sufficiently critical views from those parties that have a working relationship with the NAMA Facility. These views could have been confirmed or strengthened by a more representative opinion survey, but the added benefit to the evaluation was considered smaller than the potential costs to the NAMA Facility.

Similarly, the idea to consult with the counterpart government as envisioned in the inception report lost relevance and feasibility when the instruments were developed and when the critical case sample (see below) had identified that 27 projects would be needed to understand and asses all directions in which the portfolio composition could have been steering. This was a much larger diversity than had been expected at the time of the inception report. It was considered likely that for each of the 27 projects, at least two and up to 4 interviews would have been necessary in order to get a complete view. This would have exceeded the capacity limits of the evaluation team.

Instead, the interviews sampling strategy was reconsidered, and refocused. The sampling strategy now focused on three groups:

- Successful DOs (100% coverage for TC, 100% coverage of international for FC);
- Expert observers and consultants – with the rationale that they were typically working on more than one NAMA and therefore could provide a broader overview of some questions;
- Intergovernmental organisations: UNDP and UNEP, who are working on NAMAs with countries and the UNFCCC.

To strengthen the evidence base, the interviews were replaced with a broader survey which was addressed to more than 200 individuals that were associated with earlier NSP Outline submissions. Its 38 responses provided valuable insights into the dynamics of NSPs and the Facility, and the challenges that remain to be solved. In addition, the interviews were substituted and complemented with document reviews, including first hand documentation from NAMA-implementing governments (e.g. from the Mitigation Momentum project), and from the stakeholder consultation that the NAMA Facility had conducted.

Table 3 summarises the resulting schedule for the direct interviews.

Table 3 Sampling scheme for key informant interviews from inception report and actual

Stakeholder Group	Est. Population	Targeted for Interviews	Sampling Strategy envisioned in inception report	Actual interviews and primary data collection efforts	Reason
Insiders					
ESG/Funders	4	4	Full coverage	Full coverage	
TSU Staff	~15	8	Full coverage of organisations involved	Full coverage of individuals involved	Institutional perspective seemed to be less relevant on the basis of initial interview than rich personal views and experiences
Pipeline (calls 1-2): 9 NSPs (ministries and delivery partners)	~21	13	Full coverage of calls 1 and 2, 9 NSPs; engage ministry(s) and/or delivery partners, as appropriate	-	Cost benefit analysis demonstrated little added value
UDP	1	1		2	One of them was considered TSU staff.
Insider subtotal		26		19 + online survey	
Outsiders					
Unsuccessful NSPs (calls 1-3): (ministries and Delivery Organisations)	500+	15	"critical case" sampling: those outlines that were closest to being funded; engage ministry(s) and/or delivery partners, as appropriate	Online survey	Critical case interviews would have exceeded team capacity; substituted with interviews with DOs and NAMA-developing consultants
				5	6 representatives of successful DOs were interviewed; most of these were able to report from experiences with more than one NAMA / government
International Organisations (specialized knowledge)	25	10	Full coverage IGOs, includes UNFCCC, GIZ, KfW, other climate finance mechanisms; purposive sampling of bilateral donors and observers; self-sampling	7	3 IGO representatives and 3 non-DO consultants were interviewed, providing an outside view
Outsider subtotal		24		12 + online survey	
Grand total		**50**			

2.2.5 Critical Case Sampling

The desk review and internal perspective phases raised several aspects[1] that were not necessarily reflected in the 9 successful NSPs from the first two calls that were initially reviewed in the portfolio assessment. Therefore, the evaluation team selected NSPs from all three calls to include in the external review phase. Essentially, the critical case selection sought to assess whether promising projects were ultimately not included and if so, to explore the reasons why; as well as to provide additional evidence for all work streams as appropriate.

The critical cases were chosen from the unsuccessful NSP submissions. Evaluators selected critical cases in such a way that they would be able to serve as study cases for as many different issues as possible. These were encapsulated in several criteria, and cases were selected such that each criterion has at least 1 case. NSPs addressing multiple criteria at once were prioritised over NSPs meeting one criterion, yet where several others met the same criterion. Similarly, higher scoring examples within a criterion were prioritised over lower scoring examples (See Table 4). In addition, evaluators selected 2 of the 4 NAMAs funded from outside sources for comparison.

The evaluators reviewed the list with the TSU to confirm that the selections met the intent before proceeding.

Table 4 Critical case disposition by Call[2]

Criterion	Sample disposition
Good scores, but not selected [where a lower scoring project was ultimately selected]	Call 1: 3 Call 2: 0 Call 3: 1
Least Developed Countries (LDCs) [as per OECD definition] with good scores [of 20+ in TSU assessments]	Call 1: 0 Call 2: 0 Call 3: 3
Readiness-supported projects from a diversity of support sources [where known, such as from UNDP, Mitigation Momentum, other BMUB, etc.]	Call 1: Diverse, 1 not German Call 2: 1 Call 3: Diverse, 4 not German
Non-GIZ Delivery Organisations for the Technical Component (e.g. SNV, UNEP, UNDP, CCAP, Carbon Trust)	Call 1: 2 Call 2: 0 Call 3: 5

[1] such as relating to how the eligibility criteria were implemented

[2] The names or other identifying characteristics of individual NSPS have been removed from this summary to preserve confidentiality.

Criterion	Sample disposition
Commercially supported by NAMA specialists even if not formal Delivery Organisation (e.g. Ecofys, ECN, Perspectives) Includes: CCAP and Carbon Trust who were DOs)	Call 1: 3 Call 2: 1 Call 3: 1
Mix of KfW and non-KfW Delivery Organisations for the Financial Component (such as CAF, Development Bank of Southern Africa)	Call 1: KfW - 2; GIZ-1; Other - 2 Call 2: Other - 1 Call 3: KfW – 1; Other - 5
"Special cases" mentioned by interviewees [Note: the majority of special cases mentioned were in call 3]	Call 1: 2 Call 2: 0 Call 3: 4
Resubmissions from previous calls still not selected	Call 2: 0 Call 3: 3
Ineligible from sources that also had eligible or where eligibility changed	Call 1: 1 Call 2: 0 Call 3: 1
Call 3 projects given opportunity to address eligibility issues	Call 3: 2
Mix from all 3 calls [over emphasise call 3, as also analysing 9 successful NSPs from calls 1 and 2]	Call 1: 5 Call 2: 1 Call 3: 5
Mix of regions	Africa: 7 Asia: 1 Central Europe: 1 Latin America: 2
Mix of sectors	Renewable Energy: 4 Energy efficiency: 3 TOD: 1 Biomass/Waste: 3

2.3 Implementation of the Evaluation, Changes to the Evaluation Plan and Justifications

From the Client side, the evaluation was managed by the TSU, and specifically by the M&E focal point at the TSU, Dr. Irene Lorisika. Throughout the evaluation the TSU were interested in and supportive of the evaluation team's work. This was extremely helpful and provided the best possible basis given the formative and utilisation focus of this Mid-term evaluation.

2.3.1 Inception Phase

The inception phase started with a kick-off meeting on May 10th 2016 at the GIZ premises in Berlin. It was attended by the TSU and BMUB, and linked by phone conference with DECC, EKFM and the EU Commission. It served to clarify the approach and identify the focus of the evaluation in the changing context of the fourth call.

The inception phase of this assignment focused on developing a deeper understanding of the NAMA Facility and the TORs. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation consisted of several levels of evaluation questions that needed to be understood and analysed in order to develop an evaluation method based on this understanding. After further developing the evaluation methodology and starting data collection by gathering key documents, the inception report was compiled, proposing the evaluation framework and key methodologies.

In the inception report, the evaluation team described the evaluation strategies and adjusted the evaluation methodologies and approaches proposed in the tender. This report considered how the questions expressed in the ToR and the inception discussions with the NAMA Facility TSU and the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG)[3] could be addressed in an efficient and effective manner in the evaluation.

The inception report also contained the work plan. The work plan structured the evaluation into phases, starting with a first phase of internal consultations (the "internal phase"), to be completed by the time of the first debriefing meeting in late July. After the summer break, a phase of interviews with external stakeholders (the "external phase") was proposed, to provide an alternate set of evidence. The inception report also specified a sampling scheme for interviewees consisting in different groups of stakeholders and the number of

[3] Includes the kick-off meeting held 10.5.2016. The meeting was to officially start the mid-term evaluation of the NAMA Facility. Held at GIZ, with the Donors present, the meeting served to act as a basis to introduce plans for the inception phase, clarify aspects of the evaluation, and for both parties ask key questions in relation to the project.

stakeholders to be interviewed in each group. Table 4 above demonstrates the sampling scheme for key informant interviews from inception report and actual.

The inception phase ended with the submission of the revised inception report on June 8th 2016.

2.3.2 Internal Phase

After the approval of the inception report, the team started with an in-depth document review for each work stream. Documents were provided by the TSU. Several requests for further documentation led to a comprehensive overview of the volumes of documentation available in the TSU. On the basis of the evidence provided in the document reviews, initial hypotheses were formulated for each work stream. The guideline for the formulation of the hypothesis was the "null hypotheses" – translated into qualitative terms as the situation in which everything is functioning exactly as planned.

Internal stakeholders of the Facility are the TSU and the Board. In the internal phase, the evaluation team focused on understanding the level of consistency of opinion within and between these two groups; their levels of information and insight; their analysis of challenges and issues; their views on the need for reform and their expectations of the future. It was possible to interview almost all Board members (for scheduling reasons it was not possible to talk to DEVCO) and all technical TSU staff. A list of interviewees is contained in Appendix 6. After document review, the evaluation team conducted 19 interviews with internal stakeholders. The interviews were complemented by an internal survey among donors and TSU that took stock of some of the internal perceptions on the effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation. In these surveys, almost all stakeholders from these two groups participated. Thus together, between the two instruments the coverage is very good and allows for robust assessments.

The first debriefing meeting at which the preliminary findings were presented to the Board and TSU took place at the end of the internal phase, on August 4th 2016, on the premises of GIZ. It was attended – in person or via telephone conference - by all stakeholder groups.

2.3.3 External Phase

Following on from the internal phase, the external phase included primary and secondary "outsiders" groups.

Primary outsiders that were actively approached for interviews included agencies and organisations associated with successful NSPs and their consultants. Secondary outsiders included non-governmental organisations and groups with particular expertise in NAMAs, including those supporting readiness, as well as unsuccessful submitters. A full list of interviewees can be found in Appendix 6.

The broader community that visited the NAMA Facility website was invited to comment and contribute through a banner on www.nama-facility.org that allowed them to get in touch with the evaluation team. This opportunity was taken up by one stakeholder.

As described in 0, the sampling scheme for interviews was adjusted in a way that offered several advantages, including avoiding confusion with the ongoing fourth call, but also accepting that the resources of the evaluation team were limited and the critical case analysis would have resulted in 27 projects for which interviews – in many cases more than one and up to four interviews - would have been necessary to achieve a balanced and complete picture. Several aspects that are discussed in chapters 0, 2.5.2, and 2.5.1, made this seem not feasible. Instead, the interviews were complemented with a broader survey of more than 200 individuals that were associated with earlier NSP Outline submissions. Its 38 responses provided valuable insights into the dynamics of NSPs and the Facility, and the challenges that remain to be solved. The potential limitations and biases that arose for this evaluation are discussed in section 2.5. They were considered to be relevant for a certain aspect of the evaluation, but this should be elaborated in a larger research effort. However, it was nevertheless possible to formulate a large number of meaningful findings, conclusions and recommendations.

2.3.4 Analysis

Evidence and data collected throughout the MTE were analysed, recorded and triangulated. Interviews were transcribed. Referenced quotes were included in the detailed triangulation matrix to be included in the work stream reports or compressed triangulation matrices. The hypotheses that had been formulated were developed into well-evidenced findings within each work stream. These then fed into the general project findings.

The team have coordinated their efforts throughout the evaluation, holding regular update meetings and analysis discussions. In order to discuss the process and the cross-cutting findings, a first team meeting was held in London in July. Before and afterwards, the team coordinated through regular phone conferences between the work streams. This allowed the team to identify convergence in the findings between the work streams and to assess with higher certainty the validity of their interpretation. It also supported the consistent triangulation work.

2.3.5 Consultations and De-Briefing Meetings

Extensive and continuous consultations have been held throughout the evaluation with the secretariat and members of the TSU. Two de-briefing meetings were factored into project planning, which took place on August 4th and September 30th, 2016. These meetings provided valuable opportunities for the discussion of preliminary findings with the Board and for questions and feedback. They also supported the evaluation's orientation.

2.4 Methodological Approaches in the Work Streams

Each work stream followed in principle the same general approach: after the definition and operationalisation of the evaluation questions in the inception phase, an in-depth desk review of documents was conducted, followed by interviews and surveys. These were conducted in two phases, first consulting with the internal stakeholders, then with the external stakeholders. Work stream leaders generated data together and then used this shared evidence base for formulating and refining their hypotheses. However, each work stream required a different level of intensity of use for each data source. Some relied more heavily on document analysis, others on interviews. Therefore there were slight differences in the flow of each work stream. The following subsections provide more detail.

Not all work streams resulted in equal amounts of work or equal amounts of space in this report. For example, the work stream on perceptions is relatively concise, comprising mainly aggregated evidence collected in other work streams. This is not to be taken as an indication of the reduced importance of this aspect. Rather, the primary data collection of some work streams were, by nature, limited to document review (TOC, M&E work streams) or the internal phase (ISR). Thus, each work stream tailored its approach and emphasis to suit the sources and types of data/evidence it used. The following sections document how.

2.4.1 TOC and Monitoring and Evaluation

These two themes were merged during the implementation of the evaluation. The TOC work stream focused on reconstructing the TOC from the original documents. This was used as the basis for many of the internal interviews.

The M&E work stream found little evidence from the NAMA Facility as only one NSP has proposed its M&E plan. It was therefore limited to assessing the internal consistency of the NAMA Facility's M&E related documents, and to comparing the facility with other climate finance mechanisms. Some information was drawn from the external survey regarding the perceived feasibility of the M&E requirements.

2.4.2 Institutional Systems Review

The main tools in the institutional systems review were interviews with internal stakeholders and the internal survey (Appendix 5): these provided a significant body of evidence that pointed to areas for improvement.

2.4.3 Portfolio Assessment

The original idea of the portfolio assessment was to understand the general trends of the portfolio, and to assess whether the portfolio is best suited to achieve the objectives of the

NAMA Facility. It was not possible to include any operational experiences as none of the NSPs has generated operational experiences yet.

The assessment of the optimal portfolio was based on portfolio criteria that were derived from the TOC. These were discussed at the first debriefing meeting. They are not fully consistent with each other – optimising for one means compromising on another. But the ESG considered them relevant.

Measuring the portfolio against these criteria also demonstrates that the portfolio is still rather small. Therefore, it includes some idiosyncratic elements which might not lead to a fully fair assessment of the portfolio.

On the advice of the TSU, the evaluation team did not replicate the outline selection process. This had been considered sufficiently vetted through the external audit and review processes that each call had undergone, and it was not considered to be an efficient use of the time of the evaluation team to replicate this process a third time. The evaluation team concurred with that view. However, an assessment at the ratings' distribution demonstrated that very few non-selected outlines were higher rated than the lowest-rated selected outline, and these decisions were taken on a justified basis.

While the portfolio assessment is thus limited to one assessment criterion– is the portfolio optimal for the objectives of the Facility? – it provided a significant database and insights for all other work streams.

2.4.4 Project Cycle Assessment

The project cycle assessment started out on the basis of mere document review of the GIDs and templates, and interviews with the TSU. It quickly became clear that particularly for this work stream, interviews with the DOs would be very important. In addition to these interviews, the survey and the comparison of different GIDs, for documenting the evolution of criteria etc., provided valuable insights.

2.4.5 Climate Finance Gap Analysis

The Climate Finance Gap analysis was started explicitly only in the last phase. During the evaluation period, the Green Climate Fund took significant steps towards its operationalisation, and it was important to integrate these steps in the analysis.

The evidence allowed for a pros-cons (cost benefit) assessment of two opposing sub-hypotheses - maintaining a quasi-bilateral funding platform vs. giving it up- which was used for the formulation of recommendations.

2.4.6 Perception Assessment

From the start it was clear that people's perceptions are very important for the effectiveness of the NAMA Facility. However, only during the evaluation did it become clear just how important they really were. The relatively strong feelings around the perceived conflict of interest led the evaluation team to reducing the explicit efforts around the perception assessment and drawing more on the internal and external interviews. Going to outside stakeholders with explicit perception-related questions was considered too intrusive and potentially damaging for the facility. Therefore, the assessment is not conducted in a separate work stream but included as a chapter in the main report only.

2.5Evaluation Limitations

2.5.1 Timing of the Evaluation

As mentioned above, the NAMA Facility has already taken steps towards addressing some of the better understood challenges to pipeline development, in the preparations for the fourth call for Outlines. The MTE attempted to understand how these ongoing changes are likely to influence the Facility and its operations, and included this in the assessment, whilst recognising that the associated evidence base for this is limited. There will be a project level evaluation for the NAMA Facility in the future, as well as mid-term and final evaluations for individual NSPs, and a final programme evaluation/evaluation of the overall NAMA Facility, hence these aspects are not part of this MTE. The focus of this evaluation is on the programme level of the Facility.

In addition, the evaluation was conducted in the summer months which comprised a two month holiday period. As the stakeholders were scattered throughout the world with a strong emphasis on Europe, availability of interviewees and partially also evaluation team members unavoidably limited the speed at which the evaluation could progress. The second debriefing meeting at the end of September further compressed the interview schedule. The team reacted to this by refining the sampling scheme in particular for the external interviews and complemented it with an online survey (Appendix 5), to manage the potentially resulting biases.

Lastly it is important to note that the fourth call for Proposals was launched in July 2016, concurrent with the evaluation. This development influenced the decision taken by the evaluation team not to approach too many potential proponents in the external phase, so as not to cause confusion or distract from the work on proponents. Other factors also played into that decision, and its consequences are discussed more extensively in section 2.5.2 below.

2.5.2 Inclusion of External Stakeholder Views

External stakeholders were harder to reach. In particular, the Green Climate Fund was not available for an interview, despite repeated and insistent requests not only from the evaluation team but also from BMUB. The GEF Secretariat was not directly approached but the UNDP/GEF (the unit financed at UNDP through GEF fees, responsible for working with the Secretariat to fund UNDP projects) was able to provide insights with respect to most of the relevant questions.

In addition, the team exerted caution when approaching external stakeholders, for a number of reasons. Firstly, during the time of the MTE, the fourth call was ongoing. This entailed significant outreach activities by the TSU to communicate the procedural changes to the potential submitters. These are partially the same audience as the external stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation, and in order to avoid confusion with that target group and not distract them from working on potential submissions, the evaluation team exercised restraint on that approach. A second reason for restraint was that it became clear early on that the perception issues were much more important than initially thought. These made active and broad-based soliciting of feedback on the NAMA Facility to the evaluation team a highly sensitive undertaking. In order to limit the risk of potentially worsening the perception issue, no general stakeholder consultation of the climate change community (e.g. through a survey published through climate-l) was conducted. Lastly, host country governments of NSPs and potential NSPs were not approached, because an assessment of the number of interviews needed to get a representative and somewhat unbiased view showed that this would significantly exceed the evaluation team's available resources, while resulting in limited new and relevant information.

Ultimately, the team erred on the side of caution, and decided to limit the consultations to a small selection and to manage the biases. The stakeholders that were consulted provided a critical and constructive view that allowed the evaluation team to understand the strengths and weaknesses in sufficient detail and to trigger a meaningful discussion with the Board on these as well as on the major challenges. The scope of the questions discussed with Board members in the interviews was broad, and the convergence of responses with the external stakeholders that were consulted was substantial, to the degree that some saturation effects were observed.

The team also did not directly contact country counterparts for interviews. This group is very heterogeneous, and thus the sample size that would have been needed to achieve representative and meaningful results from this group (of 27) was considered unmanageable within the timeframe. Instead, the interviews focused on Delivery Organisations and consultants that are active in the field, with the hope that many of these are working with more than one country and/or sector and thus can provide insights that are more easily generalizable. In addition, the online survey was directed also to country proponents.

Countries that are not active in NAMAs were not included in the survey or data analysis. Conclusions on their activities were drawn on the basis of research from the Mitigation Momentum project whose main consultants were included in the interviews. The NAMA status report also included 4 extensive statements by government representatives from four potential NAMA countries which were used extensively in lieu of direct interviews. The exact bias that arises from leaving out the government view is unknown, but opinions related to the future role of NAMAs in national mitigation plans are particularly limited without national government inputs. Therefore it needs to be made clear that the statements made relate only to the opinions of sampled donors, multi-lateral agencies and project developers and Delivery Organisations; not to government stakeholders. The team provided details of this bias in the climate finance gap assessment, and included in particular the opinion of the intergovernmental organisations. It is assumed that the countries might be able to provide a more differentiated view, and it is recommended that the Facility continue surveying this target group but through a continuation of research and evaluative efforts that target this exact question (on the future role of NAMAs) and which are sufficiently resourced.

200 NSP submitters were questioned through the online survey, and all were given the opportunity to get in touch with the evaluation team should there be any grievances or if they wished to contribute opinions or evidence. Therefore the team is confident that we have provided a meaningful evaluation with the known bias of potentially not providing all critical views that might exist.

2.5.3 Coverage of Evaluation Questions

The large number of evaluation questions and scope-defining statements in the TORs and the limited resources for the evaluation team meant that not all evaluation questions could be treated equally.

A number of questions were considered less relevant because of the ongoing learning and development that the Facility itself was continuing to undertake while the evaluation was ongoing. For example, a significant number of evaluation questions focused on procedural and project cycle aspects. While this evaluation spent significant time on understanding whether and to what degree procedural and process cycle questions might influence the resulting portfolio, the questions that focused on efficiency were relatively downgraded. This is an intentional choice based on the fact that the project cycle was undergoing a thorough restructuring while the evaluation was ongoing. Therefore, the evaluation limited itself on documenting the experiences regarding the efficiency of the project cycle from the past, but does not give recommendations for the future.

The work streams were not balanced with respect to the work load required to answer each set of questions. In addition, it also became clear during the evaluation that; because the NAMA Facility is relatively new; it would not provide a large amount of new evidence for additional conclusions or recommendations beyond common knowledge available in the Facility. A good example is the work stream on portfolio assessment. For this work stream, the long project preparation periods limit the availability of actual evidence of the project successes and the relative contribution of the NAMA Facility.

A major limitation to answering some of the evaluation questions emerged at an early stage: that is, that none of the projects have collected sufficient implementation experience to provide meaningful insights into the outcome or impact levels. Hence, evaluation questions that required this experience could not be answered.

In addition, as mentioned above, the NAMA Facility is constantly learning, adjusting and reacting to criticism. In that vein, the NAMA Facility has already taken steps towards addressing some of the challenges to pipeline development, in the preparations for the Fourth Call for Outlines. While the MTE attempts to understand how these ongoing changes are likely to influence the Facility and its operations, and includes this estimation in the assessment, it needs to be recognised that there is no evidence base for assessing how these changes might affect the Facility. There will be mid-term and final evaluations for individual NSP, and a final programme evaluation/evaluation of the overall NAMA Facility which will be able to pick up these aspects.

2.5.4 Limitations in Evidence

The evaluation plan was designed and carried out with critical consideration of evidence quality and a determination to avoid bias wherever possible given the parameters and resources of the mid-term review. More information on assessing the strength of evidence, triangulation and bias management strategies can be found in the Appendix 3.

Access to data has not been considered as a major limitation here as the main focus is on procedural and perception issues.[4] All document requests have been immediately responded to by the TSU. Similarly all internal stakeholders that were approached were welcoming and open for discussion.

However, the **document review** considered all available internal documentation but only sampled a limited amount of external documentation. The GEF was used as a comparison climate fund that may support NAMA and NAMA-type actions, because the information for this instrument is available in the public domain allowing open access.

The **Key Informant Interviews** had to be reduced from 50 to 26 due to time and capacity constraints. The reduction was made up for with three online surveys.

[4] The evaluation team have maintained commercial confidentiality of the private sector and privacy protection of individuals as well as all other provisions of the UNEG Code of Conduct.

2.5.5 Methodological Limitations

Whilst the methods used to collect data were justified by time and resource constraints and by the team's wish to avoid disrupting the ongoing operations of the NAMA Facility and its Call 4, nonetheless there are clear weaknesses that need to be noted. It is recognised that the data has very limited external validity and that the findings of the evaluation have equally limited generalisability.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) are vulnerable to interviewer and interviewee bias risks. To manage this risk, the evaluation team prepared a consistent interview schedule that was used in all interviews. The findings were mapped into the workstream matrices and required triangulation from other KIIs and other data sources to be utilised in the interpretation of evaluation findings.

There are inherent risks with the use of surveys. The surveys were only tested through a pilot exercise with a separate population who don't necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the sampled populations. In the case of the 'internal survey' which was conducted amongst the TSU staff and Board, whilst all representatives were sampled, the number is very small. Because of the small number of respondents (12 in total), no attempt was made to apply statistical analysis to the findings.

The external survey had a relatively low response rate. It was also a self-response survey that included Likert style responses. These responses introduce biases which affect the validity of the data. For this reason the survey data was not used on its own, but was used as part of the evidence base, in combination with other findings from key informant and document review.

3 Appendix 3: Work Stream Analysis

Not published due to data protection.

4 Appendix 4 Evaluation Question Work Stream and Evidence Matrix

As described above, the evaluation questions were grouped into work streams. The matrix reproduced within this annex in Table 25 provides the details of that mapping. In addition, the matrix specifies where evidence is expected to contribute to each work stream.

This evaluation matrix was then used by each work stream to keep track of the evidence provided through internal vs. external information. This means that in the internal work, some work streams introduced columns for each interview and document, holding the original quotes. These then served as the basis for anonymised quotation or paraphrasing in the text. The evidence was also documented in condensed summaries, which are included in this annex for most of the work streams.

Table 25 Evaluation Matrix

				Work Stream	Workflow / sources					FINDINGS REGARDING
		Tasks from TORs	Example questions from TORs (where applicable - do not necessarily reflect the full scope of the task, not	method	DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "Internal"		DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "External"	
cross-cutting issues / Climate finance and climate negotiations	1	• Examine the strategic objectives of the NF (from the climate finance perspective)	• What is the theoretical basis (theory of change) of the NAMA Facility? Are the objectives clearly defined? Is there a joint understanding of the theory of change among major stakeholders? • To what extent, in what circumstances and why has the NAMA Facility achieved outputs 1 and 2, namely: The NAMA Facility is established as a mechanism which efficiently allocates support to the implementation of ambitious, transformative NAMAs; and the quality of the project pipeline has improved.	A.1. reconstructed TOC, understand relevance and effectiveness of NF wrt strategic objectives	A.1.1 Desk review of documents to formulate a consolidated strategic objective and a reconstructed TOC	A.1.2 a discuss validity of these formulations with stakeholders / ESG			1.4.a discuss validity of these formulations with external stakeholders	1.5 Reconstructed TOC of the facility 1.6 Findings on level of achievement wrt outputs 1 and 2 1.7 Recommendations on improvement of effectiveness
						A.1.2.b discuss extent of achievements on these objectives with ESG		1.3.b confirm achievements through desk review	1.4.b. discuss extent of achievements on these objectives with external stakeholders	
	2	• Consider and incorporate lessons learnt from other climate finance schemes and from similar funding mechanisms (e.g. from GEF, ICF, CIF and from an EC program run under CfP mode)		A.2. Testing of assumptions underlying the TOC	2.1 extraction of assumptions from foundational documents (e.g. GIZ/KfW proposal, DECC business case, DANIDA appraisal document) 2.2 review of implementation documents if assumptions held true	2.3 discussion of findings from desk review with TSU	2.4 discussion of findings from desk review and from discussion with TSU with ESG	2.5 Comparison of preliminary findings from 1.4 and 2.4 with evaluation reports and learning documents of GEF, ICF and CIF	2.6 validate with GEF, GCF, PMR, UNFCCC	2.7 Findings regarding the assumptions in the TOC and whether they conform with international experiences and integrate the lessons from other Climate Finance Mechanisms 2.8 Recommendations on risk mitigation and enhanced efficiency
	3	• Examine the role of the NF in the climate finance architecture – its niche vs. the GCF	• How relevant is the NAMA Facility for potential submitters of project outlines? • What is the conceptual understanding of NAMAs of different stakeholders? Which expectations do they have towards the NAMA Facility?	C.3. mapping of funding gaps	3.1 mapping of funding gaps in 2011 and today	3.2 validate with GIZ, KfW, BMUB, DECC, MEUC, EU			3.3 validate with GEF, GCF, PMR, UNFCCC	3.4 findings regarding the role of the NF as compared to other financing mechanisms 3.5 Recommendations on enhanced strategic relevance wrt climate finance landscape
Governance / Institutional System / decision making structure	4	• Examine the strategic objectives of the NF (from the donor perspective)	• How relevant is the NAMA Facility and its current set-up for NAMA Facility Donors? Which priority and importance has the NAMA Facility for its Donors?	combined with A.1.		4.1 discuss result of 1.1 with GIZ, KfW, BMUB, DECC, MEUC, EU				4.2 Findings on match of Donor priorities with NAMA objectives and results 4.3 Recommendations on enhanced strategic relevance wrt donor priorities
	5	• Examine the governance structure of the NAMA Facility								
	6	• Examine the division of work between the donors and the TSU	• What is the degree of delegation of decision competence to the TSU and is this level appropriate?	D.5. ISR (Thread 1 Management)	5.1 development of rubrics / criteria 5.2 application of rubrics to desk review	5.3 discussion of findings from desk review with TSU	5.4 discussion of findings from desk review and from discussion with TSU with ESG			5.5 Findings on governance structure and division of work between TSU and donors; recommendations
	7	• Examine specific procedures for donor involvement, consultation and communication processes, and funds management	• To what extent does the current governance arrangement promote learning within the NAMA Facility, amongst donors and with wider audiences? Are any improvements necessary? If so, what? • How is the communication within the TSU, between the Delivery Organizations (GIZ, KfW and Third Party Delivery Organizations) and TSU and between TSU and the Donors? • Do the NAMA Facility's funding conditions permit Delivery Organizations and implementing partner organizations to operate efficiently?	D.7. ISR (combined with ISR in 5.)	7.1 add rubrics to 5.1 7.2 analyze documents wrt procedures; map procedures	7.2 interview individual TSU members regarding procedures	7.3 interview individual donor representatives and DOs regarding procedures		F.20.4 interview DOs and DO candidates on perceptions of procedures	7.5 Findings on procedures between Donors and TSU; recommendations

				Work Stream	Workflow / sources					FINDINGS REGARDING
		Tasks from TORs	Example questions from TORs (where applicable - do not necessarily reflect the full scope of the task, not necessarily clearly attributable to just one task)	method	DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "Internal"		DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "External"	
Facility management	8	• Examine the organizational set-up of the TSU and the management of the NAMA Facility	• How do NSP monitoring and evaluation systems feed into the NAMA Facility framework?	D.8. ISR (combined with ISR in 5.)	8.1 add rubrics to 5.1 8.2 analyze documents wrt procedures; map procedures	8.2 interview individual TSU members regarding organizational setup	8.3 interview individual donor representatives and DOs regarding organizational setup		F.20.4 interview DOs and DO candidates on perceptions of organizational setup	8.5 Findings on organizational setup between Donors and TSU; recommendations
	9	• Examine the role of KfW/GIZ as trustees and delivery organizations	• What is the degree of delegation of decision competence to the TSU and is this level appropriate?	D. 9. ISR (combined with ISR in 5.)	9.1 add rubrics to 5.1 9.2 analyze documents wrt role of KfW/GIZ; map role of KfW/GIZ	9.2 interview individual TSU members regarding role of KfW/GIZ	9.3 interview individual donor representatives and DOs regarding role of KfW/GIZ		F.20.4 interview DOs and DO candidates on perceptions of role of KfW/GIZ	7.5 Findings on procedures between Donors and TSU; recommendations
	10	• Examine the internal organization of the TSU (work flow, communication, decision making, potential for learning)	• How efficient is the financial management of the NF (controlling, disbursement of funds, procurement and contracting)? • Is the staffing of the TSU sufficient and adequate?	D. 10. ISR (combined with ISR in 5.)	10.1 add rubrics to 5.1 10.2 analyze documents wrt procedures; map procedures	10.2 interview individual TSU members regarding procedures	10.3 interview individual donor representatives and DOs regarding procedures		F.20.4 interview DOs and DO candidates on perceptions of procedures	10.5 Findings on procedures between Donors and TSU; recommendations
	11	• Examine the communication / support that the TSU provides with regard to projects and applicants	• How efficient and effective is the communication between TSU and NSP proponents? • Are project cycle, technical support, engagement activities and funding instruments adequate to achieve the NAMA Facility outcomes? Are any improvements necessary? If so, which ones? • How is the communication within the TSU, between the Delivery Organizations (GIZ, KfW and Third Party Delivery Organizations) and TSU and between TSU and the Donors? • Are the eligibility criteria for qualified Delivery Organisations equally understood by all stakeholders? What are reasons to rule out third-party Delivery Organisations? • Are the advisory services provided by the TSU sufficient and adequate? How are they judged by partners? • How do NSP monitoring and evaluation systems feed into the NAMA Facility framework?		11.1 analyse documents; map project cycle, NSP approval and contracting processes, technical support activities undertaken by TSU with NSP proponents, TSU and DOs, TSU and donors, engagement / communication processes within TSU, between TSU and proponents, describe funding instrument and its processes, map eligibility criteria for qualified delivery organisations	11.2 interview TSU regarding processes and eligibility criteria, special focus communication and support to NSPs	11.3 interview donors regarding processes and eligibility criteria, special focus communication, and support to NSPs		11.4 interview DOs and DO candidates on procedures and eligibility criteria,	11.5 Findings on adequacy of project cycle and related processes, procedures, support provided; recommendations on improving the project cycle and related processes, special focus communication and support to NSPs

		Tasks from TORs	Example questions from TORs (where applicable - do not necessarily reflect the full scope of the task, not necessarily clearly attributable to just one task)	Work Stream method	Workflow / sources DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "Internal"		DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "External"	FINDINGS REGARDING
Selection and contracting process for concepts and pipeline development	12	• Examine the procedures for NSP approval and contracting	• Is the project cycle/funding system effectively supporting the objectives of the NAMA Facility? • How effective and efficient are the assessment processes for NSP outlines and for NSP project proposals? • Do the NAMA Facility's funding conditions permit Delivery Organizations and implementing partner organizations to operate efficiently? • Which effects were intended, which were not? Are influences visible, if so, which ones?		As 11.1, special focus NSP approval, contracting, funding conditions	As 11.2special focus on NSP approval, contracting, funding conditions	As 11.3 special focus on NSP approval, contracting, funding conditions		As11.4 special focus on NSP approval, contracting, funding conditions	As 11.5 special focus on NSP approval, contracting, funding conditions
	13	• Examine the procedures for project assessment, selection, M&E and quality assurance	• Are project cycle, technical support, engagement activities and funding instruments adequate to achieve the NAMA Facility outcomes? Are any improvements necessary? If so, which ones? • Are the outline and proposal templates concise enough to make the applicants understand what the NAMA Facility is looking for? • How effective and efficient are the assessment processes for NSP outlines and for NSP project proposals? • Is the project selection process suited to select those projects that are the most relevant ones for achieving the objectives of the NAMA Facility? • Are the work processes between Delivery Organisations, and between Delivery Organisations and the TSU aligned? Are there any losses or friction and/or unclear regulations? • Are the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms		As 11.1, special focus on project assessment, monitoring, quality assurance and whether most relevant projects are being selected	As 11.2, special focus on project assessment, monitoring, quality assurance and whether most relevant projects are being selected	As 11.3, special focus on project assessment, monitoring, quality assurance and whether most relevant projects are being selected	comparison with GEF	As 11.4, special focus on project assessment, monitoring, quality assurance and whether most relevant projects are being selected	As 11.5, special focus on project assessment, monitoring, quality assurance and whether most relevant projects are being selected
	14	• Examine the procedures for building the quality of the pipeline including the extent and usefulness of communication between the TSU and project submitters as they develop their bids, and in providing feedback following submission.	between TSU and NSP proponents? • How has communication between TSU and potential NSPs been effective at achieving NAMA objectives? What could be improved? How has the TSU supported new NSPs and delivery organisations in successfully applying for NAMAs? • Are the advisory services provided by the TSU sufficient and adequate? How are they judged by partners? • Are project cycle, technical support, engagement activities and funding instruments adequate to achieve	E.14/17 mapping of project cycle and response times; validation and benchmarking, analysis of the root causes for delays; combine with 20	As 11.1, with special focus on the bid development process	As 11.2 with special focus on the bid development process	As 11.3 with special focus on the bid development process		As 11.4 with special focus on the bid development process	
			• Does the current General Information Document provide sufficient guidance for potential submitters and for Delivery Organizations? • Are the outline and proposal templates concise enough to make the applicants understand what the NAMA facility is looking for?	E. link to 11 and 14 but with special focus on the GID and templates	As 11.1, with special focus on GID and templates	As 11.2 with special focus on GID and templates	As 11.3 with special focus on GID and templates		As 11.4 with special focus on GID and templates	As 11.5 special focus on GID

		Tasks from TORs	Example questions from TORs (where applicable - do not necessarily reflect the full scope of the task, not necessarily clearly attributable to just one task)	Work Stream method	Workflow / sources DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "Internal"		DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "External"	FINDINGS REGARDING
criteria for concepts and DOs	15	• Examine the eligibility criteria for qualified Delivery Organizations.	Organisations equally understood by all stakeholders? What are reasons to rule out third-party Delivery Organisations? • Is the project cycle/funding system effectively supporting the objectives of the NAMA Facility? • How does the NAMA Facility consider gender and	with special focus on formulating hypotheses regarding how eligibility criteria for DO and other aspects can influence	As 11.1, with special focus on eligibility criteria for DOs	As 11.2 with special focus on eligibility criteria for DOs	As 11.3 with special focus on eligibility criteria for DOs		As 11.4 with special focus on eligibility criteria for DOs	Findings regarding effectiveness of each eligibility criterion (are the contributing relevant information? Are the influencing the portfolio? Recommendations on changing the list of criteria
	16	• Examine the eligibility criteria and instruments for concepts and projects.	• Is the project cycle/funding system effectively supporting the objectives of the NAMA Facility? • How effective are the NAMA Facility criteria in ensuring that the highest scoring projects meet the Facility's objectives? • How is 'implementation readiness' being interpreted? • How is the concept of 'transformational change' implemented? (in the criteria) • How is 'implementation readiness' being interpreted? • How does the NAMA Facility consider gender and Human Rights issues?	E. link to 11 and 14 but with special focus on formulating hypotheses regarding how effective these eligibility criteria are (are the contributing relevant information?) and if eligibility criteria can influence the portfolio	E16.1 add to E11.1 analysis of key policies and (assessment) guidance document, review criteria for representation of general principles such as Transformational change, implementation readiness, gender and human rights, which are expected to be covered in the criteria	E16.2 interviews with TSU and external assessors for utilization of criteria for transformational change, implementation readiness, gender and human rights	E16.3 interviews with donors regarding criteria for transformational change, implementation readiness, gender and human rights	cf. B: assessment of evidence in the portfolio regarding transformational change, implementation readiness, gender and Human Rights	E16.4 discussion with rejected proposals regarding missed opportunities?	Findings regarding effectiveness of each eligibility criterion (are the contributing relevant information? Are the influencing the portfolio? Recommendations on changing the list of criteria
NAMA Support Projects	17	• Examine the project cycle of NSPs from NSP outline to proposal and implementation + evaluation (timing, costs/resources)	• Is the project cycle/funding system effectively supporting the objectives of the NAMA Facility? • How efficient and effective is the communication between TSU and NSP proponents?	E.17 mapping of project cycle and response times; combine with 14	E.11 / E.14/17.1 mapping of project cycle and response times; draw on portfolio review (B.18) for actuals	E.14/17.2 discuss project cycle and average response times with TSU				- length of project cycle - causes for delays, factors that support acceleration - readiness of countries, including typical readiness gaps recommendations on accelerating NAMA approval and implementation
	18	• Examine the portfolio (desk analysis) consisting of 9 NAMA Support Projects from two calls 2013-2014 with regard to the extent that such projects are a good fit with Nama Facility's objectives, in particular with regards to delivering transformational change and ensuring projects are embedded with government's national strategies?	• Do the NAMA Facility's funding conditions permit Delivery Organizations and implementing partner organizations to operate efficiently? • How effective are the NAMA Facility criteria in ensuring that the highest scoring projects meet the Facility's objectives? • Is the project cycle/funding system effectively supporting the objectives of the NAMA Facility? • How do NSPs intend to measure their impacts? • How is the concept of 'transformational change' implemented? (in the projects) • How has the NAMA Facility contributed to induce reflections on how to achieve transformational change in partner countries and/or in sectors? • How does the NAMA Facility consider gender and Human Rights issues? • What are the greatest challenges facing successful applicants in implementing NSPs and meeting NAMA requirements? How can the NAMA Facility support NSPs in the future?	B. portfolio analysis using rubrics; "modified process tracing" using the portfolio to test hypotheses from 15 and 16.	B.18.1 develop rubrics that apply evaluation questions B.18.2 apply rubrics to each of the 9 projects in the portfolio B.18.3 formulate preliminary findings on the assessment	B.18.4 complement desk review with interviews with project proponents and local stakeholders to complete information base	B.18.5 discuss findings with the TSU and ESG	B.18.6 compare findings with criteria and hypotheses formulated within A, D, E and potentially with findings from reviews of other CF mechanisms; apply "modified process tracing"		B. Findings regarding - expected project achievements, their measurements, and their contribution to the NAMA Facility's strategic objectives - typical challenges facing successful applicants in meeting NAMA and NAMA Facility requirements and implementing NSPs - the degree to which criteria and procedures have influenced project design - transformational change, gender, Human Rights

		Tasks from TORs	Example questions from TORs (where applicable - do not necessarily reflect the full scope of the task, not necessarily clearly attributable to just one task)	Work Stream method	Workflow / sources DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "Internal"		DESK REVIEW	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS "External"	FINDINGS REGARDING
NAMAs not supported; reputation and replication	19	• Examine the strategic objectives of the NF (with respect to incentivizing replication / scale-up)	• To what extent does the current governance arrangement promote learning within the NAMA Facility, amongst donors and with wider audiences? Are any improvements necessary? If so, what? • How has the NAMA Facility contributed to the international climate finance debate, and to efforts to influence climate relevant national and international policies? • Is the TSU successful in sharing its experiences and lessons learnt with other stakeholders in the international climate finance discussion?	A.19 TOC analysis; combine with A.1; focus on replication aspect of TOC, effectiveness of learning and outreach products	A.19.1 complement Desk Review under A.1.1 with review of learning and outreach products; analyse reach figures	A.19.2 interview TSU, ESG and direct advisors for specific incidents where learning / influencing of climate finance debate has taken place and scale-up/replication		A.19.3 validate A 19.2	A.19.4 validate A.19.3/2 with outside stakeholders	A.19 Findings regarding learning and influence climate finance debate
			• How do Delivery Organizations and partners value the activities of the NAMA Facility and of the TSU?							
			• How relevant is the NAMA Facility for potential submitters of project outlines? • How has the NAMA Facility contributed to the international climate finance debate, and to efforts to influence climate relevant national and international policies?							
	20	• Examine the reputational effect of NSP Outline rejections and selections among proponents of rejected NSPs	• Is the TSU successful in sharing its experiences and lessons learnt with other stakeholders in the international climate finance discussion? • What is the conceptual understanding of NAMAs of different stakeholders? (incl. rejected proposals) Which expectations do they have towards the NAMA Facility?	F. Perception assessment		F.20.1 interview DOs and partners wrt their perception of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the NAMA Facility and TSU (15 interviews).			F.20.2 interview purposive sample of outside stakeholders wrt their perception of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the NAMA Facility and TSU (35 interviews).	F.20 Findings regarding - the views of the various stakeholder groups; - how they compare with the evidence provided in the other workstreams Recommendations on how to overcome negative perceptions if any and enhance impact of outreach.

5 Appendix 5: Evaluation Survey Results

Not published due to data protection.

6 Appendix 6: List of Persons Interviewed

Not published due to data protection.

7 Appendix 7: References and Documents Reviewed

BMUB/DECC, (2015)., Detailed arrangement between BMUB and DECC regarding support to the NAMA Facility. Unpublished internal document. BMUB/DECC.

BMUB/DECC., (2015)., Joint Declaration of Intent - Support to the NAMA Facility. Unpublished internal document. BMUB/DECC.

BMUB/DECC/MCEB/EU Commission, (2015)., Joint Declaration of Intent - Support to the NAMA Facility. Unpublished internal document. BMUB/DECC/MCEB/EU Commission.

Bosquet, M. Rawlins, J. Afanador, A. van Tilburg, X. Eisbrenner, K. (2016)., Status Report on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) – mid year update 2016. Mitigation Momentum Project. [Online]. Available at: https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/fileadmin/Dokumente/2016/NAMA-Status-Report-June-2016.pdf. [Accessed 12th September 2016].

Bosquet, M. Rawlins, J. Afanador, A. van Tilburg, X. Eisbrenner, K. (2016)., Status Report on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) – mid year update 2016. Mitigation Momentum Project. [Online]. Available at: https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/fileadmin/Dokumente/2016/NAMA-Status-Report-June-2016.pdf. [Accessed 12th September 2016].

Carbon Market Watch, (2016)., Financing NAMAs. Available at: http://carbonmarketwatch.org/financing-namas/ [Accessed 18/11/16]

CIFs, (2011)., FIP Results Framework. [Online]. Available at: https://www-cif.climateinvestmentfunds.org/report-requirements-and-toolkits.[Accessed 28th September 2016].

CIFs, (2012A)., Revised SREP Results Framework. [Online]. Available at: https://www-cif.climateinvestmentfunds.org/report-requirements-and-toolkits.[Accessed 28th September 2016].

CIFs, (2012B)., Revised PPCR results framework. [Online]. Available at: https://www-cif.climateinvestmentfunds.org/report-requirements-and-toolkits.[Accessed 28th September 2016].

CIFs, (2013A)., A Revised CTF Results Framework. [Online]. Available at: https://www-cif.climateinvestmentfunds.org/report-requirements-and-toolkits.[Accessed 28th September 2016].

CIFs, (2013B)., Results Monitoring and Reporting in the FIP. [Online]. Available at: http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/Results_monitoring_and_reporting_in_the_FIP_key_doc_Oct_2013.pdf.[Accessed 28th September 2016].

CIFs, (2016)., FIP Monitoring and Reporting Toolkit. [Online]. Available at: https://www-cif.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/default/files/knowledge-documents/fip_monitoring_and_reporting_toolkit_final_march_2016.pdf.[Accessed 28th September 2016].

DECC, (2012)., Business Case and Intervention Summary. UK/Germany NAMA Implementation Facility. [Online]. Available at: https://aidstream.org/files/documents/NAMA-Business-Case-20160901020931.pdf. [Accessed 21st July 2016].

DECC, (2012A)., Business Case and Intervention Summary. [Online]. Available at: https://www.aidstream.org/files/documents/CTF-Additional-Contribution-Business-Case-2012.pdf. [Accessed 21st July 2016].

DECC, (2014)., Business Case and Intervention Summary. UK/Germany NAMA Implementation Facility. Unpublished internal document. DECC.

DECC, (2014A)., ICF DECC Annual review reporting template. [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/375634/nama_facility_annual_review.pdf. [Accessed 10th October 2016].

DECC, (2015)., Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions Second Annual Review . [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/471699/NAMA_Second_Annual_Review_2015.pdf. [Accessed October 13th 2016].

European Commission, (2014)., EU joins UK, Germany, Denmark in financing ground-breaking climate Facility. [Online]. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2014121201_en.htm. [Accessed 2nd June 2016]

European Commission, (2015)., Delegation Agreement with KfW. European Commission, Brussels.

European Commission, (2016)., Home - EUEI Bulletin Selected News and Information on European Energy Development Cooperation No. 3 | August 2016. [Online]. Available at: http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/euei/minisite/euei-bulletin/august [Accessed 29th August 2016].

Gardiner, A. Afanador, A. Eisbrenner, K. Bosquet, M, Bucquet, C. Cameron, L. Falzon, J. Harms, and N. Halstead, M, (2015)., Annual Status Report on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) 2015. Mitigation Momentum Project. [Online]. Available at: http://www.mitigationmomentum.org/downloads/Mitigation_Momentum_Annual_Status_Report_Dec_2015.pdf. [Accessed 12th September 2016].

Garside, B, (2015)., EU nations could double current NAMA funding with new call for projects. [Online]. Available at: http://carbon-pulse.com/3305/. [Accessed 1st June 2016].

Global Environment Facility (GEF), (2015)., Improving the GEF Project Cycle GEF/C.47/07/Rev.01 December 03 2015 Washington DC.. Available at: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/19_EN_GEF.C.47.07.Rev_.01_Improving_the_GEF_Project_Cycle_1.pdf [Accessed 18/11/16]

Government of Chile, (2015)., INTENDED NATIONALLY DETERMINED CONTRIBUTION OF CHILE TOWARDS THE CLIMATE AGREEMENT OF PARIS 2015. [Online]. Available at http://www4.unfccc.int/Submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Chile/1/INDC%20Chile%20english%20version.pdf. [Accessed 5th October 2016].

Government of Colombia, (2015)., Gobierno de Colombia. [Online]. Available at: https://www.google.de/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwjAquWb69TPAhVmKMAKHZiSAt4QFgghMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww4.unfccc.int%2Fsubmissions%2FINDC%2FPublished%2520Documents%2FColombia%2F1%2FColombia%2520iNDC%2520Unofficial%2520translation%2520Eng.pdf&usg=AFQjCNGRVfHw1KjRId4TZuw6VPvdMfDbSw&sig2=ARMaBXrZWxDyUPNTlbtSLw&cad=rja. [Accessed 2nd October 2016].

Green Climate Fund (GCF), (2015)., GCF Meeting of the Board 2 – 5 November 2015 (GCF/B.11/12 - 16 October 2015). Administrative budget of the Green Climate Fund for 2016-2018. [Online]. Available at: https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/87610/GCF_B.11_12_-_Administrative_budget_of_the_Green_Climate_Fund_for_2016_-_2018.pdf/81d87605-2a07-438b-ac9d-31adec571581. [Accessed 14th September 2016].

Green Climate Fund (GCF), (2016)., Further development of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks. [Online]. Available at: https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/184476/GCF_B.12_13_-_Further_development_of_indicators_in_the_performance_measurement_frameworks.pdf/30f1f9a5-98a5-483b-8553-e306b3c394e2. [Accessed 28th September 2016].

Green Climate Fund (GCF), (2016A)., GCF/B.14/INF.05/REV.01. [Online]. Available at: http://www.greenclimate.fund/boardroom/board-meetings/documents?p_p_id=122_INSTANCE_8e72dTqCP5qa&p_p_lifecycle=0&p_p_state=n

ormal&p_p_mode=view&p_p_col_id=_118_INSTANCE_jUGwSITWV8c5__column-2&p_p_col_count=1&p_r_p_564233524_resetCur=true&p_r_p_564233524_categoryId=409831#nav-category. [Accessed 3rd October 2016].

KfW/GIZ., (2013), Joint Offer (2013): KFW/GIZ - NAMA Facility, document. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility. (English).

KfW/GIZ., (2013), Gemeinsames Gebot (2013): KFW/GIZ - NAMA Facility, Dokument. Nicht veröffentlichtes internes Dokument. NAMA Facility. (German).

Kick off meeting discussion 10th May (2016). Internal Meeting. MTE Evaluation Team, NAMA Facility TSU and Donors.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Denmark, (2015)., Appraisal on Support to the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions Facility Under the Climate Facility – part II - DRAFT appraisal report. Unpublished internal document. DANIDA.

Nakhooda, S. Norman, M. Barnard, S. Watson, C. Greenhill, R. Caravani, A. Canales Trujillo, N. and Banton, G, (ODI), (2014)., Climate finance: is it making a difference? A review of the effectiveness of Multilateral Climate Funds. [Online]. Available at: https://www.odi.org/publications/8518-climate-finance-making-difference-review-effectiveness-multilateral-climate-funds. [Accessed 15th September 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2013, 2014, 2015)., Submitted outlines for Calls 1-3. Unpublished internal documents. NAMA Facility. (Note: This reference covers all 142 proposals put forward under calls 1-3).

NAMA Facility, (2013)., General Information Document 2013. [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/199043/NAMA_Facility_-_Information_Document_14May2013_final.pdf [Accessed 25 August 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2013A)., NAMA Facility Annual Review. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2014), Appraisal Report, Denmark. Unpublished internal document.

NAMA Facility, (2014A)., General Information Document. [Online]. Available at: http://nama-facility.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/NAMA_Facility_General_Information_Document_April2014.pdf. [Accessed 14th October 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2014B)., NAMA Facility Semi-Annual Report. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2014C)., NAMA Facility Annual Report. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2014D)., The NAMA Facility – Support for the Implementation of NAMAs (presentation). [Online]. Available at: https://unfccc.int/files/focus/mitigation/application/pdf/nama_facility_unfccc_regional_workshop_laos.pdf. [Accessed 20th September 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2014E)., General Information Document. [Online]. Available at: http://nama-facility.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/NAMA_Facility_General_Information_Document_April2014.pdf. [Accessed 14th October 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2015)., General Information Document. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/NAMA_Facility_General_Information_Document_2015.pdf. [Accessed 14th October 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2015A)., Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/conceptandapproach/monitoringandevaluation.html. [Accessed 16th August 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2015B)., Monitoring and Evaluation Guidance for NAMA Support Projects. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/conceptandapproach/monitoringandevaluation.html. [Accessed 16th August 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2015C)., NAMA Facility Annual Report (final version March 2016). Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2015D)., Monitoring and Evaluation Guidance for NAMA Support Projects. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/conceptandapproach/monitoringandevaluation.html. [Accessed 16th August 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2015E)., NAMA Facility Stakeholder Consultation – October 2015. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2015F)., The NAMA Facility. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/about-us.html. [Accessed 14th October 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2015G)., Background note for participants in the NAMA Facility. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2015H)., Financing the Implementation of NAMAs – lessons learned from the assessment of 3 Calls of the NAMA Facility 2015. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/uploads/media/Factsheet_-_lessons_learned_2015_-_NAMA_Facility.pdf. [Accessed September 21st 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2015I)., NAMA Facility Semi - Annual Report NAMA Facility - Implementation of the NAMA Facility. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2015J)., NAMA Facility Annual Report NAMA Support Project – Implementation of Housing NAMA in Mexico, Financial Component. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2015K)., NAMA Facility Annual Report NAMA Support Project – Low Emission Coffee Costa Rica. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2015L)., NAMA Facility Semi - Annual Report NAMA Support Project – SUTRI NAMA Indonesia. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility (2015M) Fact Sheet "Financing the Implementation of NAMAs – lessons learned from the assessment of 3 Calls of the NAMA Facility". [Accessed July 20th 2016 via: http://www.nama-facility.org/uploads/media/Factsheet_-_lessons_learned_2015_-_NAMA_Facility.pdf]

NAMA Facility, (2016)., Portfolio Overview of the NAMA Facility & Update on the 4th Call. Presented to the Board on 30 September 2016. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2016A)., General Information Document 4th Call for NAMA Support Projects. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/4th_Call/160704_4th_Call_General_Information_Document.pdf. [Accessed 14th October 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2016B)., Procedural changes for the 4th Call (General Information Document, Outline- and Assessment Templates). Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2016C)., 4th Call of the NAMA Facility Clarification Notes. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/4th_Call/NAMA_Facility_4th_Call_Clarification_Notes_I-29-July-2016.pdf. [Accessed 14th October 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2016D)., Theory of Change. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/conceptandapproach/theoryofchange.html. [Accessed 16th August 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2016E)., Technical Support Unit (TSU) staffing concept 2016. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2016F)., 4th Call of the NAMA Facility Clarification Notes. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nama-facility.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/4th_Call/NAMA_Facility_4th_Call_Clarification_Notes_I-29-July-2016.pdf. [Accessed 14th October 2016].

NAMA Facility, (2016G)., Portfolio Overview of the NAMA Facility & Update on the 4th Call. Presented to the Board on 30 September 2016. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2016H)., Procedural changes for the 4th Call (General Information Document, Outline- and Assessment Templates). Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2016I)., Procedures Overview. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility, (2016J)., Process Manual. Unpublished internal document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility Technical Support Unit (TSU), (2014)., Lessons Learned. Unpublished internal presentation document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility Technical Support Unit (TSU), (2015)., Lessons Learned Workshop. Unpublished internal presentation document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility Technical Support Unit (TSU), (2015A)., Perspectives 2015 Workshop. Unpublished internal presentation document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility Technical Support Unit (TSU), (2016)., NAMA Facility – Lessons Learned 3rd Call. Unpublished internal presentation document. NAMA Facility.

NAMA Facility (2016B). NAMA Facility (NF) Technical Support Unit (TSU) staffing concept. 2016

Oakden, J, (2013)., Evaluation Rubrics. Better Evaluation. [Online] Available at: http://betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Evaluation%20rubrics.pdf [Accessed 2nd June 2016].

Röser, F. van Tilburg, X. Hänsel, G. Day, T. Cameron, L. Falzon, J, (2014)., Status Report on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) – mid year update 2014. Mitigation Momentum Project. [Online]. Available at: http://www.mitigationmomentum.org/downloads/mitigation-momentum-annual-status-report-2014.pdf. [Accessed 12th September 2016].

Soren, D, (2016)., NAMA Facility: Supporting the Implementation of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs). Presentation on 23 May 2016 at the NAMA Facility Workshop.

UNEP-DTU, (ND)., Assessment of Project Outlines Submitted to the NAMA Facility during the Third Competitive Call for Projects. Final Report.

UNFCCC, (2014)., Climate Finance. [Online]. Available at: [Online]. Available at: http://unfccc.int/cooperation_support/nama/items/7476.php [Accessed 27th September 2016]. [Accessed 29th September 2016].

UNFCCC, (2014A)., Manual of the NAMA Registry. [Online]. Available at: http://unfccc.int/files/cooperation_support/nama/application/pdf/nama_registry_manual_19_february_2014.pdf [Accessed 26th September 2016].

UNFCCC, (2014B)., Parties and Observers. [Online]. Available at: http://unfccc.int/parties_and_observers/items/2704.php [Accessed 26th September 2016].

UNFCCC, (2015A)., Intended Nationally Determined Contribution of Chile towards the Climate Agreement of Paris 2015. [Online]. Available at: http://www4.unfccc.int/Submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Chile/1/INDC%20Chile%20english%20version.pdf [Accessed 27th September 2016].

UNFCCC, (2015B)., INDC Colombia. [Online]. Available at: http://www4.unfccc.int/Submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Colombia/1/INDC%20Colombia.pdf [Accessed 27th September 2016].

UNFCCC, (2016)., NAMA Registry. [Online]. Available at: http://unfccc.int/cooperation_support/nama/items/7476.php [Accessed 27th September 2016].

UNFCCC, (2016A)., Public NAMA Home (NAMA Registry). [Online]. Available at: http://www4.unfccc.int/sites/nama/SitePages/Home.aspx. [Accessed 27th September 2016].