

China

Mid-Term Evaluation

Thematic window: Environment and Climate Change

Programme Title: China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Author: Jean-Joseph Bellamy, Consultant

Prologue

The current mid-term evaluation report is part of the efforts being implemented by the Millennium Development Goal Secretariat (MDG-F), as part of its monitoring and evaluation strategy, to promote learning and to improve the quality of the 128 joint programs in 8 development thematic windows according to the basic evaluation criteria inherent to evaluation; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The aforementioned mid-term evaluations have been carried out amidst the backdrop of an institutional context that is both rich and varied, and where several UN organizations, working hand in hand with governmental agencies and civil society, cooperate in an attempt to achieve priority development objectives at the local, regional, and national levels. Thus the mid-term evaluations have been conducted in line with the principles outlined in the Evaluation network of the Development Assistant Committee (DAC) - as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In this respect, the evaluation process included a reference group comprising the main stakeholders involved in the joint programme, who were active participants in decisions making during all stages of the evaluation; design, implementation, dissemination and improvement phase.

The analysis contained in the mid-term evaluation focuses on the joint program at its mid-term point of implementation- approximately 18 months after it was launched. Bearing in mind the limited time period for implementation of the programs (3 years at most), the mid-term evaluations have been devised to serve as short-term evaluation exercises. This has limited the scope and depth of the evaluation in comparison to a more standard evaluation exercise that would take much longer time and resources to be conducted. Yet it is clearly focusing on the utility and use of the evaluation as a learning tool to improve the joint programs and widely disseminating lessons learnt.

This exercise is both a first opportunity to constitute an independent 'snapshot' of progress made and the challenges posed by initiatives of this nature as regards the 3 objectives being pursued by the MDG-F; the change in living conditions for the various populations vis-à-vis the Millennium Development Goals, the improved quality in terms of assistance provided in line with the terms and conditions outlined by the Declaration of Paris as well as progress made regarding the reform of the United Nations system following the "Delivering as One" initiative.

As a direct result of such mid-term evaluation processes, plans aimed at improving each joint program have been drafted and as such, the recommendations contained in the report have now become specific initiatives, seeking to improve upon implementation of all joint programs evaluated, which are closely monitored by the MDG-F Secretariat.

Conscious of the individual and collective efforts deployed to successfully perform this mid-term evaluation, we would like to thank all partners involved and to dedicate this current document to all those who have contributed to the drafting of the same and who have helped it become a reality (members of the reference group, the teams comprising the governmental agencies, the joint program team, consultants, beneficiaries, local authorities, the team from the Secretariat as well as a wide range of institutions and individuals from the public and private sectors). Once again, our heartfelt thanks.

The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views of the MDG-F Secretariat.

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F
*“China Joint Programme on Environment
and Climate Change”*

Final

Mid-Term Evaluation Report

Submitted by
Jean-Joseph Bellamy

July 30, 2010

8 Thiessen Crescent
Kanata, Ontario
K2L 2M3 Canada
Tel: (613) 254-8455 E-mail: JJ@Bellamy.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES	II
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VI
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. CONTEXT OF THE CCPF JOINT PROGRAMME	1
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION	2
3.1. OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION	2
3.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION.....	2
3.3. EVALUATION USERS	3
3.4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	3
3.4.1. Overall Approach	3
3.4.2. Roles and Responsibilities	4
3.4.3. Evaluation Instruments.....	5
4. EVALUATION FINDINGS	6
4.1. RELEVANCE OF THE CCPF PROGRAMME	6
4.1.1. Towards Development Objectives of China	6
4.1.2. Towards Implementation of MDGs in China.....	9
4.1.3. Towards UN Objectives in China.....	10
4.1.4. Alignment with MDG-F Goals and Principles	11
4.1.5. Towards Needs of Stakeholders.....	12
4.1.6. Synergies with Related Initiatives in China.....	13
4.1.7. Internal Programme Concept/Design.....	14
4.2. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CCPF PROGRAMME.....	17
4.2.1. Achievements of Programme’s Expected Outcomes.....	17
4.2.2. Contribution to Capacity Development	23
4.2.3. Additional Programme Achievements	24
4.2.4. Risks and Assumptions / Risk Mitigation Management	25
4.3. EFFICIENCY OF THE CCPF PROGRAMME.....	25
4.3.1. Programme Management Approach.....	26
4.3.2. Financial Management.....	28
4.3.3. Fund Leveraging / Co-financing	30
4.3.4. Quality of Technical Assistance / Use of National Capacity.....	31
4.3.5. Country Ownership / Stakeholder Participation	32
4.3.6. Monitoring Approach and Progress Reporting	33
4.4. POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE CCPF PROGRAMME.....	35
4.4.1. Potential to Achieve the Programme’s Strategies	35
4.4.2. Contribution to the Implementation of MDGs in China	36
4.4.3. Potential Impacts on Local Environment and Socio-Economic Issues.....	37
4.5. SUSTAINABILITY AND REPLICABILITY OF THE CCPF PROGRAMME	37
4.5.1. Sustainability of Results Achieved.....	37
4.5.2. Enabling Environment: Policy, Legislation and Institutions.....	39
4.5.3. Replication and Scaling-up	39
5. CONCLUSION	40

6. LESSONS LEARNED	41
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	42
ANNEXES	48
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORS).....	48
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX	61
ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	69
ANNEX 4: DISCUSSION GUIDE.....	71
ANNEX 5: EVALUATION MISSION AGENDA.....	73
ANNEX 6: LIST OF PEOPLE MET	76
ANNEX 7: JOINT PROGRAMME EXPECTED RESULTS AND PLANNED ACTIVITIES	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Programme Logic Model	15
Table 2: List of CCPF Programme Achievements.....	19
Table 3: List of Risks and Mitigation	25
Table 4: UN Agency CCPF Output Responsibilities.....	26
Table 5: Utilization of MDG-F Funds by Output	29
Table 6: Utilization of MDG-F Funds by UN Agency	29
Table 7: List of GOC Counterpart Organizations and Others Partners.....	32
Table 8: List of Performance Indicators to Monitor the CCPF Joint Programme	33
Table 9: Proposed List of Performance Indicators	45

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CAAS	Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences
CASS	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
CC	Climate Change
CCICED	China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development
CCPF	China Climate Change Partnership Framework
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEO	Chief Executing Officer
CICETE	China International Centre for Economic and Technical Exchanges
CIIMC	China International Institute of Multinational Corporations
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
COP	Conference OF Parties
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
C-PESAP	Climate-Proofed Environmentally Sound Agricultural Production
EH	Environmental Health
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GCCC	Global Climate Change Centre
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GLAAS	Global Annual Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water
GOC	Government Of China
GWP	Global Water Partnership
HDI	Human Development Index
HIV/AIDS	Human immunodeficiency virus / Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
HRPG	Heat Recovery Power Generation
ICIMOD	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
LEHAP	Local Environmental Health Action Plan
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDG-F	Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund
MDT	Multi-Disciplinary Team
MDT-F	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOFCOM	Ministry of Finance and Commerce
MOH	Ministry Of Health
MOWR	Ministry Of Water Resources
MTE	Medium Term Evaluation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NDP	National Development Plan
NDRC	National Development and Reform Commission
NSC	National Steering Committee
PMC	Programme Management Committee
PMO	Programme Management Office
RC	Resident Coordinator (UN)
SIDS	Small Island Development State
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound
SOC	State Owned Company

SO ₂	Sulphur Dioxide
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNAPCAEM	United Nations Asia Pacific Centre for Agricultural Engineering and Machinery
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade And Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNGCCE	United Nations Thematic Group on Climate Change and Environment
USD	United States Dollar
WHO	World Health Organization
WWDR	World Water Development Report
YI	Year One
YRCC	Yellow River Conservancy Commission

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by Mr. Jean-Joseph Bellamy, Senior Consultant (JJ@Bellamy.net). Mr. Bellamy would like to express its gratitude and appreciation to all stakeholders he interviewed. Their contributions were most appreciated, and facts and opinions they shared played a critical part in this evaluation.

Mr. Bellamy would also like to extend special thanks to the MDG-F Secretariat and especially the CCPF Programme Management Team who supplied key information and key contacts. A special thank you to Ms. Catherine Wong CCPF Programme Assistant and Ms. Lene Wu, Mission Assistant and Interpreter, who contributed greatly to the organization of the two-week fact-findings mission in China.

DISCLAIMER

This report is the work of an independent consultant and does not necessarily represent the views, or policy, or intentions of the United Nations Agencies.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) is an initiative funded by the Government of Spain and implemented by UN agencies to support countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication. The Fund operates through UN teams in each country and uses a joint programme mode of intervention that is divided into eight thematic windows corresponding to the eight MDGs. It has currently a total of 128 joint programmes approved in 50 countries.

The Environment and Climate Change thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service provision at the national and local levels, as well as increasing access to new funding mechanisms and expanding the ability to adapt to climate change. This window includes 17 joint programmes that mostly seek to contribute to three types of result: (a) mainstream the environment, natural resource management and actions against climate change in all public policy; (b) improve national capacities to plan and implement concrete actions in favour of the environment; and (c) assess and improve national capacities to adapt to climate change.

The China Climate Change Partnership Framework (CCPF) was the first joint programme in China and globally to receive approval by the MDG-F. It is one of four joint programmes (windows) funded by MDG-F for China. The implementation of the CCPF started in May 2008 and will terminate in May 2011. It has a total estimated budget of USD 19M – including USD 12M to be funded by the MDG-F - and it is implemented by nine UN Agencies and ten government counterpart organizations, plus numerous national and international organizations.

The CCPF has a twofold strategy: (a) support national level policies needed to achieve climate change goals in China; and (b) promote dissemination of innovative pilot partnerships and technologies at the local level. These two strategies are implemented through a set of three main outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and investment frameworks;
- Outcome 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy;
- Outcome 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms.

This Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) has been initiated by the MDG-F. Its objective was to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of CCPF activities in relation to stated objectives and to generate knowledge including the identification of best practices and lessons learned as well as conclusions and recommendations to improve the implementation of the programme for the remaining period of implementation.

The findings presented in this report are based on a desk review of project documents and on interviews with key programme informants and programme staffs including a two-week mission to China. The methodology included the development of an evaluation matrix to guide the entire data gathering and analysis process. The findings were triangulated with the use of multiple sources of information when possible and the evaluation report is structured around the GEF five evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results/Impacts and Sustainability.

The Main Findings of this Mid-Term Evaluation are:

The CCPF joint programme is well aligned with the development objectives of China and particularly with the National Climate Change programme, which it supports two main key programme areas: GHG mitigation and adaptation activities. It contributes to the implementation of the MDGs in China; particularly by addressing some implementation gaps under MDG-7, which were identified by an assessment conducted in 2008. The CCPF is a

responsive mechanism that seeks to address national priorities that were identified during the formulation of the programme. The process to design the programme possesses all ingredients for a successful implementation: strong participation, a “bottom-up” planning process to set national priorities, a learning process from past experience and a focus on developing the capacity of all stakeholders involved across sectors.

The CCPF programme delivers results as per strategies established during the formulation stage. It was also noted that most achievements are information products such as publications, presentations, training manuals, policy recommendations, etc. In themselves there are not developmental results per se but in all cases are key information products to support larger processes implemented by national partners outside of the CCPF programme such as the development of the government of China’s post-2012 strategies, the development of clean coal technologies and the management of environmental health issues due to climate change. Consequently, it is difficult to develop one “big picture” for the CCPF joint programme since each set of achievements is part of larger strategies and programmes outside of the CCPF programme’s scope. Nevertheless, the programme was built on lessons learned by the UN agencies including the recognition that emphasizing capacity development is key to sustain results in the long-term through multiple institutions and across multiple sectors.

It is a complex programme; however, it is well coordinated and managed. It involves 9 UN agencies and 10 counterpart organizations. The management aspects were well detailed during the formulation stage; including management modalities among UN agencies and the management of the fund. Roles and responsibilities were clearly identified with a management structure that includes a PMO, a NPC, a PMC and a NSC. According to the financial information reviewed, the MDG-F funds (\$12M) should be entirely disbursed by the end of the programme (May 2011). However, it was found that the management of the programme is too activity-based as opposed to be more results-based; preventing a greater focus on what the programme needs to achieve (vision) as opposed to what activities need to be delivered. It was also noted that the implementation of the CCPF has no focus on gender despite that it was mentioned at the formulation stage. Finally, a monitoring framework with 55 indicators is the weakest point of the CCPF joint programme. There are too many indicators and they do not measure well the progress made to achieve the expected impacts of the programme.

Over the long-term the CCPF joint programme should achieve its intended purpose, due mostly to the fact that the CCPF responds well to prioritized needs that were identified in 2007 and also that there is a strong country ownership of the programme. It was designed to serve as a catalyst for structural changes and as a base for further mobilization of co-financing from the international community, from the private sector and from the GOC itself. This model is working and the impacts in the long run should also be measured exponentially over time since there are many “clusters” of achievements that will contribute to greater impacts in the future. The programme should definitely contribute to the implementation of the MDGs in China and it has also the potential to impact positively the local environment and local socio-economies through the application of better agricultural practices, better health and safety conditions in the coal-gangue brick manufacturing and better water management practices to preserve this vital resource throughout China.

The sustainability of results should be ensured over the long run. Most results are institutionalized as soon as they are achieved and national partners become immediately the custodians of these results and use them to pursue their particular strategies and programmes. No results should end up on a shelf; they should all be used by national partners. Additionally, given the context of China the potential for replicability and/or scaling-up of results is excellent. Results from demonstrations and pilots should be replicated for wider use. Few examples include the support to China to prepare its climate change strategies for after 2012 that should be scaled up in the years to come; the demonstration of HRP systems should be replicated throughout China; policy recommendations from impact assessments of glacier melting and sea level rise on local socio-economic development should be incorporated into the 12th NDP and the demonstrated C-PESAP practices should be replicated throughout China over time.

Few Lessons were Identified:

- A good programme design leads to good achievements and positive long-term potential impacts of the programme.
- A joint programme with a large horizontal breadth provides good value, less implementation risks and overall more skills and knowledge transfers.
- The CCPF joint programme is an effective model to implement the “One UN” approach and also a concrete demonstration on how to apply the Paris Declaration commitments.
- Implementation success depends on a series of critical success factors such as strong partnerships between UN agencies and national government agencies lead to strong country ownership of programme achievements; strong track record to demonstrate solutions and replicate positive results; strong commitment from all parties to make it work; a staff in implementing (UN) agencies that are nationals with good government experience; and a design/implementation that is stakeholders driven.
- A complex joint programme with multiple implementing agencies and multiple administrative systems can work when the implementation modalities are well defined, including clear management arrangements and coordination, and clear roles and responsibilities.
- A strong country ownership of a joint programme leads to an early institutionalization of the implementation process by national partners and ensure the long-term sustainability of achievements.
- The use of the UN Theme Group on Climate Change and Environment provides an excellent forum for dialogues and coordination on related issues among UN agencies but also with the participation of national partners.
- It is necessary to develop communication mechanisms to convey information on the joint programme to all and keep abreast all stakeholders and implementing partners about progress of the programme.

Recommendations for the Remaining Period of the Programme:

1. It is recommended to assess the financial status of the programme during the last quarter of 2010 and, if needed, re-allocate available funds to activities to be implemented before May 2011.
2. It is recommended to produce yearly financial statements as part of the annual progress reports. These statements should indicate the actual disbursements for the reporting period, the cumulative disbursements, the commitments and the remaining budget. This information should be produced by output and by agency.
3. It is recommended to communicate the closing procedures of the CCPF joint programme to all partners; particularly the fact that all disbursements should be made before the closing date in May 2011.
4. Understanding the existing closing procedures, it is recommended for the MDG-F Secretariat and the PMO to keep some flexibility near the end of the programme to be able to pay financial commitments made prior to the closing date during a few weeks following the closing of the programme.
5. In the event that extra funds are available, it is recommended to allocate them to extra CCPF activities in line with activities implemented to date.
6. The CCPF joint programme has produced much information to date; it is recommended to assemble an electronic body of knowledge (CD, web site, etc.) and disseminate/share this information globally.
7. The Evaluator supports the plan to organize a High-Level Adaptation Symposium before COP-16 and a CCPF Forum (Climate Change Adaptation Summit) at the end of the programme (early 2011?) to showcase CCPF achievements.
8. It is recommended for the CCPF joint programme to participate to UNFCCC COP-16 under the leadership of NDRC.
9. It is recommended to present the major CCPF findings and achievements to GEF constituents and possibly to other related international bodies such as the UNFCCC Subsidiary bodies.
10. It is recommended to make appropriate indicators included in the monitoring framework gender sensitive; that is to gather information about these indicators that would provide gender disaggregated information.
11. It is recommended to review key programme deliverables and for those that are not published yet,

ensure that they are gender sensitive; particularly information products such as training manuals, local operational plans, etc.

12. It is recommended that before the closure of the CCPF joint programme, each agency produces an end of programme report with its counterpart organization(s); including initial strategies to move forward with CCPF achievements.
13. It is recommended that the final evaluation of the CCPF joint programme focus on the long-term sustainability and particularly on the replicability and/or scaling-up of the programme achievements.
14. It is recommended that in-kind contributions by national partners and UN agencies be further analyzed and documented during the final evaluation of the CCPF joint programme.
15. It is recommended to review the list of performance indicators to monitor the progress of the CCPF joint programme as per the proposed list of indicators presented in the report.

Recommendations for the MDG-F initiative:

16. It is recommended to the MDG-F Secretariat to provide better guidance (including templates) for the inception phase (start-up phase) of these joint programmes.
17. It is recommended to “cluster” geographically the various components of a joint programme to concentrate the programme’s activities in fewer geographical regions and emphasize more on synergies to be gained from this concentration among national, provincial and local partners.
18. It is recommended to introduce gender as a crosscutting theme to be applied in all joint programmes into guidelines produced by the MDG-F Secretariat. It includes the “*Implementation Guidelines for MDG-F Joint Programmes*” but also other guiding documents such as the “*MDG-F TOR for Thematic Window on Environment and Climate Change*”.
19. It is recommended to establish linkages among all similar joint programmes worldwide funded by the MDG-F and share best practices and lessons learned.

1. INTRODUCTION

1. This report presents the findings of the independent mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the China Climate Change Partnership Framework (CCPF) joint programme that is funded by the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F); an initiative funded by the Government of Spain through the United Nations System. The MTE was conducted by a Senior Evaluator - Mr. Jean-Joseph Bellamy (JJ@Bellamy.net) - on behalf of the MDG-F Secretariat (*see Terms of Reference (TORs) in Annex 1*) during the period April-June 2010; it comprised four phases: inception, mission, analysis and writing draft/final report.

2. This mid-term evaluation report includes seven sections. Chapter 2 presents the context of the CCPF; chapter 3 briefly describes the objective, scope, methodology, evaluation users and limitations of the evaluation; chapter 4 presents the findings of the evaluation. Conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations are presented in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 respectively and relevant annexes are found at the back end of the report.

2. CONTEXT OF THE CCPF JOINT PROGRAMME

3. In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million, with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. An additional pledge of €90 million was made by Spain on 24 September 2008 towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) supports countries in their progress towards the MDGs and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

4. The MDG-F operates through UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

5. The Environment and Climate Change thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service provision at the national and local levels, as well as increasing access to new funding mechanisms and expanding the ability to adapt to climate change.

6. This window includes 17 joint programmes that encompass a wide range of subjects and results. Nevertheless, certain similar underlying characteristics can be identified across most of these joint programmes. The majority of these 17 programmes seek to contribute to three types of result: (a) mainstream the environment, natural resource management and actions against climate change in all public policy; (b) improve national capacities to plan and implement concrete actions in favour of the environment; and (c) assess and improve national capacities to adapt to climate change.

7. The China Climate Change Partnership Framework (CCPF) was the first joint programme in China and globally to receive approval by the MDG-F. It is one of four joint programmes (windows) funded by MDG-F for China. The implementation of the CCPF started in May 2008 and will terminate in May 2011. It has a total estimated budget of USD 19M – including USD 12M to be funded by the MDG-F - and it is implemented by nine UN Agencies and ten government counterpart organizations, plus numerous national and international research institutes, scholars and experts who also contributes to programme outputs.

8. The CCPF addresses the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Outcome No. 3 that is “*more efficient management of natural resources and development of environmentally friendly behaviour in order to ensure environmental sustainability*”, through a twofold strategy: (a) support national level policies

needed to achieve climate change goals in China; and (b) promote dissemination of innovative pilot partnerships and technologies at the local level. This joint programme is implemented through a set of three main outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and investment frameworks;
- **Outcome 2:** Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy;
- **Outcome 3:** Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION

3.1. Objective of the Evaluation

9. The objective of this mid-term evaluation was to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of CCPF activities in relation to stated objectives so far and to generate knowledge including the identification of best practices and lessons learned. It also generated conclusions and recommendations to improve the implementation of the programme for the remaining period of implementation. Its specific objectives were to:

1. Discover the programme's design quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the MDGs, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. Understand how the joint programme operates and assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the One UN framework.
3. Identify the programme's degree of effectiveness among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the Environment and Climate Change thematic window, and the MDGs at the local and/or country level.

3.2. Scope of the Evaluation

10. The unit of analysis or object of study for this mid-term evaluation was the joint programme CCPF, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that are detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation. The evaluation assessed the planned, ongoing, or completed joint programme interventions to determine its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

11. It is part of the body of knowledge constituted by the M&E function of the MDG-F at the joint programme level. This level is the first level of information of the MDG-F information structure that comprises four levels: (a) joint programme level, (b) partner country level, (c) thematic window level and finally (d) overall MDG-F level.

12. The evaluation process generated information to address the evaluation questions identified at the outset of this mid-term evaluation. A particular emphasis was put on the current programme results and the possibility of achieving all objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed at which the programme is proceeding. The Evaluator reviewed the programme monitoring framework that was developed at the design stage, including the review of the set of indicators to monitor the programme progress.

13. More specifically, the evaluation assessed the four levels of the programme:

Design level

14. The assessment reviewed the relevance of the programme design. The extent to which the objectives of the joint programme were consistent with needs and interest of partners and end-users, the needs of the country, the MDGs and policies of partners and donors. The evaluation looked at the ownership of the programme design by considering the national social actors' effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions and to what extent the CCPF objectives reflect national and regional plans and programmes, the identified needs (environmental and human) and the operational context of national policies.

Process level

15. The Evaluator evaluated the efficiency of the overall joint programme's management model. He assessed the extent to which resources/inputs have been turned into results, the coordination among participating agencies and with the Chinese government and civil society and how the programme is being monitored. He also assessed the ownership of the process, including to what extent the target population and participants have taken ownership of the programme and its achievements and if counterpart resources have been mobilized.

Results level

16. The evaluation assessed the effectiveness of the programme in meeting its expected outcomes and objectives and also in contributing to the MDGs at the local and national levels; including putting environmental problems on the country's policy agenda. A particular emphasis was on the implementation timeline to assess if all expected results will be achieved at programme end. Success stories or best practices were identified. The sustainability of programme achievements was also assessed to explore if programme achievements will continue in the long run. The Evaluator also evaluated conditions in place at local and national levels to ensure long term impacts of the joint programme and possibly identify governance measures to improve the long term sustainability of programme achievements.

Country level

17. At the country level, the Evaluator identified lessons learned and best practices that can be transferred to other programmes or countries. It also looked into the contributions of the joint programme to the United Nations reform (one UN) and assess how principles of aid effectiveness were integrated into the CCPF.

3.3. Evaluation Users

18. This MTE was initiated by the MDG-F Secretariat. The audience for this evaluation are the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund. The evaluation findings provide these managers with complete and convincing evidence in determining the progress of the programme and – based on programme achievements - in providing conclusions and recommendations for the remaining implementation period of the programme. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

3.4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

19. The following methodology promotes a shared understanding of environmental management procedures and priorities. Findings were triangulated through the concept of “multiple lines of evidence” using several evaluation tools and gathering information from different types of stakeholders and different levels of management.

3.4.1. Overall Approach

20. This mid-term evaluation was conducted in accordance with the M&E strategy designed for the MDG-F¹.

¹ MDGF, *Monitoring and Evaluation System – Learning to Improve – Making Evidence Work for Development*

The function to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F was provided in the agreement between the government of Spain and UNDP and states that “*monitoring and evaluation of project activities shall be undertaken in accordance with established rules and procedures of UN Agencies, and determined by the Steering Committee, subject to the respective regulations, rules, policies and procedures of the UN Agencies*”. The evaluation was also conducted according to provisions stated in the CCPF document; including the programme monitoring framework with its list of indicators.

21. The Evaluator developed and used tools in accordance with the M&E strategy to ensure an effective programme evaluation. The evaluation provides evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful and that is easily understood by programme partners and applicable to the remaining period of programme duration. The evaluation was conducted and findings were structured around the five internationally accepted evaluation criteria set out by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development:

- *Relevance* relates to an overall assessment of whether the joint programme is in keeping with its design and in addressing identified key priorities.
- *Effectiveness* is a measure of the extent to which formally agreed expected programme results (outcomes) have been achieved, or can be expected to be achieved.
- *Efficiency* is a measure of the productivity of the joint programme intervention process, i.e. to what degree the outcomes achieved derive from efficient use of financial, human and material resources. In principle, it means comparing outcomes and outputs against inputs.
- *Impacts* are the long-term results of the joint programme and include both positive and negative consequences, whether these are foreseen and expected, or not.
- *Sustainability* is an indication of whether outcomes (end of programme results) and the positive impacts (long term results) are likely to continue after the joint programme ends.

22. In addition to the guiding principles described in the M&E strategy, the Evaluator also applied the following methodological principles to conduct the evaluation: (i) Participatory Consultancy; (ii) Applied Knowledge: the Evaluator’s working knowledge of evaluation theories and approaches and its particular expertise in environmental issues were applied to this mandate; (iii) Results-Based Management; (iv) Validity of information: multiple measures and sources were sought out to ensure that results are accurate and valid; (v) Integrity: Any issue with respect to conflict of interest, lack of professional conduct or misrepresentation would be immediately referred to the client; and (vi) Respect and anonymity: All participants had the right to provide information in confidence.

23. Finally, the Evaluator carried out the MTE according to the ethical guidelines and code of conduct established by the United Nations Evaluation Group². The MTE contributes to learning and accountability and the Evaluator has personal and professional integrity and is guided by propriety in the conduct of its business.

3.4.2. Roles and Responsibilities

24. The Evaluator reported to the Portfolio Manager who is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation. She has three main functions: to facilitate the work of the Evaluator, to serve as interlocutor between the Parties (Evaluator and reference group in China), and to review the deliverables that are produced

25. In addition, this MTE involved the MDG-F Secretariat, the Programme Management Office of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee (PMC). The Programme Management Office, PMC Co-Chairs, representative from the Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) and a representative from the Resident Coordinator (RC) Office served as the Evaluation Reference Group. The role of this group extended to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitate the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.

² More details on the ethic in evaluation can be found in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines at <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

- Identify information needs, define objectives and delimit the scope of the evaluation.
- Provide input on the evaluation planning documents (Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
- Provide input and participate in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
- Facilitate the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitor the quality of the process and documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Disseminate results of the evaluation, especially among organizations and entities within their interest group.

3.4.3. Evaluation Instruments

26. To conduct this mid-term evaluation the Evaluator used the following evaluation instruments:

Evaluation Matrix: As part of the inception phase, the Evaluator developed an evaluation matrix (*see Annex 2*) based on the evaluation scope presented in the TOR, the CCPF document and the review of other key programme documents. This matrix was structured along the five evaluation criteria and includes a comprehensive list of evaluation questions. It provided overall directions for the evaluation, was used as a basis for interviewing people and reviewing programme documents and provided a basis for structuring the evaluation report. This matrix was assembled with an overview of the programme, the evaluation scope and the proposed methodology to complete the inception report; which was submitted to the MDG-F Secretariat.

Documentation Review: It was conducted in Canada and in China by the Evaluator. In addition to being a main source of information, all documentation was used as preparation for the mission of the Evaluator. A list of documents was provided in the TOR and the Evaluator searched other relevant documents through the web and contacts during the field mission (*see Annex 3*).

Discussion Guide: A discussion guide was developed to solicit information from stakeholders (*see Annex 4*). As part of the participatory approach, the Evaluator ensured that all parties viewed this tool as balanced, unbiased, and structured.

Mission Agenda: An agenda for the 12 working day mission to China was developed during the inception phase (*see Annex 5*). The process included the selection of stakeholders to meet/interview, ensuring that they represent all stakeholders of the programme. Then, in collaboration with the MDG-F Team in China, meetings were planned prior to the mission. The objective was to have a well-organized and planned mission to ensure a broad scan of stakeholders' views during the time allocated to the mission.

Meetings/Interviews: stakeholders were met/interviewed (*see Annex 6*). Semi-structured interviews were conducted using the discussion guide and adapted to each meeting. All meetings were conducted in person and confidentiality was guaranteed to participants.

Capacity Development Scorecard: The Evaluator reviewed the national capacity for climate change mitigation and adaptation; using the Capacity Development Scorecard developed by UNDP/UNEP/GEF (*see Annex 7*). It is based on five capacity results needed in a particular area for a functional/operational managerial system. It includes a set of 15 indicators to monitor the progress in developing the required capacities. The main value of this instrument would be in comparing the ratings obtained at programme inception, mid-course and programme end.

Field Visit: Field site visits were conducted during the mission of the Evaluator in China. It ensured that the Evaluator had direct primary sources of information from the field and programme end-users.

4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

27. This section presents the findings of this mid-term evaluation, which are based on a desk review of project documents and on interviews with key programme informants and programme staffs. As described in Section 3.5.1 they are structured around the internationally recognized five major evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impacts and Sustainability.

4.1. Relevance of the CCPF Programme

28. The First National Assessment of Global Climate Change, issued by the Government of China in January 2007, indicates climate change's extreme potential impacts on food production, land and water resources, as well as its impact on frequency and magnitude of extreme weather conditions. The CCPF joint programme was to serve as a catalyst for structural changes and as a base for further mobilization of co-financing from the international community, from the private sector as well as from the Government of China itself. This section discusses the relevance of the programme within the national and international context; as well as against its original design.

4.1.1. Towards Development Objectives of China

29. The CCPF programme contributes greatly to the development objectives of China including its environmental objectives and more specifically its climate change objectives. Through its three expected outcomes, the CCPF seeks to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, plans and investment frameworks. It also seeks to establish innovative partnerships and disseminate technologies to mitigate climate change and support China to assess its vulnerability to climate change and develop adaptation plans and mechanisms. These outcomes are all part of the development strategies in place in China.

30. The development of China is planned through a five-year socio-economic planning cycle - currently in the period of the 11th National Development Plan (NDP) – 2006-2010. This national plan includes also an environmental plan corresponding to the same period. This plan is supplemented by a “*Programme of Action for Sustainable Development in China in the Early 21st Century*” developed in 2007 as a programme to guide the implementation of the sustainable development process in China. It follows the Agenda 21 of China published in 1992. Furthermore, as a Party of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) since November 1992, China developed a “*National Climate Change Programme*” in 2007 under the coordination of the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). These four key programmes and plans are summarized below.

The Five-Year National Economic and Social Development Plan

31. During the period 2001-2005, China's development led to a substantial improvement of people's standard of living and to a considerable enhancement of the international status of China. The development targets included in the corresponding tenth five-year plan were mostly achieved. However, from a focus on economic growth during the period 2001-2005, the CPC Central Committee put forward the scientific concept to develop and build a socialist harmonious society³ for the following period 2006-2010.

32. This concept was adopted in the eleventh five-year plan for national economic and social development for the period 2006-2010. The 11th National Development plan (NDP) focuses on independent innovation, improve institutions and mechanisms, promote social harmony and enhance China's overall national strength and international competitiveness. In order to maintain a balanced sustainable economic and social development, a set of principles were established; they include:

- Maintain a balanced and fairly rapid economic development

3 Also called a balanced “Xiaokang” society

- Speed up the transformation of economic growth pattern
- Improve the capability of independent innovation
- Promote the balanced development between urban and rural areas and among regions
- Strengthen the development of a harmonious society
- Deepen reforms and open-up

33. The 11th NDP also includes a series of strategies to promote the socio-economic development agenda such as expanding domestic demand, optimizing industrial structure, conserving resources and protecting the environment and promoting development using people-centered approaches. These strategies are followed by a set of 22 major socio-economic indicators benchmarking the situation in 2005 and setting targets for 2010. These indicators include a set of (8) indicators to monitor the population, resources and the environment including the reduction of energy consumption per unit of GDP (stated as a mandatory target), the reduction of water consumption per unit of industrial added value (mandatory) and the comprehensive utilization rate of industrial solid wastes (anticipated).

The Environmental Protection Plan within the Eleventh National Development Plan

34. The 11th NDP includes 14 chapters including chapter 6 “*Building a Resource-Conserving and Environment-Friendly Society*”. This chapter sets the objectives for the period 2006-2010 that is to “*enforce national policies of resource-conserving and environment protection by building a resource-conserving and environment-friendly society with features of low input and high output, low consumption and emission and cyclical and sustainable economic system*”. The overall strategy includes five pillars: energy conservation, land conservation, enhancing the utilization of resources, material conservation and water conservation. It includes priority programmes for ecological conservation such as wetland conservation and restoration; soil and water conservation programme; environmental pollution control such as water pollution control in major river basins; and disposal of medical and hazardous wastes.

35. This five-year plan for environmental protection (chapter 6) is also based on a situation analysis in 2005 that concluded that the environmental protection targets in the 10th NDP (2001-2005) were not met such as the increase of 28% of SO₂ emissions and a decrease of 2% of COD as compared to a targeted 10% reduction for both indicators over the period 2001-2005. Overall, the water and air quality - two critical areas - decreased seriously over this 5 year period. Emissions of major pollutants far exceeded the environmental management capacity of institutions and created serious environmental pollution problems. It was recognized that environmental protection lagged behind economic growth due to poor or inflexible mechanisms, insufficient inputs, low management capacity, difficulties to enforce environmental laws and low fines for not respecting environmental laws.

36. As a result of this analysis, the environmental protection plan for the period 2006-2010 was a priority to “*optimize economic growth*”. It sets new targets for the period focusing on air and water quality. It includes the following strategies:

- Reduce COD emission and improve the quality of water environment;
- Reduce SO₂ emissions to prevent and control air pollution;
- Control solid waste pollution and promote recycling and reuse of solid waste;
- Protect ecological environment, improve security level for eco safety;
- Control Rural Environment, Promote the Development of Socialist New Countryside;
- Strengthen marine environmental protection, focus on the prevention and control of pollution as well as ecological damage of coastal sea waters;
- Strictly supervise and management, ensure nuclear and radiation environmental safety;
- Enhance management capacity building and raise law enforcement supervision

The Programme of Action for Sustainable Development in China in the Early 21st Century

37. In 1992, the Chinese government published China's Agenda 21, a White Paper on “*China's Population, Environment and Development in the 21st Century*” as a platform document for guiding the country's social and economic development. To help implement this sustainable development strategy, a “*Program of Action for Sustainable Development in China in the Early 21st Century*” was promulgated in early 2007. This Program specifies the objectives, principles, priority areas and safeguard measures for the sustainable development of China in the early 21st century. The strategy is to seek economy restructuring, poverty relief, human resources development, resources development, environmental protection and capacity building.

38. The priority areas of this strategy include the rationale use, conservation and protection of resources and a better efficiency in utilizing resources (water, land, energy, grassland, forest, mineral, marine, climate and strategic mineral resources). It also includes the ecological conservation and development, and environmental protection and pollution control.

Context of Climate Change in China

- *Vulnerable ecosystems:* desertification extent to 27% of the country;
- *A coal dominated energy-mix:* energy consumption is provided by coal (70%), oil (21%) and other sources of energy (9%) as opposed to the world average of 28%, 36% and 36% respectively;
- *Harsh climate conditions and severe natural disasters;*
- *Large population:* China accounts for >20% of the world population. Per capita commercial energy consumption in China (1.7 tce) is only 2/3 of the world average;
- *Relatively low level of economic development:* In 2005, GDP was USD 1,714 that was only about ¼ of the world average. Also large disparities among regions and between urban and rural residents.

The China's National Climate Change Programme

39. China became a Party to the UNFCCC in November 1992. A National Coordination Committee on Climate Change was established, and a series of policies and measures to address climate change has been implemented within the context of the national sustainable development strategy. As part of China's obligations under the UNFCCC, the Government of China formulated the China's National Climate Change Programme, which outlines objectives, basic principles, key areas of actions, as well as policies and measures to address climate change for the period up to 2010.

40. Considering the challenges facing China to address climate change through mitigation and adaptation, the programme sets several objectives: control greenhouse gas emissions, enhance capacity of adaptation to climate change, enhance research and development, raise public awareness and improve the decision-making process. This programme also sets the following key areas of intervention to address climate change:

- GHG mitigation
 - Energy production and transformation: (1) Formulate and implement relevant laws and regulations; (2) Strengthen institutional innovation and mechanism construction; (3) Intensify relevant policies and measures in energy industry; (4) Strengthen the development and dissemination of advanced and suitable technologies;
 - Energy efficiency improvement and energy conservation: (1) Accelerate the formulation and implementation of related laws and regulations; (2) Strengthen institutional innovation and mechanism construction; (3) Strengthen relevant policies and measures; (4) Strengthen the development and dissemination of energy conservation technologies in key sectors; (5) Further carry out the 10 key energy conservation priority programmes in the Medium-and-Long-Term Energy Conservation Plan;
 - Industrial processes
 - Agriculture
 - Forestry
 - Municipal Wastes
- Adaptation to climate change
 - Agriculture
 - Forests and other natural ecosystems

- Water resources
- Coastal zones and coastal regions
- Climate change science and technology
- Public awareness on climate change:
- Institutions and mechanisms:

41. The CCPF programme is particularly aligned with the national climate change programme – particularly with the first two key areas (GHG mitigation and Adaptation) - and to some extent with the environmental protection plan and the sustainable development strategy that focuses on the rational use of resources and the reduction of water and air quality.

4.1.2. Towards Implementation of MDGs in China

42. In the last three decades China has undergone a remarkable transformation. The highly planned and centralized country of the 1970s has given way to a dynamic market economy that has caught the attention of the world. Since 1979, with the introduction of reforms, China's GDP has grown at an average of 9.8 percent per annum, per capita income has increased fifty-fold and some 500 million people have been lifted out of poverty. This high level of GDP growth has continued despite the international financial and economic crises experienced in 2008/9. Chinese people are now wealthier, better educated and healthier than ever before. China's Human Development Index (HDI) increased from 0.530 in 1975 to 0.793 in 2008. The number of people living on less than \$1 per day decrease from 31.5% of the total population in 1990 to 11.7% in 2003 [UNESCAP (2005)].

43. However, despite this unprecedented economic and social progress, significant new challenges have emerged including the particular challenge of balancing further economic development with environmental sustainability, and with the need to respond to the threat of climate change. As discussed in the previous section, the Government of China (GOC) attaches great importance in achieving this balance. Moreover, it is increasingly being recognized that the move to a low carbon economy and society need not be a hindrance, and that instead, a low carbon approach can be a catalyst for further growth and development, and for sustainable improvements in the lives of ordinary Chinese people.

44. As part of responding to these challenges, China began developing its own development goals and indicators in 1980 to measure progress towards the "Xiaokang" Society. By 2002, the Government had reviewed this set of indicators and has integrated its drive to meet the MDGs into its efforts to create a "Xiaokang" Society through the formulation of five strategies:

1. Expand domestic demand
2. Continually improve the economic structure
3. Maintain the protection of environmental resources as a basic state policy
4. Continue the balanced development of urban and rural areas, and different regions
5. Persist in the strategy of development rooted in technology and education

45. As of 2008, China's progress in achieving the MDGs is excellent and the country is likely to achieve all MDG targets by 2015. Three areas were identified as needed special attention: promote gender equality and women's empowerment; combat HIV/AIDS; and, reverse the loss of environmental resources.

46. Regarding the MDG-7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability, the review of progress conducted in 2008 indicates that it is likely that China will achieve this goal. However, few MDG gaps were identified such as the urgent need to introduce integrated and coordinated approaches to accelerate eco-restoration processes in order to adapt to climate change; difficulties in reducing energy use per unit of GDP, and carbon emissions due to the dominance of coal in energy use; pressure on China's agriculture from climate change and the degradation of eco-systems due to the small per capita size of land ownership; pollution of water resources; and the vulnerability of ecosystems in western China restricting socio-economic development in this region.

47. The CCPF - with its three-pronged approach – is relevant for the implementation of MDGs in China; particularly addressing some identified gaps regarding the implementation of the MDG-7 as presented above.

4.1.3. Towards UN Objectives in China

48. 2009 marked the thirtieth anniversary of UN presence in China. Through its long established in-country partnerships and extensive global networks, the UN is in a unique position to help China contribute to the realization of global MDGs. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) provides a common strategic framework for the operational in-country activities. The review of both UNDAF (2006-2010 and 2011-2015) indicates a strong alignment of the CCPF with these two development frameworks. As detailed below, the CCPF has contributed to the implementation of some of these strategies.

49. For the period 2006-2010, the UNDAF had 5 outcomes addressing five national priorities. The CCPF has been aligned with outcome #3 that is to address the national priority of balancing people and nature. Outcome #3 seeks to develop a “*more efficient management of natural resources and development of environmentally-friendly behavior in order to ensure environmental sustainability (with special focus on energy, biodiversity and water resources)*”. Under this outcome, five focal areas were identified. Those worth mentioning in the context of the CCPF are the overall assessment and tracking of energy and natural resources, energy efficiency, air quality and access to clean and safe water.

50. For the period 2011-2015, the UNDAF has three outcomes:

- *Outcome 1:* Government and other stakeholders ensure environmental sustainability, address climate change, and promote a green, low carbon economy.
- *Outcome 2:* The poorest and most vulnerable increasingly participate in and benefit more equitably from China’s social and economic development.
- *Outcome 3:* China’s enhanced participation in the global community brings wider mutual benefits.

51. The CCPF achievements – that is ending in May 2011 - will initiate the implementation of outcome #1 of this new UNDAF. Additionally, other activities implemented under this outcome for the period 2011 to 2015 should benefit from CCPF achievements and at the same time contribute the long term sustainability of CCPF achievements through replication and scaling-up (*see Section 4.5*). The strategies under this UNDAF outcome #1 include:

- Policies and regulations are strengthened to create a green economy;
- Policy and implementation mechanisms to manage natural resources are strengthened, with special attention to poor and vulnerable groups;
- China’s vulnerability to climate change is better understood and adaptation responses are integrated into Government policy;
- Government develops policies and regulatory frameworks that foster equitable access to safe drinking water and sanitation services;
- The impact of disasters on vulnerable groups is mitigated through enhanced disaster risk reduction and better preparedness and response measures.

52. The CCPF joint programme is also well aligned with the approach to implement the UN support to China. As described in the UNDAF 2011-2015, through the combined leadership of the Chinese Government (under the overall coordination of the Ministry of Commerce) and the UN Country Team in China, there has been strong progress in recent years in strengthening coordination of the UN’s support to China, not least through a growing number of joint programmes. The CCPF is one of them demonstrating a better coordination of UN agencies support to China as well as a better collaboration with national partners.

53. The wide range and variety of needs to implement the CCPF necessitated a UN multi-agency partnership

with GOC to address climate change and environment priorities. Individual organizations, given their mandates, lack the capacity to take a comprehensive and cross sector view of climate change issues. The UN cross-agency partnership presented a unique and unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate the benefits of leveraging the skills of several UN agencies in particular areas and strengthening the synergies. This demonstration of “One UN” initiative should also serve to strengthen the integration of the different sectors of the GOC.

54. In addition to the approach of developing joint programmes, UN China Theme Groups were formed and have also increasingly become fora for coordination not only within the UN but also with national partners and the international community. The CCPF has been designed and implemented through the UN Theme Group on Climate Change and Environment. It provided a context and resources for the “*raison d’être*” of this Theme Group and, as a result, the UN Theme Group demonstrated the benefits of more coordination among the UN agencies and national partners. During the mission of the Evaluator to China, the strong appreciation of a coordinated dialogue, planning and implementation among UN agencies and national partners was noted. Many stakeholders met during this mission stated a strong interest in this innovative approach.

4.1.4. Alignment with MDG-F Goals and Principles

55. As one of the first joint programmes approved by the MDG-F Secretariat, the CCPF pioneered the way to design and implement this type of joint programme. Despite this pioneer role, the CCPF is well aligned with the MDG-F goals and principles. The CCPF addresses national priorities identified by national partners and UN agencies; it seeks to coordinate the work of UN agencies with national partners; and support the implementation of innovative activities with the potential for replication and scaling-up. It is also well aligned with the objective of the MDG-F environment and climate change window.

56. The Government of Spain decided to establish the MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) as a landmark in expanding the institutional partnership with UN Agencies. This decision was done within the context of the Spanish Master Plan for International Cooperation (2005-2008) that was outlining Spain’s policy, advocacy and financial priorities in support of the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The aims of the MDG-F has been to accelerate progress towards the attainment of the MDGs in select countries by:

- Supporting policies and programmes that promise significant and measurable impact on select MDGs;
- Financing the testing and/or scaling-up of successful models;
- Catalyzing innovations in development practice; and
- Adopting mechanisms that improve the quality of aid as foreseen in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

57. The activities of the Fund and the way in which the country-level interventions are designed are guided by several principles:

- Support programmes anchored in national priorities, in line with the Paris Declaration;
- Ensure the sustainability of its investments;
- Apply the highest standards in quality of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation within a management framework oriented towards results and accountability;
- Consolidate inter-agency planning and management systems at the country level;
- Minimize transaction costs associated with administering the Fund.

58. The MDG-F supports innovative actions - within the framework of the MDGs and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness - with the potential for wide replication and high-impact in select countries⁴ and sectors. As a result, the approach and decisions of the MDG-F are informed by the imperatives of ensuring national and local ownership of supported activities, aligned with national policies and procedures, coordinated with other

4 Some 59 countries are eligible to apply for MDG-F assistance.

donors, be results-oriented and with mutual accountability. The CCPF is a case in point that demonstrates this overall guidance (*see Sections 4.2 and 4.3*).

59. The MDG-F has been implemented through the UN development system and finance, supporting collaborative UN activities that leverage the value-added of the UN in the sector and country concerned; particularly where the UN's collective strength is harnessed in order to address multi-dimensional development challenges. The MDG-F supports a number of thematic areas, including democratic governance, gender equality and women's empowerment, basic social services, economic and private sector development, environment and climate change, culture and development and conflict prevention and peace building.

60. Regarding the environment and climate change thematic window, the CCPF is well aligned with its terms of reference. The CCPF strategy is to support national level policies needed to achieve climate change goals in China and to promote the dissemination of innovative pilot partnerships and technologies at the local level. The objective of the environment and climate change thematic window is to support initiatives to reduce poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service delivery at the national and local level, increase access to new financing mechanisms and enhance capacity to adapt to climate change. This support has been provided through four priority areas:

- Mainstreaming environmental issues in national and sub-national policy, planning and investment frameworks;
- Improving local management of environmental resources and service delivery;
- Expanding access to environmental finance;
- Enhancing capacity to adapt to climate change.

4.1.5. Towards Needs of Stakeholders

61. The CCPF is highly relevant for Stakeholders involved in strengthening the climate change policy framework and promoting climate change mitigation and adaptation through concrete actions. As identified in the programme document, an important and unique strength of the CCPF joint programme is the number and diversity of UN, Chinese Government - central and local, research, academia and other public and private Chinese institutions involved in the programme to contribute to the promotion of China's efforts to address climate change. This broad group of players makes it possible to leverage a broad range of UN comparative advantages and to promote a broadening of China's response to climate change and the potential to integrate climate change responses into a greater number of priority development areas.

62. This relevance is also supported by the uniqueness of the China context. With its large population and growing energy consumption, China became recently the largest emitting country in the world. This issue offers also opportunities for dual global-local and win-win gains related to climate change and environmental management. For instance, measures taken to achieve global benefits of mitigation also offer local benefits in terms of improving the lives of large numbers of Chinese and particularly the poorest. Moreover, adaptation measures taken to reduce the impacts of climate change at the local level have other non-climate related benefits such as: reduction in local air pollution, reduction in the constraining effect of access to energy on economic development, improved livelihood opportunities, improved access to water, improved health and access to healthcare.

63. Mitigation efforts in China – due to its size and growth rate - offer great potential leverage in terms of net greenhouse gas emission reduction; including the opportunities to phase-out old technologies and install more climate friendly technologies from the start (to meet the economic growth demand), a more cost-effective mitigation approach than retrofitting infrastructures already in place.

64. Regarding the vulnerability of the people of China, it is less understood than climate change mitigation. Nevertheless, it is expected that climate change will have extreme impacts on food production and water

resources as well as extreme weather conditions. The China's First National Assessment of Global Climate Change (June 2007) projected that China's production of wheat, corn, and rice could drop by up to 37 percent over the next 50 years; and that worsening droughts, dust storms, and water shortages, caused by reduced rainfall, are projected in North China, while increased flooding and typhoons are projected for South China. Assessment of impacts on the major vulnerable sectors and development of adaptation measures are now priority areas for the GOC.

65. With its three-pronged approach – policy, mitigation and adaptation - the CCPF addresses some of the main GOC climate change priorities. It is very much a response to the current needs of the programme's Stakeholders. This relevance is also due to the way this programme was designed. Under a short timeframe, this programme was put together under the UN Theme Group on climate change and the environment with a strong collaboration with national partners (*see Section 4.1.7*).

4.1.6. Synergies with Related Initiatives in China

66. The CCPF programme was built on the results of past climate change initiatives undertaken by GOC and its international partners. Considering the three strategies of the CCPF – policy, mitigation and adaptation - the design considered the achievements of previous projects, seek to strengthen synergies with existing initiatives and more importantly avoid the overlap of activities with similar initiatives.

67. The description of past initiatives in the joint programme document indicates that results from several GEF funded projects contributed to the design of the CCPF and at the same time the design of the CCPF was done in such a way to avoid overlaps with these initiatives:

- In the policy area it included two UNDP/GEF projects supporting China in preparing its first and second national communication to UNFCCC as well as two UNDP/GEF projects to support China's policy efforts on energy efficiency and on the development of renewable energy. The latter was also very pertinent in laying the groundwork for some mitigation activities planned in the CCPF programme. It also included support from the UN Foundation and other bilateral organizations for developing the capacity to apply CDM in China.
- In the mitigation area, the CCPF benefited from the World Bank/GEF China Renewable Energy Scale-Up Project (CRESP) that focused on grid-connected wind, grid-connected biomass power, and hydropower sectors and from the World Bank/GEF Energy Conservation Project, as well as an IFC project. The mitigation portfolio of CCPF activities also considered the UNIDO/GEF "*Energy Conservation and GHG Emissions Reduction in Chinese Township and Village Enterprises project*", which introduced new technology for energy conservation and GHG emissions reduction in the coking, brick making, cement and metal casting sectors.
- In the vulnerability assessment and adaptation area, fewer internationally funded experiences were available. However, since 2000 the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) had been leading the identification of research needs in this area. For instance, during the 10th Five-Year Plan formulation, NDRC led the Study on the "*Impact Threshold and Integrated Assessment of Climate Change on the Major Vulnerable Areas*". NDRC also organized a group of 40 national experts to finalize the needs in vulnerability assessment and adaptation, which their findings were used to design this component of the CCPF programme.

68. Another important characteristic of the CCPF programme is the link with related global initiatives through the UN agencies involved in the CCPF. For instance, through UNESCO, the CCPF has a direct link to the knowledge and expertise accumulated by the United Nations World Water Assessment Programme. This programme brings together 26 UN organizations led by UNESCO (Secretariat) with the mandate to periodically assess the state of freshwater resources globally. The end product is the "*World Water Development Report (WWDR)*", which offers an authoritative picture of the state of the World's fresh water resources and a description of critical problems and threats. It was noted by the Evaluator that the third global report (*WWDR-3* –

Water in a Changing World) published in 2009 had a special focus on impact of climate change on water resources and it included a case study on the Yellow River Basin to discuss a more integrated approach to managing China's water resources, which was based on information given by the Yellow River Conservancy Commission and supported by the CCPF joint programme.

69. The CCPF has a link with the Global Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) implemented by UNEP, including the MA sub-global assessment in West China conducted in 2001-2003 and focusing on the integrated ecosystem assessment of the western region of China. Other MA studies were conducted on marine and coastal ecosystems. The accumulated knowledge and the MA methodologies have provided a scientific basis for the CCPF programme. Through UNEP, the CCPF has also a link with the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), which aims to assist mountain people of the greater Himalayas to understand the increasing influence of globalization and climate change on the stability of fragile mountain ecosystems and livelihoods of mountain people and how to adapt to these changes, and make the most of new opportunities. Activities of ICIMOD focused on three key strategic areas: water, environmental services, and livelihoods. Finally, through WHO, the CCPF has a link with the Global Annual Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS).

70. The CCPF was designed on the basis of existing knowledge accumulated by previous projects and programmes. Additionally, the UN multi-agency partnership offers to CCPF partners the potential to link with related global initiatives. Furthermore, the strong ownership of the programme by national partners (*see Section 4.1.7*) should also ensure that future programmes and projects use CCPF achievements.

4.1.7. Internal Programme Concept/Design

71. The review of the CCPF joint programme document indicates a good rationale for the programme and there is a good coherence among the design elements of the programme (internal logic: components, partners, structure, delivery mechanisms, scope and budget) and its expected results. The programme document reflects well the intention of key stakeholders at the formulation stage and these same stakeholders are also satisfied with the implementation to date.

72. One of the main positive characteristics of the design of the CCPF is how well it captured the Chinese climate change priorities at the design stage. It may look broad (many different components) but most of these components are direct responses to needs identified during the design stage of the joint programme. Therefore, most implementation strategies of the CCPF are well integrated with national objectives of the Chinese climate change agenda. As a result, there is a strong ownership of the CCPF programme by national partners and as a consequence, the CCPF benefits from a strong support by Stakeholders at all levels: national, regional and local.

73. The strength of this design is due to few critical factors. One of them is a concise design phase coupled with strong coordination among all partners involved, including some "*bottom-up*" planning method. Following the call for the concept note from the MDG-F Secretariat, each UN agency and its national partners quickly gathered a first set of priorities. These priorities were put together by NDRC as the GOC coordination body and reviewed under the umbrella of the UN Thematic Group on Climate Change and Environment (UNGCCE); including all UN agencies involved and national partners. Further prioritization of national priorities to be included in the joint programme happened through meetings and exchange of drafts to refine the scope of the joint programme. The planning process was finalized with the joint programme document, which was put together in a short period of time of only a few weeks; including its approval by GOC and the UN Resident Coordinator (UN-RC). Globally, it is said that following the call for joint programme documents by the MDG-F Secretariat, the CCPF joint programme was the first one reviewed and approved by the MDG-F Secretariat.

74. A second factor was the explicit consideration of some key strategies to design the CCPF programme from its outset; they were:

- Build on the UN’s experience supporting China on high-level policy issues as well as achieving replication of its pilots on the ground,
- Draw on wide range of very rich experience from past and ongoing UN Supported projects,
- Build on potential synergies among agencies in the UN family
- Build on previous and ongoing Government efforts,
- Involve and build links and capacity among multiple partners across sectors,
- Complement the support of other bilateral and multilateral agencies, and
- Focus on rural areas to maximize environmental and social co-benefits

75. Another critical factor that contributed to this good design is the timing. The design phase was done during the year 2007 and the implementation started in May 2008. Considering the global on-going negotiation on climate change - including at the time the coming 2009 Copenhagen summit (COP-15) - the MDG-F mechanism to support China in its effort to develop its climate change strategies and actions happened at the right time. It was a good opportunity for the GOC and the UN Country Team (UNCT) to support important national priorities that were also part of the 11th NDP. Additionally, the fact that the approval process was also fast - it took only a few months to approve the CCPF joint programme and start the mobilization of resources – most key stakeholders who participated in the design were still in their respective position, facilitating the implementation start-up. Back in 2007, there was (and still is) considerable enthusiasm to package national priorities into a joint programme and this strong interest was kept alive with a rapid start of implementing this joint programme.

76. Since the start of the CCPF programme, the joint programme document is used as a “blue-print” for implementation. It is a reference document for “implementers” containing strategies and components, partners, management structure, delivery mechanisms and budget. The logic model of the joint programme is presented in the table below; it consists of two strategies, 3 expected outcomes and 8 outputs (plus one outcome and output for programme management) (see Annex 7 for an overview of outputs and related activities).

Table 1: Programme Logic Model

Strategies	Outcomes	Outputs
<p>(a) Support national level policies needed to achieve climate change goals in China.</p> <p>(b) Promote dissemination of innovative pilot partnerships and technologies at the local level.</p>	<p>Outcome 1: Mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and investment frameworks.</p>	<p>Output 1.1: Improved policies and partnerships at national level to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into policy frameworks.</p> <p>Output 1.2: UN-business partnerships and new ‘green’ financing mechanisms to mainstream climate change and energy into investment frameworks and business practices.</p>
	<p>Outcome 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy.</p>	<p>Output 2.1: Development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy efficiency.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas.</p>
	<p>Outcome 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms.</p>	<p>Output 3.1: Climate proofing of poverty reduction in less developed areas of West China and vulnerable coastal areas of Southeast China.</p> <p>Output 3.2: Policies and capacities developed to manage environmental health issues from climate change.</p> <p>Output 3.3: Capacities enhanced and policies developed for understanding and adapting to impacts of water management changes on China’s environment and development.</p> <p>Output 3.4: Enhanced strategies for climate-proofed and</p>

Strategies	Outcomes	Outputs
		environmentally sound agricultural production.

77. The programme implementation strategy has not changed significantly since the formulation stage. Few changes were made to the programme during implementation and approved by the PMC and NSC; however there are mostly of financial nature such as moving a budget line for an activity from one year to the next due to operational constraints. One change that affected the overall budget was the decision by the PMC and NSC to reallocate programmatic funds of \$40,000 in YII and the same amount in YIII for a total of \$80,000 to support the UN-RC office for matters related to the implementation of the CCPF joint programme.

A horizontal design as opposed to a vertical one

78. A review of the logic model presented above indicates an extensive programme scope with 8 distinct outputs (which are further divided into 23 discreet activities) targeting many different areas of climate change interventions. The horizontal breadth of the programme is such that the question (horizontal breadth or more vertical focus?) was raised during the mission of the Evaluator to China. Despite the attractiveness of a narrower programme (narrower scope), it could not have been implemented in this context. The CCPF is a programme involving 9 UN Agencies and 10 national partners; restricting the scope of the programme would have limited the role of each partner and as a result prevented the use of relevant climate change mitigation and adaptation skills, knowledge and networks available through all these organizations.

79. Nevertheless, if the programme breadth was assessed as the most appropriate one, there is a constant risk of compartmentalizing the programme and limiting the potential synergies among all partners involved. Its horizontal breadth and its number of partners make it a complex programme that is difficult to coordinate and monitor. However, despite these recognized difficulties, the assessment reveals that the management model works well; most interviewees indicated that the coordination of the programme is a strength of the CCPF.

80. There is also the risk of being “spread too thin”; that is too many areas with smaller budgets limiting the depth of the programme intervention in each area. The review indicates that it is not the case for most of these areas; however, two areas may suffer from not enough resources: components 2.2.1 and 2.1.3. In the case of 2.1.3, two CDM feasibility studies were conducted on conservation agriculture and household biogas to assess the application of CDM in these contexts. The studies are completed and no other resources are available to “push” the file further. Nevertheless, these studies were conducted by the Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development in Agriculture at the Ministry of Agriculture. They now have the results of these studies and they may pursue the process to go ahead with the development of a CDM project.

81. Nonetheless, by design, the joint programme was also to focus on strategic and highly cost effective sectors. The programme was to serve as a catalyst for structural changes and as a base for further mobilization of co-financing from the international community, from the private sector as well as from the Government of China itself; particularly for the implementation of new technologies and their effective integration at the policy level.

Few design limitations

82. Despite a good programme document, there were limited guidelines on how to start the implementation of the programme; both in the programme document and from the MDG-F Secretariat. The document provides a good rationale for the joint programme, an explicit programme strategy and a first year annual work plan; however, not many details are provided on how to implement each output. This is expected in documents of this nature and the logical process to detail the design is an inception phase at the start-up of any programme and/or project. An inception phase is an opportunity to review the overall strategy, to detail the design, to review the allocation of resources, the management arrangements of the programme and also the performance monitoring of the programme, including the set of performance indicators and their related baseline values.

83. In the case of the CCPF, a rapid inception phase took place where partners identified activities to be implemented, using the first year annual work plan that was included in the joint programme document. However, the review indicates uneven processes; some components of the project were well planned during the inception phase and others went directly into implementation without much detailed design; including the identification of a vision from the stakeholders on what they want to achieve under a particular component of the CCPF programme. A strengthened inception phase with adequate guidelines is recommended for other joint programmes (*see recommendation #16 in Section 7*).

84. Considering the discussion above on “horizontal versus vertical”, the CCPF joint programme intervenes in many provinces in China; including the participation of numerous national, provincial and local institutions. The review indicates that it works and some linkages exist across UN agencies and national partners. However, more synergies would be found if these interventions were more clustered in some (less?) geographical areas with the participation of more local partners (*see recommendation #17 in Section 7*).

85. The major weakness of this CCPF programme document is the monitoring framework. Under the section 9 of the programme document, the monitoring framework is presented as the main management instrument to monitor the progress of the programme over time. The reporting of progress is to be done through management briefs, narrative joint programme progress reports and financial progress reports. The monitoring framework includes about 55 indicators and their related baseline, methods of data collection and responsibility. However the review of this extensive list of indicators raises three main issues. The first one is the number of indicators for a programme of this size. Tracking 55 indicators is a complex endeavor and run the risk that it will not be done accurately and timely. The second issue is that despite this long list of indicators, there are more targeted at monitoring progress of activities as opposed to monitoring achievements of expected outcomes and outputs. For instance, tracking the number of scientists and officials having capacity for the post 2012 negotiation is a good indicator for a training programme but not directly to track the development of “Post-Kyoto” strategies and options for technology transfer⁵. The third issue is the result of the first two issues presented above. With too many indicators and not the most appropriate ones, the result is a monitoring framework that is not providing summarized, accurate and timely progress information to managers of the CCPF programme. The assessment of this area indicates the need to review and simplify this list of indicators (*see Section 7*).

86. In conclusion this joint programme is highly relevant for China to support its efforts in developing its climate change strategies and actions. It responds well to the development objectives of China and to those of UN Agencies in China. The design of the joint programme is strongly rooted in the national priorities and, as a result of good “bottom-up” planning, the ownership of the programme by national stakeholders is excellent. It is a high-quality response mechanism to support China in addressing national climate change priorities.

4.2. Effectiveness of the CCPF Programme

87. This Section presents the findings on the effectiveness of the programme that is a measure of the extent to which formally agreed expected programme results (outcomes) have been achieved, or can be expected to be achieved in the future. It includes an overview of key results achieved to date by the programme, followed by the programme contribution to capacity development, the review of unexpected project achievements and finally the review of risks management and mitigation measures related to the implementation of the programme.

4.2.1. Achievements of Programme’s Expected Outcomes

88. The progress made by the programme to achieve its expected outcomes and outputs is good. The two strategies of the CCPF programme that is to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into the GOC policy framework and to promote the dissemination of innovative partnerships and technologies are

⁵ It is noted that the same discussion took place at the PMC March 2010 meeting and recommendations for changes of some indicators were approved at this meeting and by NSC at their April 2010 meeting.

implemented through a set of three outcomes subdivided into 8 outputs, which are further divided into 23 activities. The review of achievements versus the programme's expected targets indicates that the programme has been meeting its expected targets. In term of programme outputs, the programme has delivered what it was supposed to deliver. Key outputs delivered to date are presented in the table next page.

Table 2: List of CCPF Programme Achievements

Outputs	Activities	Achievements (as of March 2010)
Outcome 1: Mainstreaming climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning and investment frameworks		
Output 1.1: Improved policies and partnerships at national level to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into policy frameworks (\$1.916M)	1.1.1. Support to Post 2012 Frameworks 1.1.2. Support to establish a new Global Climate Change Centre 1.1.3. Support to establish a new High-Level Climate Change Task Force 1.1.4. Support to design China's new Basic Energy Law and series of Energy Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for post-2012 strategies on international cooperation jointly formulated by UN and Government of China and shared at COP-15 Side Event. It includes 7 studies on climate change related areas done by national experts. • Concept for a Climate Change Strategic Center (GCCC) to act as an international hub for best practices and south-south cooperation on climate change mitigation and adaptation submitted to State Council. Concept approved now discussing procedures. • Conducted a regional workshop on CDM with participants from China, Pakistan, Nepal, Laos, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and Myanmar. More seminars are planned for 2010: 1 for African countries and 1 for SIDS • Supported establishment of Task Force on rural energy for 2 years. Task Force made policy recommendations, which were presented at CCICED 2009 Annual General meeting and was submitted to State Council. • Draft Energy Law formulated, reviewed by China Energy Law Forum and submitted to the Legislative Affairs Office of the State Council for review before going to the National People's Congress for final approval.
Output 1.2: UN-business partnerships and new 'green' financing mechanisms to mainstream climate change and energy into investment frameworks and business practices (\$0.443M)	1.2.1 Engage multinational and local companies to increase awareness on climate change issues in China 1.2.2 Engage multinational and local companies through a UN-Business Compact on Climate Change 1.2.3 Demonstrate best practices of "green employment" in three selected companies with UNIDO and FAO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted Provincial workshops on climate change and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) within the context of the UN Global Compact policy initiative. • Developed resource material on Climate Change (CC) and CSR such as CC and CSR Guidelines Handbook, Climate Friendly Investment and Financing Guide and Best Practice Guide on Industrial Energy Efficiency and GHG Mitigation. • Organized a CEO Forum on climate change and CSR within the context of the UN Global Compact policy initiative • 3-4 global compact pilot enterprises were established in different sectors of the Guangcai network. Each enterprise has prepared a full CSR report including a section on climate change and is in the process of or has already completed the process of joining the UN Compact • Green Business Options: Pilot training workshops and Training of Trainers Workshop completed. Training to roll-out in 20-60 universities and training institutions beginning April 2010
Outcome 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy		
Output 2.1: Development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy	2.1.1 Pilot and disseminate clean coal technology 2.1.2 Develop and disseminate technology and policy for production of bricks from coal gangue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Coal Development Forum held as part of 3rd International CEO Roundtable of Chinese and Foreign Multinational Corporations in September 2009. • Clean Coal Technology Pilot Projects Technical Workshop (September 2009) • CEO Roundtable on clean coal technology • Research paper on clean coal technology • First heat recovery power generation (HRPG) brick plant underway with the Juyi Industrial Group in

Outputs	Activities	Achievements (as of March 2010)
efficiency (\$1.895M)	2.1.3 Promote policies, technologies, and practices for biogas and conservation agriculture, with an aim at CDM facility	Lingshi, Shanxi (testing in May-June 2010) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDM assessment of HRPB technology dissemination potential • TV documentary on HRPB underway • Health and Safety assessment of the coal-gangue brick sector to be used by GOC to improve Health and Safety of the sector • CDM feasibility studies on conservation agriculture (conservation tillage) and household biogas completed and published
Output 2.2: Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas (\$0.371M)	2.2.1 Develop and disseminate a new biomass pellet system, and increase capacities and disseminate productive applications associated with off-grid rural renewable power stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two pilot biomass pellet feasibility study completed, including selection of demonstration site and technological and economic feasibility
Outcome 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanism		
Output 3.1: Climate proofing of poverty reduction in less developed areas of West China and vulnerable coastal areas of Southeast China (\$1.275M)	3.1.1 Analyze key climate risks to poverty reduction and livelihoods in selected areas in the Himalayan Region 3.1.2 Assess the impacts of rising sea levels on the Southeast coast of China 3.1.3 Map the employment and income impacts of climate change in China, including the detection of potential for green jobs and the need for managed transitions in labour market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessed impact of glacier melting on social-economic development in the northwest region, and Gansu and Xinjiang Provinces and Adaptation Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developed glacier melting scenarios of watersheds ○ Analyzed the vulnerability to glacier melting of the social and economic development of these regions • Assessed impact of rising sea level on social-economic development of Tianjin, Shanghai and Guangzhou coastal regions as well as Zhejiang & Guangdong Province and Adaptation Strategies • Held project expert seminars in 2009 with UNEP, NDRC, CAS and CASS researchers to revise these assessments • Developed training materials on impacts of glacier melting and rising sea level • Disseminated information (500 project brochures) • Completed research and policy recommendations on low carbon economy and green jobs; findings presented to 2 seminars with decision-makers to promote “green jobs”
Output 3.2: Policies and capacities developed to manage environmental health issues from climate change (\$1.395M)	3.2.1 Benchmark Environmental Health best practice and support leadership development for climate change policy and practice 3.2.2. Develop effective local action plans to protect human health from climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed report “<i>Environment and Health (EH) Management for Climate Change in China</i>” (3 volumes: EH Governance and Management; Health Impacts, Adaptation Strategies and Research Priorities in China; Evaluation of Workforce Competency and Training Needs on Environmental Health) • Finalised and distributed training manual on “<i>Climate Change and Health</i>” (10 modules) • Conducted one national (Beijing) and two regional workshops (Guangzhou and Gansu) on climate change and health impacts • Conducted International Study Tour • Completed “<i>Local Environmental Health Action Plans (LEHAP) Resource Manual to Support Training in</i>

Outputs	Activities	Achievements (as of March 2010)
	<p>risks considered by local authorities and in the framework of the NEHAP</p> <p>3.2.3. Strengthen capacity to assess and respond to key climate risks, and identify the health aspects of climate change mitigation policies</p> <p>3.2.4. Enhance capacity for monitoring, analysis and reporting progress on impact of climate to health</p>	<p><i>China</i>” to strengthen local planning for climate change and EH management in 4 pilot Provinces: Gansu, Chongqing, Guangdong and Jiangsu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed critical review of local environmental health services in four pilot provinces, drafted 4 LEHAPs, including workshops with key stakeholders and commenced implementation of LEHAPs • Completed curriculum design and training materials for EH management risk assessment tools and application to climate change and started delivery of training • Completed an international review of environmental health indicators and information systems to support strengthening of national monitoring system development • Developed assessment framework and completed assessment of environmental health monitoring system • Commenced national review of EH monitoring and development of agreed indicators and identification of recommendations to improve HE monitoring systems
<p>Output 3.3: Capacities enhanced and policies developed for understanding and adapting to impacts of water management changes on China’s environment and development (\$1.864M)</p>	<p>3.3.1 Undertake comprehensive assessment of climate risks to water resources, defining risk scenarios and local actions to prevent impacts on MDGs</p> <p>3.3.2 Build capacities to track the effects of climate change on groundwater</p> <p>3.3.3 Monitor and analyze groundwater level & quality, develop and test a model of management and control of ground water level</p> <p>3.3.4 Organize a series of training workshops and on-site trainings for information and experience dissemination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published jointly with the Yellow River Conservancy Commission (YRCC) “<i>Assessment Report of Climate Change Impact and Water Resources of the Yellow River Basin</i>”, including impacts of climate change on water resources in Yellow River basin, causes analysis, trends and scenarios analyses. • Commenced identification of policy recommendations • A case study on the Yellow River Basin to discuss a more integrated approach to managing China’s water resources was included in the 3rd United Nations World Water Development Report (WWDR-3) “<i>Water in a Changing World</i>” published in 2009 and presented at the 5th World Water Forum • Developed a groundwater model (with future scenarios analysis capability) for analyzing impacts of climate change on water quality, on seawater intrusion and on groundwater dynamic and irrigation. Model based on data collected and analyzed from three selected high alert areas: Cangzhou in Hebei Province, Weihai city in Shandong Province and Xianyan in Shaanxi Province • Provided financial support to purchase some groundwater monitoring equipment to monitor water quality parameters such as salinity, nitrate-nitrogen, ammonia-nitrogen, arsenic, fluoride, ... • Technical support provided in three pilot areas to develop the capacity of local technicians on groundwater monitoring and data management and analysis • Characteristics of climate change drivers and the impacts of climate change and human activities on groundwater level were analyzed based on historical data. A paper titled “<i>Analysis on characteristics of groundwater level changes in Yundong Plain from 1976</i>” was published. Another two papers were accepted by related Journals: “<i>Variations of Shallow Groundwater depth and Its Response to Climate Change in Weihai</i>” and “<i>Artificial neural network approach for quantifying climate change and human activities impacts on shallow groundwater: A case study of Wuqiao in North China Plain</i>” • Research on impacts of climate change on the Yellow River Basin and groundwater monitoring were shared at a special session “<i>Impact of Climate Change on Groundwater</i>” during the 4th International Yellow River Forum (Zhengzhou, 2009) with the participation of the YRCC and the Yellow River Institute of Hydropower Research • National workshop for groundwater monitoring was held in Zhenzhou (June 2009) with the participation

Outputs	Activities	Achievements (as of March 2010)
		<p>of 113 participants from 7 River Basin Committees as well as representatives from 31 provinces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>The Effect of Climate Change on Groundwater and Drinking Water Supply</i>” was presented at a high level roundtable on global climate change and water security held in China in April 2010 and organized by the Global Water Partnership (GWP) China and the Swiss Agency For Development and Cooperation. • International experience exchange through a study tour in the USA and Netherlands visiting several groundwater management agencies and institutes: IHE, Institute for Delta Technology, USGS and NGWA. • Presented research results “<i>Statistical analysis on relationship among groundwater level, human activities and climate change in Yundong Plain</i>” at the International Forum on Water Resources and Sustainable Development (Wuhan, 2009)
<p>Output 3.4: Enhanced strategies for climate-proofed and environmentally sound agricultural production: Agricultural development in selected agro-ecosystems of the Yellow River Basin (\$1.488M)</p>	<p>3.4.1 Establish multidisciplinary teams at national and provincial levels, develop multi-sector IS, and conduct situation analysis 3.4.2 Train the MDTs, select pilot agro-ecosystems, and involve authorities to develop a roadmap for communities and farmer associations participation 3.4.3 Compile suitable agricultural practices to address C-PESAP and an operational plan, and feed into the IS to share with stakeholders 3.4.4 Train field technicians and farmer associations in selected agro-ecosystems, and pilot suitable agricultural practices with farmers/farmers associations 3.4.5 Formulate 4 to 5 C-PESAP provincial action plans based on experience derived from the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) at national and provincial levels • Identified about 30 suitable and locally adapted Climate-Proofed Environmentally Sound Agricultural Production (C-PESAP) practices and made them available through the Information System that went live in January 2010 • Additional practices to be gathered using questionnaire adapted from World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies • Developed training manuals for training of authorities, field technicians, and farmers • Selected 4 pilot sites representing different agro-ecosystems for piloting selected C-PESAP practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Ningxia</i>: irrigation agriculture (Adjustment crop planting and harvesting) and dry-land farming (water saving and efficient cultivation technology) ○ <i>Shaanxi</i>: cash crops (green plan cover and mulched drip irrigation technology) and grain crops (conservation tillage technology) ○ <i>Henan</i>: Winter wheat and Summer corn (conservation tillage technology and adjustment of crop planting and harvesting) ○ <i>Shandong</i>: Cash crops (precise fertilization technology and application of organic fertilizer) and grain crops (adjustment of crop planting and harvesting and utilization of crop straws) • Delivered training for stakeholders in 4 selected pilot sites regarding the impact of climate change to agriculture and best management practices to reduce vulnerability of agriculture to climate change and pollution from agricultural activities (Local authorities: 120, Technicians: 120 and Farmers: 320) • Prepared 4 Provincial operational plans for implementing C-PESAP practices

89. When comparing expected results versus the actual progress, there is one main variance that is the “*Output 2.2 - Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas*” with a budget of \$0.371M. The main planned activities were to develop and disseminate a new biomass pellet system and increased capacities and dissemination of productive applications associated with off-grid rural renewable power stations. The ambitious objectives under this output and the relatively low corresponding budget were reviewed in 2009 and a proposal to reduce the objectives was presented and accepted by the PMC at the March 2010 meeting and by the NSC at their April 2010 meeting. The modified plan is mostly to complete two pilot biomass pellet feasibility studies; which is currently completed.

90. The review of current achievements indicates that by the end of the programme most expected results should be achieved. Few activities are already completed or near completion such as activities 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.2.1-2 (all substantive work has finished, there is only the final CEO Forum to be held), 1.2.3, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, and 3.1.3. No particular issue exists to complete the programme within the given timeframe. Moreover, a few agencies mentioned the potential for doing more if additional financial resources were available.

91. The review of these achievements indicates a strong focus on activities as opposed to developmental results (*see also Section 4.3.1*). Many of these achievements are publications, presentations at seminars, training manuals, etc. There are indispensable results from activities but are mostly information products. The interviews conducted by the Evaluator in China indicate that the “real story” is not about these products but rather the context in which these information products were developed and particularly approved. Most of them were done to respond to a need of a particular strategy or programme of Stakeholders. The programme’s results are part of national partners plans and programmes. In other words, these information products will not “end up on a shelf” but rather be used to strengthen or develop a policy and/or a programme. They can be considered as steps in implementing national partners’ programmes and projects. From a CCPF point of view, this approach makes it difficult to see the “big picture” about what the programme is trying to achieve overall; however, these activities are fully part of the overall GOC climate change strategy.

4.2.2. Contribution to Capacity Development

92. The contribution of the CCPF joint programme to develop the capacity of stakeholders is excellent. This contribution is being made despite that no capacity development approach or strategy were explicitly stated in the joint programme document. However, the need to develop capacities was recognized at the outset of the programme and was part of a learning process from past experiences. To this end, the joint programme document included key over-arching lessons - from UN agencies experiences - that were particularly pertinent for this programme; including the following lessons:

- A multi-disciplinary approach, involving stakeholders from a range of institutions is the most effective way to deal with cross-sector problems, such as climate change, energy, agriculture, natural resource management, health, etc.
- Participatory approach is the most effective approach in policy-making and on-the-ground implementation. All relevant stakeholders have to be involved.
- Sharing international experience is one key value-added offered by UN programmes,
- Capacity development and skill building is another key value-added offered by UN programmes in China. Capacity building is key to sustain results of the programme and will therefore be pursued with multiple institutions across multiple sectors and components.
- Initiatives sometimes are stopped at national-level and fail to adapt themselves to local situations. There is a need to take national-level plans down to the local-level by developing local plans, in addition, they need to be adapted to the local situation by discussing needs with local stakeholders.
- For policy formation, busy decision-makers in China need and welcome distilled policy briefs based on detailed analysis of the current situation by well-respected domestic experts. Social dialogue and consultation are also important to policy formation.

- The capacity for monitoring, analyzing, and reporting on progress towards environmental sustainability needs to be strengthened significantly.

93. Furthermore, specific lessons related to policy, mitigation and adaptation from the UN experience worldwide were used as guidelines during the formulation process of this joint programme and contributed to the implementation of a capacity development approach emphasizing the development of national capacities and the long term sustainability of programme's achievements.

94. Globally it is now well recognized that capacity refers to the overall ability of a system to perform and sustain itself⁶. Capacity development encompasses the acquisition of skills and knowledge for individuals, the improvements of institutional structures, mechanisms and procedures and finally the strengthening of an enabling environment with adequate policies and laws. Capacity is the sum of a series of conditions, intangible assets and relationships that are part of an organisation or system and that are distributed at various levels:

- Individuals have personal abilities and attributes or competencies that contribute to the performance of the system;
- Organisations and broader systems have a broad range of collective attributes, skills, abilities and expertise called capabilities which can be both 'technical' (e.g. policy analysis, marine resource assessment, financial resource management) and 'social-relational' (e.g. mobilising and engaging actors to collaborate towards a shared purpose across organisational boundaries, creating collective meaning and identity, managing the tensions between collaboration and competition).

It is noted that CCPF activities are very much aligned with this approach; including also a strong focus on the introduction of efficient technologies.

95. As a result, results from the joint programme have been achieved using existing processes, skills and knowledge. These results are well institutionalized with the necessary capacities in place to be sustained in the long run. This is the case, for instance, of the draft Energy Law that is now under review by the State Council. The joint programme supported the development of the draft Law that was a government of China process. Capacity was developed along the way, the process is well institutionalized within the government of China and once this Law is passed it will become the new legislation reference for energy matters. Another example is the development of a heat recovery power generation system in the context of brick making. The joint programme partnered with a private company to undertake this initiative, local skills and knowledge were used and soon the first system should be operational. The system is built in an existing brick plant and its sustainability depends mostly on the success of the system that is to recycle heat into electricity; saving electricity cost for the plant in the long run. Several studies were supported by the joint programme. These studies were identified by national partners and results were published in related journals and conferences. Additionally, the knowledge accumulated through these studies is being used by the respective partners to develop future policies, programmes and projects.

4.2.3. Additional Programme Achievements

96. As described in the above Section 4.2.1, the joint programme is meeting its expected achievements. The programme has been delivering what it said it would deliver. No additional programme achievements have been noted during this evaluation. However, in the context of long-term impacts and sustainability, it is possible that additional achievements may be achieved before the end of the programme. Most CCPF achievements are part of larger programmes and strategies; further achievements can be expected after the CCPF expected results are achieved. It is recommended that this aspect be fully reviewed during the final evaluation of the CCPF programme.

⁶ See the study on “*Capacity, Change and Performance*” conducted by the European Center for Development Policy Management; which explored the notion of capacity and capacity development (<http://www.ecdpm.org/>).

4.2.4. Risks and Assumptions / Risk Mitigation Management

97. Risks were analyzed at the formulation stage of the CCPF programme and a very low overall level of risk was found due mostly to high-level and strong support from GOC. However, to achieve quality results, some specific risks were identified at the outcome level as well as measures to mitigate these risks; they are presented in the table below:

Table 3: List of Risks and Mitigation

Outcomes	Risk	Mitigation
Outcome 1: Mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and investment frameworks.	A shift in political direction away from engagement in international climate negotiations.	In terms of political direction, China has shown a strong commitment to engagement. By supporting China in preparing for post-Kyoto negotiations, the programme adds further strength for continued engagement.
Outcome 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy.	Climate change mitigation initiatives at the local-level will depend strongly on technology being both available and appropriate technologically, economically, and socially. In general, the companies operating in the technology areas of interest for rural applications will be small and weak.	→ It will be important for pilot projects to establish financial tools, and produce feasibility studies to support widespread dissemination that such companies cannot achieve on their own. → Success in the adoption of technology will also depend on supportive legislation, technical and financial measures, which are addressed by the programme.
Outcome 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms.	Lack of programme ownership by all parties.	Through the proper distribution of tasks, responsibilities and decision-making processes, all the parties have incentives to become and remain involved.

98. Other risks were also identified such as insufficiency of data, coordination difficulties among stakeholders, willingness of local governments and private sector to adopt new technologies, suitability of social and technical conditions at the local-level, lack of suitable trainers and confirmation of feasibility for some CDM initiatives. However, there were considered as low risks and mitigation measures included the establishment of an effective coordination mechanism; involvement of broader stakeholders for data collection; and strong consultation at the local-level to ensure that technologies and initiatives are adjusted to meet local conditions.

99. From a management reporting point of view, risks were not reviewed specifically; i.e. no special section on risk analysis was identified in the CCPF progress reports and no risks log has been maintained. However, implementation constraints (or also called challenges) were constantly identified, assessed, discussed at PMC meetings and reported in annual progress reports. The review of the CCPF programme confirms the low level of risks during this first period of implementation and also confirms that it is due to a strong ownership by stakeholders and a strong support from GOC.

4.3. Efficiency of the CCPF Programme

100. This Section presents findings on the efficiency of the joint programme that is a measure of the productivity of the programme intervention process. It reviews to what degree achievements derive from efficient use of financial, human and material resources. It reviews the overall management approach and the use of adaptive management, the financial management of the programme, the technical assistance, the delivery mechanisms, the participation of stakeholders and the monitoring approach to measure the programme's progress.

4.3.1. Programme Management Approach

101. Considering the complexity of the programme due to numerous institutions involved and the horizontal breadth of the programme, the efficiency of the management and coordination functions is satisfactory. The joint programme is well managed. The programme management team uses an adaptive management approach to secure programme outcomes while maintaining adherence to the overall programme design; including the commitment of resources when it is needed and not only to meet a disbursement schedule. The review indicates that the implementation of the programme is well aligned with the CCPF joint programme document and its anticipated set of results. It reflects well the structure of the programme, its activities and its management. The results framework is used to guide the implementation of the programme (see Section 4.1.7).

United Nations Management Modalities

102. One critical success factor to manage efficiently the MDG-F resources was to set up management arrangements that included clear roles and responsibilities for each UN agency as well as clear fund management arrangements. In order to ensure an effective implementation, each UN agency has been linked to specific components (also called Activities) and was technically and financially responsible for the implementation of these components. The table below indicates these links:

Table 4: UN Agency CCPF Output Responsibilities

UN Agency	CCPF Components / Activities
FAO	3.4.1 to 3.4.5 ⁷
ILO	1.2.3, 3.1.3
UNAPCAEM	2.1.3
UNDP	1.1.1 to 1.1.4, 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, 4.1
UNEP	3.1.1, 3.1.2
UNESCO	3.3.1
UNICEF	3.3.2 to 3.3.4
UNIDO	1.2.2., 2.1.2
WHO	3.2.1 to 3.2.4

103. Then, fund management arrangements were set to efficiently mobilize MDG-F financial resources. This arrangement was based on the “pass-through” fund management option as guided by the UNDG guidance note on joint programming. UNDP acts as the Administrative Agent and the accountability rests with the Executive Coordinator of the MDT-F Office with some delegation of authority to the UN-RC in China.

104. Once an annual work plan – including its budget - is approved by the Programme Management Committee (PMC) and by the National Steering Committee (NSC), an annual Fund Transfer Request is made by the UN-RC on behalf of the NSC to the MDT-F office. Once the request is cleared by the MDG-F Secretariat the requested funds are transferred by the MDT-F to the respective UN Headquarter Agencies. Each agency assumes complete programmatic and financial responsibility for the funds receive to implement the components as per the table above as well as for the execution modality, and method of transfer funds to its partners and counterparts. It is to be noted that the release of funds is subject to meeting a minimum commitment⁸ threshold of 70% of the previous fund release to all UN agency and clear progress towards results.

⁷ Note that these activities 3.4.1 to 3.4.5 were merged in YII into one activity 3.4.1 under the same output 3.4.

⁸ Commitments are defined as legally binding contracts signed, including multi-year commitments, which may be disbursed in future years.

105. Each UN agency is requested to provide certified financial reporting according to a budget template that is provided by the MDT-F Office. Indirect costs for each agency are compensated by a 7% management fee applied on programme expenditures.

Management Mechanisms

106. The mechanisms to oversee and manage the implementation of the CCPF joint programme include the following:

- The Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM), which serves as the national focal point of the UN System in China, is responsible for the overall coordination of the government bodies involved in the CCPF as well as coordinating the UN-GOC relationship. It is ultimately responsible for achieving the objectives of the programme. It had the authority to sign the joint programme document on behalf of all GOC partners.
- The National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) with its responsibility for overall macroeconomic planning and energy issues as well as housing the National Climate Change Committee, takes the leading coordination role for the operational management of the programme.
- The UN-RC reports to the MDG-F Secretariat on behalf of the programme. He/She takes overall responsibility for facilitating collaboration between participating UN Organizations to ensure that the programme is on track and that promised results are being delivered.
- A national MDG Steering Committee (NSC) was established, comprising the UN-RC, Senior Representatives from MOFCOM and NDRC, and a representative from the Government of Spain. The Co-chairs are the UN-RC and the Senior Representative from the GOC. Other representatives and observers are invited by the co-chairs as appropriate. The NSC's role is to provide oversight and strategic guidance to all MDG-F joint programmes in China. It meets annually and makes decisions by consensus.
- A PMC was formed of all national and international organizations directly involved in implementing the joint programme. It is co-chaired by the UN-RC or his designate and NDRC or his designate. UN-RC and NDRC work closely to ensure sound operation of the program, including proposing PMC meetings as necessary. The PMC is an operational sub-entity of the existing UN Theme Group on Climate Change and Environment, which has responsibility inter alia for overseeing the UN's broader work in the climate change field. The Joint Programme Coordinator and experts are invited to PMC meetings as needed.
- A Project Management Office (PMO) was established in NDRC's premises and is responsible for daily management of the joint programme. The PMO prepares all the documentation required by the PMC and service its meetings. The PMO also provides administrative and management services to UN agencies, Ministries, agencies, and partners as required.
- A UN Programme Coordinator, recruited by the RC Office and working under the guidance and direct supervision of the UN Resident Coordinator, works in the PMO and coordinates the UN Agencies' activities on a day to day basis⁹. The UN Programme Coordinator submits joint annual narrative progress reports and financial reports to the UN Resident Coordinator, who formally submits it to the MDG-F Secretariat
- A National Programme Coordinator (NPC) and an assistant to NPC were recruited by NDRC. They work under the guidance and direct supervision of the Co-Chair of the PMC. They are responsible for the programme management and coordination among ministries, agencies, and programme implementing partners under the guidance of NDRC.

Management Approach

107. The review indicates that the management approach is much activity-based as opposed to be more results-based. Instead of having a focus on three outcomes and 8 outputs, there is a strong focus on implementing the 23 discreet activities (also called components). This approach is also reinforced by the fact that some of these activities under a same output may be implemented by different UN agencies. For instance, under the output 2.1 that is the development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy efficiency, activity 2.1.1 is under the leadership of UNDP, 2.1.2 is under UNIDO and 2.1.3 is under UNAPCAEM. Considering the

⁹ The Programme Coordinator left the joint programme in 2009 and he has not been replaced since.

nature of each of these activities, there is a certain logic to have 3 different UN agencies involved. However, the tendency is to focus more on the delivery of discreet activities than on what results is expected from the CCPF joint programme (big picture).

108. Nevertheless, each activity has a logic in the overall context of the joint programme; however they should have been packaged into expected results – with their own strategies - that should be the focus during implementation. This packaging should also consider the concept of “clustering” these activities better (*see Section 4.1.7*) in order to enhance synergies among various partners involved in the implementation of these activities.

109. The review of the programme timetable to deliver the expected outputs indicates that overall the implementation is on track as compared to the original plan. This is an ambitious programme to be implemented over a short period of time but it should be delivered by the end of the programme in May 2011.

Gender Approach

110. It is noted that the effort to mainstream gender in the CCPF joint programme has been weak to date. As a crosscutting theme it was briefly mentioned in the programme document but only in the second to last Section of this document¹⁰. This short Section (page 52) states that the CCPF will make special efforts to mainstream gender into its activities and outputs. It was mentioned that the environmental health component as well as some rural energy initiatives would put special emphasis on women. However, the review of progress reports indicates that gender has not been tracked; no gender-disaggregated information exists in the quarterly and annual progress reports. Furthermore, the monitoring framework of the CCPF programme does not include any gender-based indicators among the list of 55 indicators.

111. A recent meeting of both the UN Theme Group on Climate Change and Environment and the UN Theme Group on Gender took place on April 21, 2010 to explore the ways to incorporate a gender approach into climate change activities supported by the UN system. A presentation was made by UNIFEM, including few statistics on the situation of women in China:

- Education: women account for 70% of adults who are illiterate.
- Employment: women constitute 45.4% of total employed population (2006) but income gap between men and women remains high: women’s average income is <70% of men’s.
- Political participation: women represent only 21.3% of NPC members; 23.2% of village committee members; 8% of heads of ministries; and only 3% of village mayors.

The meeting explored the linkages between climate change, gender, food security, natural disasters, health and household decision-making, focusing on climate change impacts on women.

112. The lack of gender focus of the CCPF joint programme is not saying that the implementation of the programme does not consider women. On the contrary, they are part of the programme’s stakeholders; however, women are not targeted as a special group of stakeholders to mitigate and/or adapt to climate change and since no gender-disaggregated monitoring information is produced, no gender-based information is produced by the CCPF joint programme. Considering that the programme still have one more year to go, it is recommended to review the list of monitoring indicators from a gender perspective and also to explore the possibilities to mainstream gender approaches in activities where possible (*see Section 7*).

4.3.2. Financial Management

113. The management of CCPF finances is a complex affair; as it involves 9 different financial management systems (one for each UN agency). As per the fund management arrangements, each UN Office in China is

¹⁰ It is noted that gender is also not part of the “*Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes*”; though it recognizes that the MDG-F support joint programme for the implementation of MDGs including the MDG-3 – Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women.

requested to report financial commitments and disbursements on a 6-month basis and each UN Headquarter Agency is requested to provide certified financial reporting according to a budget template that is provided by the MDT-F Office. It is the mechanism to aggregate financial information coming from all these different systems.

114. Based on the information reviewed by the Evaluator, the utilization of funds indicates that the entire budget of \$12M should be used by May 2011. The MDG-F funds allocated to the CCPF joint programme is presented in the tables 5 and 6 below:

Table 5: Utilization of MDG-F Funds by Output

Item	Total Budget	YI WP	YII WP	Re-phased YII in YIII	YIII WP
Output 1.1	1,916,000	773,500	999,500	268,754	122,037
Output 1.2	400,000	132,000	266,000	15,950	45,000
Output 2.1	1,895,000	438,000	1,207,000	487,709	237,270
Output 2.2	371,000	175,000	196,000	143,061	0
Output 3.1	1,318,000	290,000	500,000	29,248	475,688
Output 3.2	1,395,000	455,000	537,000		392,129
Output 3.3	1,864,500	446,500	789,000	31,000	614,471
Output 3.4	1,488,000	569,000	433,000	84,177	474,405
Output 4.1	548,762	131,000	248,000		249,762
Management Fee (7%)	783,738	238,700	362,285	74,193	182,753
Project Preparation	20,000	20,000	0	0	0
Total	12,000,000	3,668,700	5,537,785	1,134,092	2,793,515

(*) Source: Data obtained from Programme Management Office (PMO), Beijing

Table 6: Utilization of MDG-F Funds by UN Agency

Item	Total Budget	YI WP	YII WP	Re-phased YII in YIII	YIII WP
FAO	1,592,160	608,830	463,310	90,069	507,613
ILO	214,000	66,340	99,510	4,367	48,150
UNAPCAEM	214,000	149,800	64,200	0	0
UNDP	3,445,525	1,334,135	1,776,735	520,217	397,825
UNEP	1,278,650	256,800	502,900	29,155	508,986
UNESCO	999,915	263,755	394,830	0	333,538
UNICEF	995,100	214,000	449,400	33,170	323,946
UNIDO	1,748,000	268,190	1,212,310	457,114	253,879
WHO	1,492,650	486,850	574,590	0	419,578
Project Preparation	20,000	20,000	0	0	0
Total	12,000,000	3,668,700	5,537,785	1,134,092	2,793,515

(*) Source: Data obtained from Programme Management Office (PMO), Beijing

115. These tables indicate the distribution of the total budget by output (table 5) and by UN agency (table 6). The YI, YII and YIII columns correspond to the requested amounts documented in the respective annual work plans. The column "Re-phased YII in YIII" corresponds to budget amounts that were part of YII but that were not committed in YII. Therefore, these amounts were reported to YIII. Consequently, the YIII budget is made up of the last 2 columns for a total budget of \$3,927,607.

116. Regarding the financial management process, there does not seem to be financial reports that report precisely how much has been spent and how much is left (by output and/or by UN agency). From the tables above it is assumed that YI amounts were all disbursed and YII minus the re-phased amounts were also disbursed. Therefore the assumption is that an amount undisbursed of \$3,927,607 is left and it corresponds to the YIII budget.

117. The total figures indicate that about 67% has been disbursed or committed and that 33% is left for this year (YIII). The review by output indicate no major issue and all output should be completed on budget by May 2011. However, by UN agency, the review indicates that budgets for this year (YIII) for UNEP and UNIDO represent respectively 42% and 40% of their overall respective budgets to implement their set of activities as opposed to 33% of the programme duration left (12 months out of 36 months). It does not seem to be a major issue but it also needs to be monitored. Part of the answer for the UNIDO budget is the delay in implementing the HRPG coal gangue brick plant pilots. Regarding UNEP, some delays to transfer funds in 2009 affected its utilization of funds and it is anticipated that their commitments for 2010 will compensate for this delays.

118. From table 5 above, the budget to manage and coordinate the CCPF joint programme is \$1,332,500 (Output 4.1+management fee); it represents an 11% share of the MDG-F budget (\$12M). An additional \$80k was approved by the PMC to support the UN-RC in monitoring the implementation of the programme, which brings the share to 11.8%. As discussed in Section 4.3.1, the CCPF programme is well managed and well coordinated; it was confirmed by the interviews conducted in China during the mission of the Evaluator. It is difficult to assess the value of this coordination and management; nevertheless, 11% is not expensive compared to similar programmes and/or projects; especially considering the breadth of the programme and the multiplicity of implementing partners.

119. Regarding the closing procedures of the CCPF joint programme next May 2011, it is important to note that the official rule is to close the programme by May 2011 including all disbursements made by this date. This information was already conveyed to all partners of the CCPF programme; however, based on discussions conducted during this evaluation, it is critical that this information be communicated again to all partners for a proper ending of the programme. Connected with the closure procedure it is also recommended that a full financial assessment be done during the last quarter of 2010 to eventually re-allocate available funds to some activities (*see Section 7*).

4.3.3. Fund Leveraging / Co-financing

120. The capacity of the programme to leverage funds to co-finance some programme activities is good; although it may not meet the planned amount. A total of \$7M was planned as co-financing for the implementation of the CCPF programme, including \$5M from the private sector for the piloting of heat-recovery technology in coal gangue brick manufacturing and \$2M in-kind from the GOC corresponding to the cost of their participation in implementing the joint programme.

121. At the time of this evaluation, the total estimated private sector amount of co-financing for the entire duration of the programme should be between \$2.5M and \$3.2M; corresponding to the implementation of two heat recovery power generation (HRPG) brick plant pilots. The first pilot is currently underway (testing planned in June 2010) with the Juyi Industrial Group in Lingshi, Shanxi; the co-financing amount is about \$1.2M. The second pilot is at the feasibility stage and should be with a larger State Owned Company (SOC). At this stage the co-financing amount for this second pilot is estimated between \$1.3M and \$2M.

122. The difference between the amount noted in the programme document (\$5M) and the current reality (\$2.5M - \$3.2M) is due mostly to two factors. The first one was the financial crisis of 2008-2009. As in most part of the world, China's investment in new ventures slowed down dramatically during this period. The

situation improved somewhat but the overall enthusiasm to embrace new technologies was affected and this type of investment delayed over time. The second factor was the lack of concrete agreements at the formulation stage. The amount of \$5M was an estimate of what the private sector may invest in this type of ventures through pilots partially supported by the CCPF programme. It was estimated (and not agreed upon) during the formulation stage, mostly based on discussions with relevant stakeholders.

123. Nevertheless, the piloting of HRPG is going well and should demonstrate the environmental and especially the economic benefits to brick manufacturing companies. It is well adapted to the production of coal gangue bricks, which is also being boosted by new government regulations to ban the production of bricks made from clay¹¹. Following the first pilot, other companies and entrepreneurs already contacted the Juyi Industrial Group to express their interest in this technology. A market transformation is the ultimate goal here and it could not happen in 3 years but the prognostic of this transformation is good over the longer term.

124. Regarding the in-kind contribution by the GOC, it was estimated at \$2M. There is no detailed information as to how this information was calculated and no specific correspondence on this beside what is stated in the CCPF programme document and approved by GOC, UN and Spain. However, the Evaluator noted the strong engagement of GOC into the implementation of the CCPF joint programme. This engagement is a major strength of this programme and will certainly contribute to the long-term sustainability of programme achievements. It would be difficult to assess how much would be the value of this in-kind contribution but the review indicates that the actual in-kind contribution has been meeting (possibly exceeded?) the planned contribution identified at the formulation stage.

125. In addition, the in-kind contribution from UN agencies should also be noted. Their strong commitment to the implementation of the CCPF programme was noted during this evaluation. Overall, it is noted that the great interest of all parties involved in the implementation is translated into a large in-kind contribution that seems to be greater than what was stated in the joint programme document. It is recommended that this in-kind contribution be further analyzed and documented during the final evaluation (*see Section 7*).

4.3.4. Quality of Technical Assistance / Use of National Capacity

126. A high quality team of professionals from UN agencies and national partners implements the programme. The programme is also implemented with the participation of national and few international consultants when needed for specific work assignments such as studies and surveys. The entire programme is being coordinated by a PMO constituted of 4 people: a UN Programme Coordinator, a National Programme Coordinator (NPC), an Assistant to the NPC and an Assistant to the Programme Coordinator. In February 2010 the Programme Coordinator's contract ended and considering the timing (late) and the learning curve to be operational it was decided not to replace this position for the remaining implementation period of the joint programme. As a result, the PMO remains with 3 Officers who are paid by the CCPF joint programme under the output 4.1. All other officers involved in the implementation of the programme are supported by in-kind contributions from UN agencies and national partners. It was also noted that UN agencies receive a management fee of 7% of programme expenditures to cover some of the programme's transaction costs.

127. Overall the review found a highly motivated staff and dedicated to the programme, going often beyond the call of duty. Additionally, the involvement of key stakeholders allows activities to be well supported by key institutions, ensuring a better long-term sustainability. For instance, under the UNESCO-Yellow River Conservancy Commission (YRCC) partnership, the CCPF joint programme supported an extensive assessment to study the impacts of climate change on the water resources of the Yellow River basin. This assessment included causes, trends and scenarios analyses and the results were jointly published. This information is now

11 As of June 2000, the Government of China promulgated a directive requesting that 160 cities in China ban the production of clay bricks; which has been extended in June 2001 to 170 cities. By the end of 2010, the production of clay bricks will be banned in all cities in China. The current production of brick is estimated as about 400 billion pieces per year.

part of both – UNESCO and YRCC – knowledge base and will be used in the future for the development of a more integrated water resources management approach in the Yellow River basin. Another example is the partnership between UNIDO, Ministry of Agriculture and the Juyi Industrial Group. A HRP system is being piloted in a newly built factory producing coal-gangue bricks. This co-financed operation should be soon operational. The prognostic is that the HRP system will function and in the long-term, the company will carry on with its production of bricks with reduced emissions due to the HRP system, the Ministry of Agriculture will be able to use this pilot as a demonstration to replicate/scale up these results and UNIDO will benefit from this experience to replicate the process worldwide.

4.3.5. Country Ownership / Stakeholder Participation

128. The country ownership of the implementation of the CCPF joint programme is excellent. As discussed in Section 4.1.7, the programme was developed through a strong participatory approach. Using the various partnerships existing between UN agencies and national partners, this joint programme was formulated in 2007 as a direct response to several national priorities identified through a good participatory process. The objective of developing a good country ownership was also reinforced by some explicit participative strategies considered from the outset of this joint programme (see Section 4.1.7).

129. As a result, this joint programme “is owned” by key stakeholders. It is their response to address the need to develop a better policy framework, to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change; and they will be the custodians of CCPF achievements in the long-term (see Section 4.5.1).

130. The CCPF joint programme involved 10 Government of China Counterpart organizations as well as more than a dozen other partners. The list of these organizations is provided in the table below:

Table 7: List of GOC Counterpart Organizations and Others Partners

Counterpart Government Organizations	Other Partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development, Ministry of Environmental Protection (CCICED) ➤ China International Centre for Economic & Technical Exchanges (CICETE) ➤ China International Institute of Multinational Corporations (CIIMC) ➤ China Society for Promotion of the Guangcai Programme ➤ Energy Bureau, NDRC ➤ Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) ➤ Ministry of Health (MOH) ➤ Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security ➤ Ministry of Water Resources (MOWR) ➤ Office of National Leading Group on Climate Change, National Development and Reform Commission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All China Federation of Trade Unions ➤ Centre for Disease Control ➤ China Association of Rural Energy Industry ➤ China Enterprise Confederation ➤ China Geological Survey ➤ China Institute of Water Resources, Hydropower Research and Centre for Groundwater Monitoring, MOWR ➤ China International Institute for Multinational Corporations and Shanghai Environmental Protection Bureau ➤ China Land Surveying and Planning Institute ➤ Chinese Academy of Agricultural Engineering ➤ Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences ➤ Chinese Academy of Sciences, Including: Nanjing Institute of Soil Sciences Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Institute of Remote Sensing Application, and Research Centre for Eco-environmental Science, and Cold and Arid Regions Environmental and Engineering Research Institute ➤ Conservation Tillage Research Centre ➤ Earth Institute

131. During the implementation phase, participation is continually encouraged. Key stakeholders meet once a year at NSC and PMC meetings but a broader group of stakeholders meet more regularly at technical meetings organized jointly by NDRC and the UN under the UN Thematic Group on Climate Change and Environment.

Cross-fertilization happens through these meetings. Additionally, within each Activity regular meetings among stakeholders take place to discuss progress and the way forward.

4.3.6. Monitoring Approach and Progress Reporting

132. The CCPF joint programme is monitored and progress is reported according to the monitoring framework that was identified during the formulation of the programme. Progress reporting is to be done through management briefs, narrative joint programme progress reports and financial progress reports that are based on the monitoring framework. The monitoring framework includes about 55 indicators with their related baseline, methods of data collection and responsibility centers. During the second year (YII), some indicators were reviewed and approved by the PMC and endorsed by the NSC. The list of indicators is presented in the table below:

Table 8: List of Performance Indicators to Monitor the CCPF Joint Programme

Outputs	Original Indicators	Approved Changes
Outcome 1: Mainstreaming climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning and investment frameworks		
<i>Output 1.1:</i> Improved policies and partnerships at national level to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into policy frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No. of scientists and officials having capacity for the post 2012 negotiations ➤ <u>No. of agreements of technology transfer and investment</u> ➤ A knowledge hub for global best practices on mitigation and adaptation ➤ No. of cooperative initiatives added into the south-south cooperation framework ➤ A new high-level Climate Change Policy Task Force ➤ Basic Energy Law draft ➤ Series of energy strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Replaced by:</i> No. of studies emerging from and following the COP15
<i>Output 1.2:</i> UN-business partnerships and new 'green' financing mechanisms to mainstream climate change and energy into investment frameworks and business practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A UN-Business Compact on Climate Change, and series of high profile communication and awareness raising activities, including citizen engagement ➤ No. of climate change-friendly designs and products from multinational firms ➤ No. of best practices of "green employment" 	
Outcome 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy		
<i>Output 2.1:</i> Development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Partnership and financing for one pilot clean coal power plant</u> ➤ No. of entities and individuals received Replication of results from demonstration ➤ Energy and resources efficiency model developed ➤ 2 Pilot bricks making factories established ➤ Pilot bricks making factories performance ➤ Energy generated has access to the grid and is marketable ➤ Local policy incentives and financial tools available for energy efficiency coal gangue technology ➤ Number of technicians trained and licensed ➤ Local policy and financial incentives available for power generation through waste heat recovering in coal gangue brick manufacturing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Replaced by:</i> Finalization and publication of China's Blue Paper on Clean Coal Technology

Outputs	Original Indicators	Approved Changes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Number of people aware of the problem and potential remedies ➤ No. of enterprises monitored for working condition and working environment ➤ Set up protocol productivity parameters ➤ Specific conclusions and recommendations for application of CDM in biogas and conservation agriculture. 	
<p><i>Output 2.2:</i> Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>No. of biomass pellets replacing coal</u> ➤ <u>No. of households with stoves and boiler</u> ➤ <u>Rural biomass waste management guidance</u> ➤ <u>Increased market for productive applications of off-grid rural renewable power</u> ➤ <u>No. of rural individual and TVEs received trainings on rural renewable power</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Replaced by: No. of households interviewed for biomass supply ➤ Replaced by: No. of suppliers of pellet machinery interviewed ➤ Replaced by: No. of households with stoves and boilers interviewed ➤ Replaced by: Feasibility study completed on rural biomass pellet ➤ No. of off-grid rural renewable power plants surveyed ➤ No. of rural renewable power plants, TVEs and rural individuals trained
<p>Outcome 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanism</p>		
<p><i>Output 3.1:</i> Climate proofing of poverty reduction in less developed areas of West China and vulnerable coastal areas of Southeast China</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Situation analysis report of glacier in Himalayas ➤ Adaptation strategy for glacier melting (2008-2010) ➤ Situation analysis report of sea-level rising in the selected coastal areas ➤ Adaptation strategy for sea level rising ➤ No. of individuals received Outreach materials ➤ Number of feasibility studies, comparative studies and needs assessments conducted; ➤ Number of policy recommendations 	
<p><i>Output 3.2:</i> Policies and capacities developed to manage environmental health issues from climate change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Institutional capacity for management of climate change risks to health at national and provincial levels ➤ Local action plans to protect human health from climate change risks ➤ Capacity for climate risk assessment and specific policy recommendations ➤ Health related climate impact monitoring capacity ➤ No. of pilot EH monitoring systems established and made functional, and lessons shared 	
<p><i>Output 3.3:</i> Capacities enhanced and policies developed for understanding and adapting to impacts of water management changes on China's environment and development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Policy recommendations and development of key indicators on the 11 identified challenges; ➤ Strategies and methodology to monitoring groundwater quality developed ➤ Improved strategies and methodology to monitoring groundwater level ➤ An integrated groundwater system in high alter areas ➤ Partnerships at national level ➤ Model of management and control of groundwater level ➤ Long-term sustainable capacity after the end of the programme 	
<p><i>Output 3.4:</i> Enhanced strategies for climate-proofed and environmentally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ National and provincial MDTs working with stakeholders (1st year) ➤ A multi-sector information system for eastern provinces of the Yellow River Basin facilitating the analysis and 	

Outputs	Original Indicators	Approved Changes
sound agricultural production: Agricultural development in selected agro-ecosystems of the Yellow River Basin	exchange of information (1st year) ➤ Guidelines to involve communities and farmers associations in planning for C-PESAP (2nd year) ➤ Technical advice to local authorities to implement C-PESAP by trained MDTs (2nd year) ➤ Menu of C-PESAP practices and options for implementation at local level available (2nd year) ➤ No. of trained field technicians, farmers and farmer associations in C-PESAP (2nd year) ➤ Pilot testing of suitable C-PESAP practices (2-3rd year) ➤ Four to five provincial adaptation action plans for C-PESAP (3rd year)	

133. This monitoring framework is the main monitoring instrument to monitor the progress of the programme over time. However the review of this extensive list of indicators raises three main issues:

- *Number of indicators:* Tracking 55 indicators is a complex endeavour and run the risk that it will not be done accurately and timely.
- *Content of indicators:* Current indicators are more targeted at monitoring progress of activities as opposed to monitoring the achievements of expected outcomes and outputs. For instance, tracking the number of scientists and officials having capacity for the post 2012 negotiation is a good indicator for a training programme but not directly to track the development of “Post-Kyoto” strategies and options for technology transfer¹². These indicators need to be SMART¹³
- *Quality of progress information produced:* As a result of too many indicators and not the most appropriate ones, the monitoring framework is not providing summarized, accurate and timely progress information to managers of the CCPF programme.

134. The review of progress reports produced so far indicates that it is difficult to get the “big picture” about the progress of the CCPF joint programme. This is also compounded by the change of template for reporting annually. From one annual progress report in 2008, the CCPF-PMO was asked to produce semi-annual progress reports from the second semester of 2009; using a different template. If we take the example of the first 2009 semi-annual report and focusing on output 1.1 that is “*Improved policies and partnerships at national-level to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into policy frameworks*”, it is difficult to interpret the progress made toward this particular output. The given update tells us how many people were trained and that some policy recommendations were made; however, it is difficult to gauge the progress made in improving sustainably the policy framework. It is recommended to review this monitoring framework, including the list of indicators (see recommendation #15 in Section 7).

4.4. Potential Impacts of the CCPF Programme

135. This section discusses the progress made so far toward the achievement of strategies and outcomes of the programme and the likelihood that programme achievements will have a long-term impact on the climate change agenda of China.

4.4.1. Potential to Achieve the Programme’s Strategies

136. There is a good potential for the programme to achieve its strategies and outcomes over the long-term. As

12 It is noted that the same discussion took place at the PMC March 2010 meeting and recommendations for changes of some indicators were approved by the PMC and NSC at their April 2010 meeting.

13 S: Specific; M: Measurable; A: Achievable; R: Relevant; T: Time-bound

per its design, the programme supports national level policies needed to achieve climate change mitigation and adaptation goals in China and promotes the dissemination of innovative pilot partnerships and technologies at the local level. Through its 23 components grouped into 8 outputs, the CCPF joint programme seeks to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and investment frameworks; establish innovative partnerships and disseminate technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy; and to accelerate action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms.

137. The review of the progress to date in achieving its set of expected results (*see Section 4.2.1*), reveals that what is expected from the programme will be delivered by May 2011. Moreover, the fact that the CCPF is a direct response to national priorities and that the country ownership of the programme is good will contribute to the long-term impacts on the climate change agenda in China.

138. By responding to national priorities, most CCPF components are implemented in the context of broader national strategies and programmes. The results from studies, assessments, modeling, manuals and pilots are all being integrated into these strategies and programmes and will be used in the future to pursue the objectives of these national strategies and programmes implemented by national partners. Therefore, the uptake potential from each “cluster” of achievements is excellent. It includes the drafting of future national policies related to climate change mitigation and adaptation, the replication of management and monitoring models, the implementation of the new Energy Law, the position of GOC on climate change for after-2012, the identification and implementation of clean technology strategies and the development of strategies for the promotion of green jobs and of corporate social sustainability in the private sector.

139. Moreover, considering that the CCPF joint programme was designed to serve as a catalyst for structural changes and as a base for further mobilization of co-financing from the international community, from the private sector and from the GOC itself, the impacts in the long run could be measured exponentially over time. Overall, the CCPF joint programme has brought innovative approaches, methodologies and technologies and has taken risks to venture in new areas of climate change mitigation and adaptation in China. Its investments could be compared to the “seed money” concept in venture capital operations. It invested in new climate change initiatives with the full participation of key stakeholders. A certain level of risks has been attached to these initiatives – such as a feasibility study concluding that the particular project is not feasible or a pilot demonstrating a new technology with negative results – however, most initiatives should lead to greater results in the long run and this success should amplify the positive impacts of the programme in the future.

4.4.2. Contribution to the Implementation of MDGs in China

140. As discussed in Section 4.1.2, China has integrated its drive to meet the MDGs into its effort to create a “Xiaokang” society. It has done this also by setting national strategies including the strategy to “*maintain the protection of the environmental resources as a basic state policy*”. This strategy is particularly important since the MDG assessment of 2008 indicated that special attention is needed for “*reversing the loss of environmental resources*”. China should still meet the MDG-7 by 2015; however, few gaps were identified through this 2008 assessment. They include (i) the urgent need to introduce integrated and coordinated approaches to accelerate eco-restoration processes in order to adapt to climate change; (ii) difficulties in reducing energy use per unit of GDP, and carbon emissions due to the dominance of coal in energy use; (iii) pressure on China’s agriculture from climate change and the degradation of eco-systems due to the small per capita size of land ownership; (iv) pollution of water resources; and (v) the vulnerability of ecosystems in western China restricting socio-economic development in this region.

141. Considering the design of the CCPF joint programme, it contributes well to the implementation of the MDG-7; particularly addressing the gaps (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) as presented above. As a climate change partnership programme to support China in developing its policy framework for climate change and in

promoting innovative partnerships and technologies at the local level, the CCPF joint programme contributes fully to the implementation of the MDGs in China.

4.4.3. Potential Impacts on Local Environment and Socio-Economic Issues

142. The CCPF joint programme is having positive impacts on the local environment and the welfare of local communities where the programme intervenes. This is not a direct impact since the CCPF target the policy framework and the development of mitigation and adaptation actions. However, indirectly, most components of the programme will benefit the local environment and local communities; particularly activities under outcomes 2 and 3.

143. For instance, the pilot implemented under the activity 2.1.2 should lead to the production of coal-gangue bricks, which should have positive environmental and socio-economic impacts. The use of a HRPG should make the manufacturing of bricks more profitable with the use of heat to produce electricity but also encouraging the production of coal-gangue bricks, which are re-using a by-product of coal mining. All together it is also expected that the process will decrease the amount of emissions released by the manufacturing process. Additionally the programme is supporting the development of better health and safety standards in the sector, which should translate to improving health and safety of workers in this sector. Activities under output 3.4 should also contribute to positively impact the local environment and local socio-economy. Through the implementation of C-PESAP practices, the programme supports the implementation of better agricultural practices, which seek to be climate-proofed but which will also impact positively the productivity of local farms over the long run. Over the long-term, the output 3.3 should also have a positive impact on the environment, social and economy of the Yellow River basin by providing critical information and models to better manage water resources of the basin.

4.5. Sustainability and Replicability of the CCPF Programme

144. This section discusses the potential for the long-term sustainability of programme achievements. It is an indication of whether outcomes (end of programme results) and positive impacts (long-term results) are likely to continue after the programme ends.

4.5.1. Sustainability of Results Achieved

145. The CCPF joint programme document stated that sustainability would be achieved through several innovative features of the programme, including the incorporation of social and economic considerations and a partnership approach involving various partners in each activity. It was anticipated that these innovations would contribute to the sustainability of results through identifying ways to mainstream results and establish means for future replication through national and local financing.

146. The assessment of achievements to date reveals that their sustainability over the long-term should be ensured. The strong ownership of achievements to date by national partners together with the fact that the CCPF joint programme is a direct response to national priorities are two critical factors ensuring the long-term sustainability of achievements (*see Section 4.1.7*). Most results are/will be integrated into broader strategies and programmes developed by national partners of the CCPF joint programme.

147. For instance, under output 1.1, the programme supported 7 studies on various aspects of climate change mitigation and adaptation. These studies – conducted under the leadership of NDRC, a key institution in China for climate change policy making - were part of GOC approach to develop its position on climate change for post 2012. The results of these studies were already used in the context of preparing the participation of China to the Copenhagen summit in December 2009 (COP-15) and are used to prepare the next summit this year in Mexico. The same is true for the task force on rural energy supported by the CCPF programme. This support allowed this task force to elaborate policy recommendations that are now under review by the State Council and

will be used to develop/strengthen the policy context for energy supply and demand in rural areas. The support provided to the Energy Law was concluded with the submission of the draft Law to the State Council in 2009 for the legislative review; which then has been submitted to the National People's Congress for its final approval. It is a comprehensive Energy Law that will replace/complete thematic Laws; thereby strengthening China's legislation on energy.

148. Sustainability should also be ensured for results under output 2.1. The programme supported feasibility studies to pilot HRP system in the coal-gangue brick-manufacturing sector. A first pilot is under way and a second one should be implemented before the end of the CCPF programme. These pilots are implemented with co-financing from the private sector. At programme end, these technologies will continue to be used by these 2 companies and it is hoped that replication will happen throughout China. Interests by other companies have already been noted. In addition to the introduction of new technologies, the programme is also supporting the review of health and safety in this sector. This review will provide recommendations to GOC to improve the working conditions for workers in this sector.

149. The logic for the long-term sustainability of results under output 3.3 and particularly under activity 3.3.1 is also revealing of the strong ownership of these results by key stakeholders. UNESCO in partnership with the YRCC worked together to assess the water resources (surface water) in the Yellow River Basin. Information has been collected, a management model and policy recommendations are emerging on how to better manage these water resources. The results are with YRCC, the agency that was mandated and empowered by the GOC in 1998 to manage the water resources of the Yellow River Basin. The financial contribution of the CCPF joint programme is relatively small (\$1M) as compared to the YRCC budget and also to the billion dollars investment made by the GOC to monitor and control the water resources in the Yellow River Basin through a series of dams. Nevertheless, as one YRCC Officer said, the support from the CCPF is in a "niche" (developing policy options) that is to provide the "How To's" for managing these water resources including the use of these dams. It is a \$1M investment that will make good use of the billion dollars investment in water management infrastructure.

150. Overall, the long-term sustainability of the CCPF joint programme results is good and no major issues were raised during this review. As described throughout this report, the good prospect for the long-term sustainability is due to few critical success factors:

- Strong ownership of design and of achievements
- Institutionalization of results where needed
- Strong ability in China to replicate and scale-up results
- No issue of recurrent costs

151. However, when these factors are not met, the long-term sustainability may be hampered. This is the case of two examples when all these factors were not met: the CCPF support for the establishment of a Global Climate Change Centre in China (Activity 1.1.2) and the CDM feasibility studies on conservation agriculture and household biogas (Activity 2.1.3). In both cases, these activities were less of a priority for national partners at the formulation stage of the CCPF programme and were "pushed" by the UN agencies to be part of the CCPF programme. As a result, the activity 1.1.2 to create the Global Centre presented great difficulties in 2009 and implementation was halted. After much discussions between the UN and GOC parties on how to proceed with this activity an agreement had been found in April 2010 to move forward with the concept of expanding the NDRC-Climate Change Strategic Centre into a global knowledge hub for south-south cooperation. Regarding the CDM feasibility studies, there were conducted by the Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development in Agriculture under the guidance of UNAPCAEM. These feasibility studies were not part of priorities identified by national partners in 2007. As a result, the studies were conducted and the results were published. However, the uptake of these results may be limited as there are not integrated into a broader approach led by GOC to develop/use the CDM mechanism in agriculture. The long-term sustainability of these studies depends on UNAPCAEM and CAAS to use these findings into related work that they will undertake in the future.

4.5.2. Enabling Environment: Policy, Legislation and Institutions

152. Supporting the strengthening of an enabling environment for related policies, legislation and institutions is fully part of the two-pronged strategy of the CCPF joint programme; whereby the first strategy is to support national level policies needed to achieve climate change goals in China. In this area, the CCPF supported the drafting of the Energy Law and has identified policy recommendations in few climate change related areas such as clean technology, energy in rural areas, agricultural practices, green jobs in a low carbon economy and water resource management.

153. The dual strategy of the CCPF joint programme is a good design characteristic of the CCPF programme. It allows the identification of innovative partnerships and technologies at the local level but also to support the necessary changes at policy, legislation and institutional levels for these innovative partnerships and technologies to be sustainable in the long run including their replication, throughout China. This is an important part of developing the capacity of a sector. It needs technical solutions but these solutions are often unsustainable if the enabling environment is not conducive for these solutions to take place and be replicated.

154. For instance, the assessment of the water resources (both surface water and groundwater) in the Yellow River Basin has led to the identification of management models and policy recommendations. The knowledge accumulated to date by stakeholders is already used in their day-to-day operations and programmes. However, addressing the policy recommendations made will strengthen the long-term sustainability of these results and allow their replication throughout China. The same can be said for the piloting of HRP systems. It is anticipated that these systems will demonstrate benefits for the operators; however, the scale-up of these results will be strengthened with an adequate enabling environment.

4.5.3. Replication and Scaling-up

155. As discussed in Section 4.5.1, replication and scaling-up of results is a critical success factor unique to China. According to the experience of the UN in China, once a successful pilot is demonstrated, China moves quickly to expand the model and replicate it for wide use. This strong ability of stakeholders to replicate and/or scale-up results was fully integrated in the design of the CCPF joint programme. The programme was to serve as a catalyst for structural changes and as a base for further mobilization of co-financing from the international community, from the private sector and from the Government of China itself; particularly for the implementation of new technologies. It was developed on the basis of improving local capacities and partnerships for financing technology transfers and replicating innovative technology and management models.

156. Consequently the replication and scaling-up of CCPF achievements have been happening and the overall potential is excellent. This great potential is also due to a good alignment of the programme with the development objectives of China and the breadth of the CCPF joint programme that is pioneering innovative partnerships and technologies in many areas. The uptake of programme achievements should have happened and also contributes to the long-term impact of the programme on the climate change strategies of China.

157. Some highlights of the expected replication and/or scaling-up of results include:

- Initiatives to contribute to the positioning of China for climate change post 2012 strategies should be used for preparing the Mexico climate change summit in 2010 and further international meetings in climate change;
- The Climate Change Strategic Centre should be finalized in the current year and have the necessary budget and procedure in place to be scale-up afterward and become a global knowledge hub for south-south cooperation;
- The Energy Law should be passed and be implemented in the years to come;

- Based on the pilots to demonstrate HRP systems, it is expected that other companies will replicate the technology and that the GOC will strengthen its policy framework for clean coal technology;
- The main conclusions of the impact assessment of glacier melting and sea level rise on local socio-economic development are emerging as policy recommendations with the aim to be introduced in the 12th National Development Plan;
- The incorporation of findings from the work completed in the environmental health management area are being discussed with stakeholders in charge of the “Healthy City” programme. These same results will also be “infused” little by little through training of university students and also potentially through the training of public servants, using the training modules developed with CCPF support.
- The results from the implementation of LEHAP in 4 pilots have already been discussed in the context of workshops with Health Officers from all provinces;
- The findings from the assessment of climate change impact on water resources of the Yellow River Basin as well as from the groundwater assessment are being used to develop management models and to identify policy recommendations;
- Based on pilots in 4 provinces, C-PESAP practices should be replicated throughout China with the support of CAAS and provincial authorities

5. CONCLUSION

158. In conclusion, the CCPF joint programme is well aligned with the development objectives of China and particularly with the National Climate Change programme, which it supports two main key programme areas: GHG mitigation and adaptation activities. It contributes to the implementation of the MDGs in China; particularly by addressing some implementation gaps under MDG-7, which were identified by an assessment in 2008. The review of the design indicates an excellent “blue print” that has been used during the implementation of the programme. The CCPF seeks to address national priorities that were identified during the formulation of the programme. It is a responsive mechanism that is also linked with a strong ownership of the programme by key stakeholders. The process to design the programme possesses all ingredients for a successful design and implementation: strong participation, a “bottom-up” planning process to set national priorities, a learning process from past experience and a focus on developing the capacity of all stakeholder involved across sectors.

159. The review indicates that the CCPF programme delivers results as per strategies established during the formulation stage. A change of targets for output 2.2 was the only significant variance noted since the start of the programme. The ambitious targets under this output were reviewed downward to match the available budget. It was also noted that most achievements are information products such as publications, presentations, training manuals, policy recommendations, etc. In themselves there are not developmental results per se but in all cases are key information products to support larger processes implemented by national partners outside of the CCPF programme. Consequently, it is difficult to develop one “big picture” for the CCPF joint programme; each set of achievements is part of larger strategies and programmes outside of the CCPF programme’s scope. In addition to good achievements, the programme was built on lessons learned by the UN agencies including the recognition that capacity development is key to sustain results and will be emphasized with multiple institutions across multiple sectors and components.

160. From a management perspective, it is a complex programme to coordinate and manage. It involves 9 UN agencies and 10 counterpart organizations. The management aspects were well addressed during the formulation stage and detailed in the programme document including the UN management modalities - including fund management - and overall management arrangements. Roles and responsibilities are clearly identified with a management structure that includes a PMO, a NPC, a PMC and a NSC. According to the financial information reviewed, the MDG-F funds (\$12M) should be entirely disbursed by the end of the programme. However, it was found that the management of the programme is too activity-based as opposed to be more results-based; preventing a greater focus on what the programme needs to achieve (vision) as opposed to what activities need to be delivered. It was also noted that the implementation of the CCPF programme has no focus on gender despite

that it was mentioned at the formulation stage. Finally, a monitoring framework with 55 indicators is used to monitor the programme. However, it is the weakest point of the CCPF joint programme, there are too many indicators and their content does not measure well the progress made to achieve the expected impacts of the programme.

161. The potential of the CCPF joint programme to achieve its strategies is good. This good potential is mostly due to the fact that the CCPF responds well to priority needs that were identified in 2007 and also that there is a strong country ownership of the programme. It was designed to serve as a catalyst for structural changes and as a base for further mobilization of co-financing from the international community, from the private sector and from the GOC itself. This model is working and the impacts in the long run could also be measured exponentially over time since there are many “clusters” of achievements that will contribute to greater impacts in the future. As explored in the relevance section, the programme definitely contributes to the implementation of the MDGs in China. It has also the potential to impact positively the local environment and socio-economies through the application of better agricultural practices, better health and safety conditions in the coal-gangue brick manufacturing and better water management practices to preserve this vital resource throughout China.

162. The sustainability of results should be ensured. Through a strong partnership and participation of national partners in the implementation of the CCPF, most results are institutionalized as soon as they are achieved. The national partners become immediately the custodians of these results and will use them to pursue their particular strategies and programmes. No results should end up on a self; they should all be used by national partners. Additionally, the potential for replicability and/or scaling-up of results is excellent. Based on the UN experience in China, once a successful pilot is demonstrated, Chinese partners move quickly to expand the model and replicate it for wide use. It should be the case in the context of the CCPF joint programme. Few examples include the support to China to prepare its climate change strategies for after 2012 that should be scaled up in the years to come; the demonstration of HRP systems should be replicated throughout China; policy recommendations from impact assessments of glacier melting and sea level rise on local socio-economic development should be incorporated into the 12th NDP and the demonstrated C-PESAP practices should be replicated throughout China over time.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

163. Based on the review of project documents, interviews and meetings with key informants, and the analysis of this information, the Evaluator collated the following lessons learned:

- A good programme design leads to good achievements and positive long-term potential impacts of the programme. A design that includes a strong participatory process to capture well national priorities leads to a strong country ownership during the implementation of the programme, which in turn is transformed into sustainable results with potential for long-term positive impacts.
- A joint programme with a large horizontal breadth provides good value, less implementation risks and overall more skills and knowledge transfers. It is also effective through its intervention in many strategic sectors and serves as a catalyst for structural changes in all these sectors.
- The CCPF joint programme is an effective model to implement the “One UN” approach and also a concrete demonstration on how to apply the Paris Declaration commitments such as:
 - *Ownership*: Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions;
 - *Alignment*: Donors base their overall support on partner countries’ national development strategies, organizations and procedures;
 - *Harmonization*: Donors’ actions are more harmonized, transparent and collectively effective;
 - *Managing For Results*: Managing resources and improving decision-making for results
 - *Mutual Accountability*: Donors and partners are accountable for development results

- A joint programme of this nature should succeed if the following critical success factors are applied to a programme: a strong partnership between UN agencies and GOC agencies leads to strong participatory approach during the implementation and as a result a strong country ownership of programme achievements; a strong track record to demonstrate solutions and replicate positive results; a strong commitment from all parties to make it work; a staff in the implementing (UN) agencies that are nationals with strong government experience; a design and an implementation that is stakeholders driven.
- A complex joint programme with multiple implementing agencies and multiple administrative systems can work when the implementation modalities are well defined, including clear management arrangements and clear roles and responsibilities and when the programme management is transparent and well coordinated.
- A strong country ownership of a joint programme leads to an early institutionalization of the implementation process by national partners. It contributes to ensure the long-term sustainability of programme achievements. When stakeholders are involved in a programme through a good participatory process, they institutionalize the process and achievements along the way and continue to use these achievements for the implementation of their strategies and programmes.
- The use of the UN Theme Group on Climate Change and Environment provides an excellent forum for dialogues and coordination on related issues among UN agencies but also with the participation of national partners. It allows a good exchange of experiences including lessons learned and best practices and contributes to the move toward a “One UN”.
- When a joint programme involved many implementing partners and stakeholders, it is necessary to develop communication mechanisms to convey information on the joint programme to all and keep abreast all stakeholders and implementing partners about the progress of the programme.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

164. Based on the findings of this mid-term evaluation, the following recommendations for the remaining implementation period of the programme are suggested. It also includes recommendations for the overall MDG-F initiative.

Recommendations for the remaining period of implementation

Recommendation #1

It is recommended to assess the financial status of the programme during the last quarter of 2010 and, if needed, re-allocate available funds to activities to be implemented before May 2011.

Issue to Address

The review of the financial status of the programme indicates that the entire budget should be spent by May 2011. However, this is based on the analysis that includes some commitments (not disbursed yet) and a budget for YIII representing 1/3 of the total budget. Considering the closing date of May 2011 for the programme including its disbursement, it is possible that funds for some activities may not be disbursed before the end date. A re-allocation of these funds would benefit other areas of the programme.

Recommendation #2

It is recommended to produce yearly financial statements as part of the annual progress reports. These statements should indicate the actual disbursements for the reporting period, the cumulative disbursements, the commitments and the remaining budget. This information should be produced by output and by agency.

Issue to Address

The review of the CCPF financial information presented some difficulties in obtaining the financial status to date. Recognizing the complexities of collating financial reports from multiple financial systems, it would be

beneficial for the management team to state clearly once a year how much has been spent so far, how much is committed and how much is left. Currently the main difficulty is to assess the actual amount disbursed.

Recommendation #3

It is recommended to communicate the closing procedures of the CCPF joint programme to all partners; particularly the fact that all disbursements should be made before the closing date in May 2011.

Issue to Address

The procedure has been already communicated. However, during the meetings in China conducted by the Evaluator, it needs to be clearly communicated again, in order to avoid surprises in the last few weeks of implementation of the programme.

Recommendation #4

Understanding the existing closing procedures, it is recommended for the MDG-F Secretariat and the PMO to keep some flexibility near the end of the programme to be able to pay financial commitments made prior to the closing date during a few weeks following the closing of the programme.

Issue to Address

On a case-by-case basis, this flexibility may be needed to allow some activities to be fully completed before May 2011. It is a complex programme with many partners and several different information management systems. Some administration processes may take too long and may impose an early stop of implementation of activities to allow the administrative system to process all tasks prior to May 2011.

Recommendation #5

In the event that extra funds are available, it is recommended to allocate them to extra CCPF activities in line with activities implemented to date.

Issue to Address

Few agencies mentioned the potential for doing more in the current timeframe if additional financial resources were available; including funds from MDG-F. It is particularly the case of those activities that are now completed or near completion such as activities under outputs 2.2, 3.1 and 3.4.

Recommendation #6

The CCPF joint programme has produced much information to date; it is recommended to assemble an electronic body of knowledge (CD, web site, etc.) and disseminate/share this information globally.

Issue to Address

The review reveals that despite all the information produced by the programme there is no easy access to most reports. This information exists electronically and is stored with each responsible agency. It is recommended to assemble this information and make it accessible to the public. Possibilities include the channel of the UN Thematic Group on “China in the World”, as well as exploring the possibility to share this information using the “teamworks” platform developed by UNDP.

Recommendation #7

The Evaluator supports the plan to organize a High-Level Adaptation Symposium before COP-16 and a CCPF Forum (Climate Change Adaptation Summit) at the end of the programme (early 2011?) to showcase CCPF achievements.

Issue to Address

The high-level adaptation symposium would be limited to high-level representatives focusing on political discussions on adaptation to be used in the lead up-to and preparation of COP-16. The CCPF Forum is an excellent channel to present and disseminate the knowledge that the CCPF has produced to date. It is recommended that, in addition to partners involved in the implementation of the component 1.1.2, all

implementation partners of the CCPF joint programme be involved and that CCPF information be disseminated/distributed. Side events could be organized on particular components to showcase achievements. This summit could also be an excellent opportunity to advertise the Climate Change Strategic Centre and develop its knowledge base.

Recommendation #8

It is recommended for the CCPF joint programme to participate to UNFCCC COP-16 under the leadership of NDRC.

Issue to Address

The CCPF joint programme contributed to the participation of the GOC team to COP-15 with a side event on the programme. It is recommended to do the same for COP-16 planned to be in Mexico in December 2010.

Recommendation #9

It is recommended to present the major CCPF findings and achievements to GEF constituents and possibly to other related international bodies such as the UNFCCC Subsidiary bodies.

Issue to Address

GEF is the largest funder of projects to improve the global environment and is the main financial instrument for the implementation of multi-lateral environmental agreements (MEAs), including UNFCCC. With its 183 member governments it provides a large forum to exchange on global environmental issues, including climate change mitigation and adaptation. Two main avenues exist for reaching out GEF constituents: GEF Council (32 constituencies) that meets twice a year and GEF assembly (all member governments) that meets every 3 to 4 years. One possibility is to invite some GEF constituents and other bodies to the CCPF Forum (see recommendation #7)

Recommendation #10

It is recommended to make appropriate indicators included in the monitoring framework gender sensitive; that is to gather information about these indicators that would provide gender disaggregated information.

Issue to Address

To date, limited gender reporting has been done and only 10-11 months of implementation remain. However, the review of the list of indicators reveals that some of them could be without difficulty made gender sensitive. For instance, tracking the “*number of scientists and officials having capacity for the post 2012 negotiations*”, can be changed to “*number of men and women scientist and officials having*”.

Recommendation #11

It is recommended to review key programme deliverables and for those that are not published yet, ensure that they are gender sensitive; particularly information products such as training manuals, local operational plans, etc.

Issue to Address

A review of deliverables by a gender specialist should provide few implementable actions to make the CCPF joint programme more gender sensitive. It should also include the collection of some data on the management and implementation of the programme such as number of men and women in the various management and implementation committees of the programme and also for most workshops supported by the programme, using the list of participants.

Recommendation #12

It is recommended that before the closure of the CCPF joint programme, each agency produces an end of programme report with its counterpart organization(s); including initial strategies to move forward with CCPF achievements.

Issue to Address

The main purpose of these reports would be to document succinctly the accomplishments of each agency with their partners, to draft the way forward for all components of the CCPF joint programme and possibly to identify further initiatives through concept notes or other mechanisms to develop future programmes and projects. It should also be done prior to the final evaluation.

Recommendation #13

It is recommended that the final evaluation of the CCPF joint programme focus on the long-term sustainability and particularly on the replicability and/or scaling-up of the programme achievements.

Issue to Address

The MTE reveals that the expected results should be delivered by the end of the programme and that most CCPF achievements are part of larger programmes and strategies implemented by national partners. Moreover, these achievements should be sustainable in the long run with a strong potential to be replicated or scaled-up. A focus of the final evaluation on this potential will explore the replicability/scaling-up of CCPF achievements, a strong characteristic of China development, to assess the long-term impact of these achievements but also to learn lessons and best practices.

Recommendation #14

It is recommended that in-kind contributions by national partners and UN agencies be further analyzed and documented during the final evaluation of the CCPF joint programme.

Issue to Address

The review indicates that the strong involvement of national partners in implementing the CCPF joint programme should be translated into a higher level of in-kind contribution as compared to the plan. In the interest of analyzing the value for money of this \$12M programme, it would be beneficial to have a more detailed analysis of this contribution by national partners. A National Programme Coordinator (NPC) is assigned to the programme. However, each “cluster” of activities has a kind of small PMO structure to coordinate their activities. Capturing this information as part of analyzing the contributions to climate change mitigation and adaptation in China made by the CCPF programme would be valuable.

Recommendation #15

It is recommended to review the list of performance indicators to monitor the progress of the CCPF joint programme as per the proposed list of indicators presented on the table below.

Issue to Address

As discussed in Section 4.1.7 and 4.3.6, the monitoring framework is the main weakness of the programme design. There are too many indicators and the content of these indicators is to focus on the delivery of activities. It is proposed to shorten this list and to modify these indicators to focus more on monitoring progress in achieving the respecting expected results of the CCPF joint programme. A proposed list is presented below. A new list of indicators should also be accompanied by a table presenting for each indicator, its baseline, its target by end of programme and its source(s) of verification.

Table 9: Proposed List of Performance Indicators

Outputs	Proposed Indicators
Outcome 1: Mainstreaming climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning and investment frameworks	
<i>Output 1.1:</i> Improved policies and partnerships at national level to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into policy frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Studies emerging from and following COP15 ➤ An operational global knowledge hub for best practices and lessons learned on climate change mitigation and adaptation ➤ A high-level Climate Change Policy Task Force generating policy recommendations

Outputs	Proposed Indicators
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A GOC approved Energy Law ➤ Energy strategies
<p><i>Output 1.2:</i> UN-business partnerships and new 'green' financing mechanisms to mainstream climate change and energy into investment frameworks and business practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ An established UN-Global Compact initiative in China on Climate Change ➤ Series of high profile communication and awareness raising activities, including citizen (men and women) engagement ➤ Selected climate change-friendly designs and products from multinational firms ➤ Best practices of "green employment" demonstrated in selected companies
<p>Outcome 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy</p>	
<p><i>Output 2.1:</i> Development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy efficiency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Publication of China's Blue Paper on Clean Coal Technology ➤ HRPG systems piloted in 2 coal-gangue brick making factories ➤ Recommendations for policy and financial incentives for dissemination of HRPG systems in coal gangue brick manufacturing ➤ Approved health and safety guidelines for coal-gangue brick manufacturing facilities ➤ Recommendations for CDM application in biogas and conservation agriculture.
<p><i>Output 2.2:</i> Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Feasibility study on rural renewable power stations using biomass pellets ➤ Policy recommendations for dissemination of off-grid rural renewable power stations
<p>Outcome 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanism</p>	
<p><i>Output 3.1:</i> Climate proofing of poverty reduction in less developed areas of West China and vulnerable coastal areas of Southeast China</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Adopted adaptation strategy for glacier melting ➤ Adopted adaptation strategy for sea level rising ➤ Policy recommendations on "green jobs" for men and women in a low carbon economy
<p><i>Output 3.2:</i> Policies and capacities developed to manage environmental health issues from climate change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Benchmark of climate change impacts on EH management in China ➤ Piloting development and implementation of LEHAPs in 4 provinces ➤ Adequate provincial and local capacity for climate change risks assessment on health and identification of health policy recommendations ➤ Adequate capacity for monitoring climate change impacts on health
<p><i>Output 3.3:</i> Capacities enhanced and policies developed for understanding and adapting to impacts of water management changes on China's environment and development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Policy recommendations for water resource management in the YR Basin ➤ A tested groundwater monitoring model ➤ Adequate capacity to use the model to monitor groundwater level and quality ➤ Policy recommendations to improve groundwater level and quality monitoring
<p><i>Output 3.4:</i> Enhanced strategies for climate-proofed and environmentally sound agricultural production: Agricultural development in selected agro-ecosystems of the Yellow River Basin</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Functional national and provincial MDTs supported by local authorities ➤ An operational multi-sector information system for eastern provinces of the Yellow River Basin giving access to C-PESAP practices ➤ Identified C-PESAP practices ➤ Adequate capacity of field technicians and farmers' associations to pilot C-PESAP practices ➤ Approved provincial action plans for implementing C-PESAP practices

Recommendations for the MDG-F initiative

Recommendation #16

It is recommended to the MDG-F Secretariat to provide better guidance (including templates) for the inception phase (start-up phase) of these joint programmes.

Issue to Address

The start up phase of the CCPF joint programme was lacking some guidance including the objective of putting an inception report together and a stakeholder workshop to close this phase. Guidance for an inception phase

should include the objective of this initial phase such as review of programme strategy, management arrangements, risks and risks mitigation, monitoring framework (performance measurement) and finalization of the YI work plan. This phase should also be concluded with an inception workshop marking the start of implementation. An inception phase should also focus on identifying detailed strategies for each component of the programme. In the case of the CCPF, this identification happened unevenly across the programme and a more consistent approach is recommended; particularly to focus the management of each component on expected results rather than on activities to be delivered.

Recommendation #17

It is recommended to “cluster” geographically the various components of a joint programme to concentrate the programme’s activities in fewer geographical regions and emphasize more on synergies to be gained from this concentration among national, provincial and local partners.

Issue to Address

Despite that the horizontal breadth of the CCPF joint programme was appropriate, the implementation of activities in fewer geographical areas would have allowed more synergies among the various partners involved in the implementation. Fewer areas of intervention would create a “tighter” joint programme, offer more possibilities for communication among partners, facilitate coordination of programme activities and allow for more synergies among actors; particularly at the local level.

Recommendation #18

It is recommended to introduce gender as a crosscutting theme to be applied in all joint programmes into guidelines produced by the MDG-F Secretariat. It includes the “*Implementation Guidelines for MDG-F Joint Programmes*” but also other guiding documents such as the “*MDG-F TOR for Thematic Window on Environment and Climate Change*”.

Issue to Address

Currently, very little is said about gender into these guiding materials. The CCPF joint programme mentioned that a gender approach will be applied in the programme document; however, gender has not been applied to the implementation of the programme and there is only limited resources and guidance to do so. Gender needs to be fully part of the implementation of joint programmes and guidance should be provided to implementation teams.

Recommendation #19

It is recommended to establish linkages among all similar joint programmes worldwide funded by the MDG-F and share best practices and lessons learned.

Issue to Address

Based on the experience of the CCPF joint programme useful lessons learned and best practices are emerging both in term of technical solutions and management/coordination solutions. It would be beneficial for all to be able to exchange these lessons learned and best practices with other similar joint programmes worldwide; including the possibility to find synergies among countries with similar environmental issues and technology needs.

Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TORs)

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE CHINESE JOINT PROGRAMME ON ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

General Context: The MDGF Environment and Climate Change Thematic Window

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million, with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG Achievement Fund (MDGF) supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

The MDGF operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs.

The Environment and Climate Change thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service provision at the national and local levels, as well as increasing access to new funding mechanisms and expanding the ability to adapt to climate change.

The Window includes 17 joint programmes that encompass a wide range of subjects and results. Nevertheless, certain similar underlying characteristics can be identified across most of these joint programmes. The majority of the programmes in the window seek to contribute to three types of result: making the environment, natural resource management and action against climate change a mainstream focus in all public policy; improving national capacities to plan and implement concrete actions in favour of the environment; and assessing and improving national capacities to adapt to climate change.

The joint programmes within this thematic window serve a variety of participants¹⁴, ranging from national governments to local populations. All joint programmes include a support component directed at national and local governments. Other beneficiaries include civil society, communities and citizens.

China has received funding for four joint programmes from MDGF, with the China Climate Change Partnership Framework (CCPF) being the first both in China and globally to receive approval. Implementation commenced on 13th May 2008 and the three year programme is now approaching its final year of implementation.

The joint programme is implemented by nine UN Agencies and their ten respective Government counterparts, in addition to numerous national and international research institutes, scholars, experts, etc., who have also contributed to programme outputs.

The CCPF's Joint Outcomes and Outputs are as follows:

OUTCOME 1: Mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and investment frameworks;

Output 1.1 Improved policies and partnerships at national level to mainstream climate change mitigation and

¹⁴ This refers to what previously was named beneficiaries

adaptation into policy frameworks: including Post-Kyoto strategies and options for technology transfer, a new Global Climate Change Centre to serve as an international hub for best practices and south-south cooperation on mitigation and adaptation, a new high-level policy task force on ways to link climate change to development and a new Basic Energy Law for China to guide issues of CC and energy management:

Output 1.2: UN-business partnerships and new 'green' financing mechanisms to mainstream climate change and energy into investment frameworks and business practices: Results associated with this output are focused on business and employment practices and include: development and piloting of Green Business Options (GB) training module supplementing existing business start-up training programmes to support starting new green businesses.

OUTCOME 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy;

Output 2.1: Development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy efficiency: Results associated with this output cover the introduction and replication of demos as well as the application of CDM to rural energy efficiency applications, including a) One pilot clean coal power plant and replications, b) full technology and policy package for coal gangue brick production, c) feasibility study and methodologies for the application of CDM to conservation agriculture.

Output 2.2: Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas: Results associated with this output are focused on three technology areas: a) Biomass pellets, b) off-grid renewable power stations, and c) biogas.

OUTCOME 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms.

Output 3.1: Climate proofing of poverty reduction in less developed areas of West China and vulnerable coastal areas of Southeast China: comprehensive research report quantifying employment impacts of transition to low carbon economy and mid-term projection for future trends in selected sectors.

Output 3.2: Policies and capacities developed to manage environmental health issues from climate change, including, the implementation of the key elements of the National Environment and Health Action Plan focusing on improvement of the management of environmental health risks related to climate change.

Output 3.3: Capacities enhanced and policies developed for understanding and adapting to impacts of water management changes on China's environment and development: Results include assessment of, development of adaptation measures for, and increased capacity for monitoring the impact of climate change on water resources and to define and enact remedial action:

Output 3.4: Enhanced strategies for climate-proofed and environmentally sound agricultural production: Agricultural development in selected agro-ecosystems of the Yellow River Basin.

The Joint Programme contributes to: UNDAF Outcome No. 3: More efficient management of natural resources and development of environmentally friendly behaviour in order to ensure environmental sustainability. It also contributes to MDG 7: ensure environmental sustainability by (I) mainstreaming environmental issues in national and sub-national policy, planning and investment frameworks, (II) improving local management of environmental resources and service delivery and (III) Enhancing capacity to adapt to climate change.

The table below gives more specific details on the programme framework. Given the large number of Organizations and human resources involved, only the key organizations are named. The Evaluation Reference Group can facilitate meetings with the focal points of each Organization as necessary.

CCPF output description	Financial resources *	Targeted direct and indirect participants and geographical scope	Main programme implementation partners
<p>OUTPUT 1.1 Improved policies and partnerships at national level to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into policy frameworks</p>	<p>USD 1,916,000</p>	<p>Activities under Output 1.1 have outcomes at a national level potentially affecting all of China's population.</p> <p>Other countries such as: Pakistan, Nepal, Laos, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh also benefit through trainings as part of South-South cooperation.</p>	<p>UNDP National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) National Energy Administration (NEA) China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development (CICCED) Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS)</p>
<p>OUTPUT 1.2: UN-business partnerships and new 'green' financing mechanisms to mainstream climate change and energy into investment frameworks and business practices</p>	<p>USD 443,000</p>	<p>UN Compact targets private and multi-national companies, specifically those located in Hebei, Guangdong and Guangxi provinces. Training materials produced could potentially benefit companies beyond those targeted in the programme pilots.</p> <p>UNIDO has also developed a project in the South African city of Durban, which will make use of materials compiled under this Output.</p> <p>Green Business Options (GBO) will benefit students and young people in 20 universities and training institutions across China. Other business starters will also benefit as GBO will be incorporated into MOHRSS Start and Improved Your Own Business (SIYB) program.</p>	<p>UNDP UNIDO ILO China Society for Promotion of the Guangcai Program Energy and Environmental Development Research Centre (EED) Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MOHRSS)</p>
<p>OUTPUT 2.1: Development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy efficiency:</p>	<p>USD 1,895,000 USD 5,000,000 (from the private sector)</p>	<p>This output targets specifically those private enterprises participating in the mitigation pilots and replication activities in Shandong, Shanxi, and Inner Mongolia. The results of the pilots will benefit other companies beyond the pilots</p>	<p>UNDP UNIDO UNAPCAEM China International Institute of Multinational Corporations (CIIMC) Ministry of Agriculture Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development in Agriculture - Chinese Academy of</p>

CCPF output description	Financial resources *	Targeted direct and indirect participants and geographical scope	Main programme implementation partners
			Agricultural Sciences (IESDA-CAAS)
OUTPUT 2.2: Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas.	USD 371,000	Government and private enterprises participating in biomass pilot related activities in Henan and Shandong	UNDP National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC)
OUTPUT 3.1: Climate proofing of poverty reduction in less developed areas of West China and vulnerable coastal areas of Southeast China.	USD 1,275,000	National and local policymakers, local communities in Gansu, Guangdong, Xinjiang and Zhejiang. Findings and policy recommendations on low carbon economy and employment focus on coal, wind and solar energy, forestry and cement sectors.	UNEP ILO National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MOHRSS) Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS)
OUTPUT 3.2: Policies and capacities developed to manage environmental health issues from climate change.	USD 1,395,000	National and local health officials, health Inspection Institutes, universities and professionals in Chongqing, Gansu, Guangdong and Jiangsu.	WHO Ministry of Health
OUTPUT 3.3: Capacities enhanced and policies developed for understanding and adapting to impacts of water management changes on China's environment and development.	USD 1,864,500	National and local policymakers, trade union and enterprise union representatives, academia, including local young researchers, Farmers, famers associations, technicians. local Government and communities in and around Yellow River Basin area, Qinghai, Hebei, Shaanxi and Shandong,	UNESCO UNICEF MWR Yellow River Conservation Commission (YRCC)
OUTPUT 3.4: Enhanced strategies for climate-proofed and environmentally sound agricultural production: Agricultural development in selected agro-ecosystems of the Yellow River Basin.	USD 1,488,000	Farmers, famers associations, technicians. local Government authorities and villages/communities in pilot provinces of Henan, Ningxia, Shaanxi and Shandong	FAO UNV MOA Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS)

*Funding from MDG-F unless otherwise stated

Some changes were made to the programme during implementation. These are all summarized below by Output. See also the CCPF's Year II Annual Work Plan for full details of the changes, all of which were approved by National Steering Committee (NSC) in May 2009:

Output 1.1

The NSC approved the Programme Management Committee's (PMC's) recommendation to move funds from year III to year II of Activity 1.1.1 to allow flexibility to hold roundtable(s) and/or provide further technical support to strengthen the Government's preparations for COP-15.

Outputs 1.2 and 3.1

ILO secured additional funding (up to USD 200,000) for research activities on climate change related employment issues, freeing up funds to be used to support the roll-out Green Business Options. NSC approved the transfer of USD 43,000 from Activity 3.1.3 to Activity 1.2.3. (See tables below.)

Output 3.1

Training sessions under Activities 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 originally scheduled to be carried out in pilot sites in YIII were moved forward to YII. NSC approved a reallocation of funds from YIII to YII to ensure their successful implementation.

Output 3.2

Of the four activities under this output, greater emphasis is to be placed on 3.2.2. In addition, activities originally planned for YIII have been moved forward to YII. NSC approved the transfer of funds totalling USD 33,750 from YIII under components 3.2.2 and from 3.2.4 to the YII budget for component 3.2.2.

Output 3.4

The programme was originally intended to commence at the beginning of 2008, however, funds were transferred in May 2008 and received by FAO China in July 2008. As the Joint Programme started after the crop season, some activities under this component were postponed until the next crop season, in mid-YII, and will continue into YIII. NSC approved the transfer of USD 111,000 from year II to year III to reflect this.

Output 4.1

There is an ongoing need for considerable staff time in the UN Resident Coordinator's Office to be invested in the provision of support and advice to the CCPF. This had not previously been budgeted for. NSC approved the reallocation of \$40,000 for this purpose in Year 2. Taken together with contributions from other Joint Programme's and the Resident Coordinator's Office's own limited resources, this would be sufficient to maintain RC Office support to the CCPF.

2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDGF. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes lasting longer than two years will be subject to a mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are formative in nature and seek **to generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned and improve implementation of the programmes during their remaining implementation.** As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the PMC, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this mid-term evaluation is the joint programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. To discover the programme's **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the **Millennium Development Goals**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **One UN** framework.
3. To identify the programme's **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the **Environment and Climate Change thematic window**, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

Design level

- **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**
 - a) Is the identification of the problem and its causes in the joint programme being addressed? (Environmental and human)
- **Ownership in the design: national social actors' effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**
 - a) To what extent do the joint programme's goals and lines of action reflect national and regional plans and programmes, identified needs (environmental and human) and the operational context of national policy?

Process level

- **Efficiency: The extent to which the resources/inputs (funds, time etc.) have been turned into results**

- a) How well does the joint programme's management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?
- b) To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society?
- c) Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded?
- d) Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme's results?
- e) Are work methodologies, financial tools etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes?
- f) Have the most efficient measures for the context been adopted to solve the environmental issue?
- g) Are the monitoring indicators relevant? Are they of sufficient quality to measure the joint programme's outputs?

- Ownership in the process: National social actors' effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions

- h) To what extent have the target population and the participants taken ownership of the programme, assuming an active role in it?
- i) To what extent have national public/private resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme's goals and impacts?

Results level

- Efficacy: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been met or are expected to be met, taking into account their relative importance.

- j) Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?
 - a. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
 - b. To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways?
- k) Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met?
- l) Do the outputs produced meet the required quality?
- m) Is the programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned?
- n) What factors are contributing to progress or delay in achieving outputs and outcomes?
- o) To what extent has the programme contributed innovative measures towards solving the problems?
- p) Have any success stories been identified, or examples that could be transferred to other contexts?
- q) To what extent have the behaviours causing the environmental problem been transformed?
- r) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to putting environmental problems on the country's policy agenda?
- s) What differential impacts and types of effect is the joint programme producing among population groups, such as youth, children, adolescents, the elderly, and rural populations?

Sustainability: The probability that the benefits of the intervention will continue in the long term.

- a) Are the necessary preconditions being created to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the joint programme?
 - i. At the local level: are local knowledge, experiences, resources and local networks being adopted?
 - ii. At the country level: have networks or network institutions been created or strengthened to carry out the roles that the joint programme is performing?

- iii. Is the joint programme's duration sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions into the future?
- b) To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent with or different from those of the joint programme?
- c) In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future?

Country level

- d) During the analysis of the evaluation, what lessons have been learned, and what best practices can be transferred to other programmes or countries?
- e) To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards the Millennium Development Goals in the country?
- f) To what extent and in which ways are the joint programmes helping make progress towards United Nations reform? One UN
- g) How have the principles for aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, managing for development results and mutual accountability) been developed in the joint programmes?
- h) To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country's public policy framework?

5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The mid-term evaluation will use an international consultant, appointed by MDG-F, as the Evaluator to conduct the evaluation and a locally hired consultant who will support the Evaluator by [providing information about local context such as institutions, protocol, traditions, etc.](#) and [assist with translation of key meetings/ interviews during the mission](#) as needed. It is the sole responsibility of the Evaluator to deliver the [inception, draft final and final reports](#).

The Evaluator will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, the Evaluator is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. The Evaluator is also expected to use interviews as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the inception report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at a minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Evaluator is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the Secretariat of the MDGF:

✂ **Inception Report** (to be submitted within seven days of the submission of all programme documentation to the Evaluator)

This report will be 5 to 10 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The inception report will propose an initial theory of change to the joint programme that will be used for comparative purposes during the evaluation and will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluator and the evaluation managers. The Evaluator will also share the inception report with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

✧ **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The MDGF Secretariat will share the draft final report with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

✧ **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within seven days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The MDGF Secretariat will send the final report to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page
2. Introduction
 - Background, goal and methodological approach
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Methodology used in the evaluation
 - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
3. Description of interventions carried out
 - - Initial concept
 - - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.
4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions
5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)
6. Recommendations
7. Annexes

7. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The mid-term evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the Evaluator and the reference group of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The Evaluator must corroborate all assertions, and note any disagreement with them.
- **Integrity.** The Evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The Evaluator should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, the Evaluator must report these immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used by the Evaluator to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the

MDGF in these terms of reference.

- **Validation of information.** The Evaluator will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the Evaluator shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION

The main actors in the mid-term evaluation are the Secretariat of the MDGF, the Programme Management Office of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee. The Programme Management Office, PMC Co-Chairs, MofCom and RC Office will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
- Providing input on the evaluation planning documents (Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
- Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

The Secretariat of the MDGF shall manage the mid-term evaluation in its role as proponent of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the mid-term evaluation. As manager of the mid-term evaluation, the Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated; promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process. It shall also support the country in the main task of disseminating evaluation findings and recommendations.

9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

A. Design phase (15 days total)

1. The Secretariat shall send the generic TOR for mid-term evaluation of China's CCPF to the reference group. The reference group is then to adapt these to the concrete situation of the joint programme in China, using the lowest common denominator that is shared by all, for purposes of data aggregation and the provision of evidence for the rest of the MDGF levels of analysis (country, thematic window and MDGF).

This activity requires a dialogue between the Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation. This dialogue should be aimed at rounding out and modifying some of the questions and dimensions of the study that the generic TOR do not cover, or which are inadequate or irrelevant to the joint programme.

2. The MDGF Secretariat will send the finalized, contextualized TOR to the Evaluator it has chosen .

3. From this point on, the Portfolio Manager is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the Evaluator, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (Evaluator, reference group in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.

B. Execution phase of the evaluation study (55-58 days total)

Desk study (15 days total)

1. The Portfolio Manager will brief the Evaluator (**1 day**). He/she will hand over a checklist of activities and documents to review, and explain the evaluation process. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. The Evaluator will review the documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. The Evaluator will submit the inception report to the MDGF Secretariat; the report will include the findings from the document review and will specify how the evaluation will be conducted. The Evaluator will share the inception report with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (**within seven days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal points for the evaluation (PMC Co-Chairs) and the Evaluator will prepare an agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc) (**Within seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

Field visit (9-12 days)

1. In-country, the Evaluator will observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document review. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, the Secretariat's Portfolio Manager may need to facilitate the Evaluator's visit by means of phone calls and emails to the reference group.
2. The Evaluator will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

Final Report (31 days total)

1. The Evaluator will deliver a draft final report, which the Secretariat's Portfolio Manager shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group (**within 10 days of the completion of the field visit**).
2. The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The Evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the Secretariat's Portfolio Manager can and should intervene so that erroneous data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed (**within 14 days of delivery of the draft final report**).

The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgements contained in the report, but these do not affect the Evaluator's freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.

3. The Secretariat's Portfolio Manager shall assess the quality of the final version of the evaluation report presented, using the criteria stipulated in the annex to this TOR (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report**).
4. Upon receipt of input from the reference group, the Evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit. The Secretariat's Portfolio Manager shall review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report by the MDGF Secretariat to the evaluation reference group (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments**).

5. Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within 21 days of delivery of the final report):

1. The Secretariat's Portfolio Manager, as representative of the Secretariat, shall engage in a dialogue with the reference group to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.
2. The Secretariat's Portfolio Manager will hold a dialogue with the reference group to develop a simple plan to disseminate and report the results to the various interested parties.

10. ANNEXES

a) Document Review

MDG-F Context

- MDGF Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

Specific Documents for the CCPF

- "China Climate Change Partnership Framework": results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan
- All financial information (from MDTF, biannual monitoring reports, etc.)

Other in-country documents or information

- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One

b) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan

After the interim evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

Evaluation Recommendation No. 1				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up	
1.1			Comments	Status
1.2				
1.3				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 2				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up	
2.1			Comments	Status
2.2				
2.3				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 3				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up	
3.1			Comments	Status
3.2				
3.3				

Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix below serves as a general guide for the evaluation. It provides directions for the evaluation; particularly the collect of relevant data. It will be used as a basis for interviewing people and reviewing programme documents. It will also provide a basis for structuring the evaluation report as a whole.

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Evaluation criteria: Relevance - How does the programme relate to the needs of China, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies and strategies of programme's partners and donors?				
<i>Is the programme relevant to MDG implementation at local and national level in China?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the programme support the objectives of the MDGs Does the programme participate in the implementation of the MDGs in China? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between programme objectives and the MDGs Degree of coherence between the programme and national priorities, policies and strategies in the area of climate change MDGs status in China 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents National policies and strategies to implement the MDGs or related to environment more generally Key government officials and other partners MDG web site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with government officials and other partners
<i>Is the programme relevant to UN objectives in China?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the programme support the objectives of the UN organizations – including the UNDAF 2011-15 - in China? To what extent and in which ways are the joint programmes helping make progress towards United Nations reform? One UN How have the principles for aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, managing for development results and mutual accountability) been developed in the joint programmes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a clear relationship between the programme objectives and sustainable development objectives of UN organizations including those in UNDAF 2011-15 Principles on aid effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents UNDAF 2011-15 and other UN strategies and programmes National policies and strategies to implement the MDGs or related to environment more generally Key government officials and other partners Related web sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with government officials and other partners
<i>Does the programme contribute to the goals of the thematic window?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of coherence between the CCPF objectives and the goals of the environmental sustainability thematic window 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MDG-F web site CCPF document Other programme documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with government officials and other partners
<i>Is the programme relevant to China development objectives?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent do the joint programme's goals and lines of action reflect national and regional plans and programmes, identified needs (environmental and human) and the operational context of national policy in China? How does the programme support the objectives of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the programme support national environmental objectives Degree of coherence between the programme and national priorities, policies and strategies Appreciation from national stakeholders with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents National policies and strategies on climate change, environment and PRSP Key government officials and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with government officials and other partners

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<p>development of China?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How country-driven is the programme? Does the programme adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional framework and programming, in its design and its implementation? To what extent were national partners involved in the design of the programme? 	<p>respect to adequacy of programme design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of involvement of Government officials and other partners into the programme Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and criteria contains in the MDG-F thematic window and in the CCPF 	<p>other partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MDG-F web site CCPF document 	
<i>Is the programme addressing the needs of target beneficiaries?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the programme support the needs of target beneficiaries? Is the implementation of the programme been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? Are local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in programme design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strength of the link between expected results from the programme and the needs of target beneficiaries Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of beneficiaries and stakeholders in programme design and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beneficiaries and stakeholders Needs assessment studies Programme documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders
<i>Is the programme internally coherent in its design?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a direct and strong link between expected results of the programme and the programme design (in terms of components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)? Is the length of the programme conducive to achieve programme outcomes? Have the most efficient measures for the context been adopted to solve the environmental issue? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between programme expected results and programme design internal logic Level of coherence between programme design and programme implementation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents Key programme stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Key Interviews
<i>How is the programme relevant in light of related initiatives in China?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering other related on-going initiatives in China, does the programme remain relevant in terms of areas of focus and targeting of key activities? How does the CCPF help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are crucial but are not covered by other initiatives funded by the government of China and other donors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other government and donor programming in China and regionally List of programs and funds in which the future development, ideas and partnerships of the programme are eligible? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government and other donors' policies and programming documents Government and other donor representatives Programme documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with government officials and other donors
Future directions for similar Programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons have been learnt and what changes could have been made to the programme in order to strengthen the alignment between the programme and the Partners' priorities and areas of focus? How could the programme better target and address priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Evaluation criteria: Effectiveness – To what extent are the expected outcomes of the programme being achieved?				
<i>How is the programme effective</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the programme being effective in achieving its expected outcomes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptation strategies through alternatives economic development activities Change in climate change mitigation and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents including monitoring and evaluation documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analysis Meetings with main Partners

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>in achieving its expected outcomes?</i>	<p>investment frameworks;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy; ○ Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do the outputs produced meet the required quality? ▪ To what extent has the joint programme contributed to putting environmental problems on the country's policy agenda? ▪ To what extent have the behaviors causing the environmental problem been transformed? ▪ Is the identification of problems and its causes in the joint programme being addressed? (Environmental and human)? 	<p>adaptation practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change in capacity for information management: Knowledge acquisition and sharing; Effective data gathering, methods and procedures for reporting on vulnerability assessment, early warning and mitigation and adaptation strategies. ▪ Change in capacity for awareness raising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stakeholder involvement and government awareness ○ Change in local stakeholder behavior ▪ Change in capacity in policy making and planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy reform for climate change mitigation and adaptation ○ Legislation/regulation change to improve climate change mitigation and adaptation ○ Development of national and local strategies and plans supporting climate change mitigation and adaptation ▪ Change in capacity in implementation and enforcement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design and implementation of risk assessments ○ Implementation of national and local strategies and action plans through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance ○ Monitoring, evaluation and promotion of demonstrations ▪ Change in capacity in mobilizing resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leverage of resources ○ human resources ○ appropriate practices ○ mobilization of advisory services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key stakeholders ▪ Research findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with programme beneficiaries
<i>What is the ownership of the process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent have the target population and the participants taken ownership of the programme, assuming an active role in it? ▪ To what extent have national public/private resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme's goals and impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree of engagement of programme partners and beneficiaries in programme activities and achievements ▪ Nature of the decision-making processes of the programme and degree of participation of partners and beneficiaries in these processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Programme documents ▪ Programme Partners ▪ Programme staff ▪ Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
<i>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How well are risks and assumptions being managed? ▪ What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? ▪ Were these sufficient? ▪ Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during programme planning ▪ Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Programme documents ▪ Programme staff and programme partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Future directions for similar Programmes	term sustainability of the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons have been learnt for the programme to achieve its outcomes? ▪ What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the programme in order to improve the achievement of the programme's expected results? ▪ How could the programme be more effective in achieving its results? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data analysis
Evaluation criteria: <i>Efficiency - How efficiently have the programme resources been turned into results?</i>				
<i>Is programme support channeled in an efficient way?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How well does the joint programme's management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes? ▪ Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme's results? ▪ Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met? ▪ Is adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? To what extent has the programme contributed innovative measures towards solving the problems? ▪ Are the programme results framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation? ▪ Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for programme management and producing accurate and timely financial information? ▪ Are progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? ▪ Are the monitoring indicators relevant? Are they of sufficient quality to measure the joint programme's outputs? ▪ Has the leveraging of counterpart funds happened as planned? ▪ Are financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? ▪ How is RBM used during program implementation? ▪ Are there institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanisms to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to programme design and implementation effectiveness are shared among stakeholders and partners involved in programme implementation for ongoing programme adjustment and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability and quality of progress and financial reports ▪ Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided ▪ Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures ▪ Planned vs. actual funds leveraged ▪ Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar programmes from other organizations ▪ Adequacy of programme choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost ▪ Quality of RBM reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) ▪ Occurrence of change in programme design/ implementation approach (ie restructuring) when needed to improve programme efficiency ▪ Existence, quality and use of M&E, feedback and dissemination mechanism to share findings, lessons learned and recommendation on effectiveness of programme design and implementation. ▪ Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives ▪ Gender disaggregated data in programme documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Programme documents and evaluations ▪ Programme staff ▪ PMC and NSC representatives ▪ Beneficiaries and partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Key interviews

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>How efficient are partnership arrangements for the programme?</i>	improvement? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the programme mainstream gender considerations into its implementation? 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable? To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society (level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements)? Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded? Are work methodologies, financial tools etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, Examples of supported partnerships Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents Programme Partners Programme staff Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? Did the programme take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the programme? Was there an effective collaboration with scientific institutions with competence in climate change adaptation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of total expertise utilized taken from China Number/quality of analyses done to assess local potential and absorptive capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents Programme partners Programme staff Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
Future directions for similar Programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be learnt from the programme on efficiency? How could the programme have more efficiently addressed its key priorities (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)? What changes could have been made (if any) to the programme in order to improve its efficiency? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Evaluation criteria: <i>Impacts</i> - <i>What are the realized and potential impacts of activities carried out in the context of the programme?</i>				
<i>How is the programme effective in achieving its long-term objective?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the programme achieve its strategy that is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support national level policies needed to achieve climate change goals in China; Promote dissemination of innovative pilot partnerships and technologies at the local level. To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country's public policy framework? What differential impacts and types of effect is the joint programme producing among population groups, such as youth, children, adolescents, the elderly, and rural populations? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in capacity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To pool/mobilize resources For related policy making and strategic planning, For implementation of related laws and strategies through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance, Change to the quantity and strength of barriers such as change in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge about climate change and national incentives for climate change mitigation and adaptation Cross-institutional coordination and inter- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents Key Stakeholders Research findings; if available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analysis Programme staff Programme partners Interviews with programme beneficiaries and other stakeholders

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<p><i>How is the programme effective in contributing to the MDGs?</i></p> <p>Future directions for the Programme</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o sectoral dialogue o Knowledge of climate change mitigation and adaptation practices by end users o Coordination of policy and legal instruments incorporating climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies o Climate change mitigation and adaptation economic incentives for stakeholders ▪ Change in use and implementation of sustainable alternatives 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels? ▪ What are the impacts or likely impacts of the programme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o On the local environment; o On poverty; and, o On other socio-economic issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide specific examples of impacts at those levels, as relevant ▪ List of potential funds to be used to assure long term sustainability of MDG objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Programme documents ▪ MDGs documents ▪ Key stakeholders ▪ Research findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data analysis ▪ Interviews with key stakeholders
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How could the programme build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives? 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collected throughout evaluation
<p>Evaluation criteria: Sustainability – What are the probabilities that the programme achievements will continue in the long run?</p>				
<p><i>Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in programme design?</i></p> <p><i>Are the CCPF achievements sustainable?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the programme? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence/Quality of sustainability strategy ▪ Evidence/Quality of steps taken to address sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Programme documents and evaluations ▪ Programme staff ▪ Programme partners ▪ Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the necessary preconditions being created to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the joint programme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Local level: are local knowledge, experiences, resources and local networks being adopted? o Country level: have networks or network institutions been created or strengthened to carry out the roles that the joint programme is performing? o Is the joint programme’s duration sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions into the future? ▪ To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent with or different from those of the joint programme? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree to which programme activities and results have been taken over by governments or other stakeholders ▪ Evidence of commitments from governments or other stakeholders to sustain programme achievements in the long run ▪ Mechanisms in place to sustain programme achievements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Programme documents and evaluations ▪ Government documents ▪ Media reports ▪ Programme staff ▪ Programme partners ▪ Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>Financial Sustainability</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the programme adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues? Are the recurrent costs after programme completion sustainable? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities in China after programme end? Evidence of commitments from government or other stakeholder to financially support relevant sectors of activities after programme end Level of recurrent costs after completion of programme and funding sources for those recurrent costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents and evaluations Programme staff Programme partners Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<i>Organizations arrangements and continuation of activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the results of efforts made during the programme implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures? Is there evidence that programme partners will continue their activities beyond programme support? What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results? Are appropriate 'champions' being identified and/or supported? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which programme activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after programme end Number/quality of champions identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents and evaluations Programme staff Programme partners Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<i>Enabling Environment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the programme, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms? Are the necessary related capacities for lawmaking and enforcement built? What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of the programme? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies State of enforcement and law making capacity Evidences of commitment by the political class through speeches, enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents and evaluations Programme staff Programme partners Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<i>Institutional and individual capacity building</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elements in place in those different management functions, at the appropriate levels (national, regional and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents and evaluations Programme staff Programme partners Beneficiaries Capacity assessments available, if any 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Documentation review
<i>Replication</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are programme activities and results replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up? What is the programme contribution to replication or scaling up of innovative practices or mechanisms that support the climate change policy of the government of China? What lessons have been learned, and what best practices can be transferred to other programmes or countries? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number/quality of replicated initiatives Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives Volume of additional investment leveraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other donors programming documents Beneficiaries Programme staff Programme partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<i>Challenges to sustainability of the</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges in view of building blocks for long-term sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>programme</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have any of these been addressed through programme management? ▪ What could be the possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the programme? ▪ In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recent changes which may present new challenges to the programme ▪ Education strategy and partnership with school, education institutions etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Beneficiaries ▪ Programme staff ▪ Programme partners 	
Future directions for the Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Which areas/arrangements under the programme show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results? ▪ What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the programme initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data analysis

Annex 3: List of Documents Consulted

CCPF, *Annual Joint Programme Progress Report - 2008*

CCPF, *Annual Joint Programme Progress Report - 2009*

CCPF, *Draft Year II Annual Work Plan – May 2009 / April 2010*

CCPF, *Draft Year III Annual Work Plan – May 2010 / April 2011*

CCPF, February 2009, *Programme Management Committee Meeting - Meeting No.1 - Follow-Up and Recommendations Report*

CCPF, *Fond Transfer Request YII*

CCPF, *Fond Transfer Request YIII*

CCPF, *Joint Programme Monitoring Report – 2nd Semester 2009*

CCPF, *Mini Monitoring Report – June 2009*

CCPF, *Minutes of China National MDG Fund Steering Committee Meeting held on May 19, 2009*

CCPF, *Minutes of China National MDG Fund Steering Committee Meeting held on April 22, 2010*

CCPF, *PMC Meeting Minutes – held on Monday March 22, 2010*

CCPF, *Presentation to NSC Meeting held on April 22, 2010*

CCPF, *Presentations (8) to PMC Meeting held on Monday March 22, 2010*

CCPF, *Presentations (16) to PMC Meeting held in February 2009*

CCPF, *Programme Monitoring Framework – 2008*

CCPF, *Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Quarter 3, 2008*

CCPF, *Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Quarter 1, 2009*

CCPF, *Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Quarter 2, 2009*

CCPF, *Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Quarter 3, 2009*

CCPF, *Progress Report*

CCPF, various reports, presentations, work plans, publications completed under outputs/activities and provided to the Evaluator as background information on the respective outputs/activities

China Environmental Science Press, *Reports on National Capacity Self-Assessment for China's Implementing International Environmental Conventions*

Dr. Feng Jiang, *MDG in China* (presentation)

GEF, *Country Profile for China*

GEF, UNDP, March 2005, *Assessment on Capacity for Implementing UNFCCC and China's Strategies of Capacity Building for Climate Protection – NCSA Project Report*

MDG-F, *Advocacy and Partnerships: Guidance Note for Elaborating Advocacy Action Plans*

MDG-F, April 2008, *Revised Standard Joint Programme Document*

MDG-F, *First Steps to Follow when Starting Mid-Term Evaluations For MDG-F Joint Programmes*

MDG-F, June 2009, *Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes*

MDG-F, *MDG-F Advocacy and Communication Strategy*

- MDG-F, *Monitoring and Evaluation System – Learning to Improve – Making Evidence Work for Development*
- MDG-F, *Thematic indicators for the Environment and Climate Change Window*
- MDG-F, *UNDP-Spain MDG Achievement Fund - Terms of Reference for Thematic Window on Environment and Climate Change*
- MDG-F, *UNDP/Spain Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund – Framework Document*
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, UN, 2008, *China’s Progress Towards the Millennium Development Goals – 2008 Report*
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, UN, October 2005, *China’s Progress Towards the Millennium Development Goals 2005*
- NDRC, February 2007, *Program of Action for Sustainable Development in China in the Early 21st Century*
- NDRC, June 2007, *China’s National Climate Change Programme*
- NDRC, UN China, December 8, 2008, *China Introduces its Vision of Low Carbon Future*
- UNIDO, December 3, 2008, *UNIDO and UNDP launch the Joint Programme ‘Industrial Climate Change Compacts – A United Nations-Business Partnership for Sustainability*
- UN, 2003, *Millennium Development Goals – China’s Progress*
- UN, *Common Country Assessment 2004*
- UN, March 2005, *UNDAF for the People’s Republic of China – 2006-2010*
- UN, *UN Partnership in China - Balancing Development to Achieve Xiaokang and Millennium Development Goals*
- UN, *UNDAF 2011-2015 for the People’s Republic of China*
- UNDP, GEF-China, April 2005, *National Capacity Self-Assessment Report on Cross-Cutting Areas of Protecting Biodiversity, Addressing Climate Change and Combating Desertification*
- UNDP, Renmin University of China, *China Human Development Report 2009/10 – Towards a Low Carbon Economy and Society*
- UNESCO, Earthscan, *WWWR-3 - Case Studies Asia and the Pacific – China: The Yellow River Basin*
- UNESCO, Earthscan, *Water in a Changing World (WWWR-3)*
- UNTGCCE, UNTGG, April 21, 2010, *Climate Change and Women: Why does Gender Matter? (2 presentations)*
- UNTGCCE, UNTGG, April 21, 2010, *Mainstreaming Gender into the CCPF*
- UNTGCCE, UNTGG, *Meeting Minutes – April 21, 2010*
- _____, 2004, *The People’s Republic of China – Initial Communication on Climate Change*
- _____, *China Climate Change Partnership Framework Document*
- _____, March 5, 2008, *The National Eleventh Five-Year Plan for Environmental Protection (2006-2010)*

Annex 4: Discussion Guide

Note: This is only a discussion guide for the Evaluator; it is a simplified version of the evaluation matrix. All questions will not be asked to each meeting; it is a reminder for the Evaluator on the type of information required to complete the evaluation exercise and a guide to prepare the semi-structured interviews.

I. RELEVANCE – *How does the programme relate to the needs of China, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies and strategies of programme's partners and donors?*

- I.1. Is the programme relevant to MDG implementation at local and national level in China?
- I.2. Is the programme relevant to UN objectives in China?
- I.3. Does the programme contribute to the goals of the thematic window?
- I.4. Is the programme relevant to China development objectives?
- I.5. Is the programme addressing the needs of target beneficiaries?
- I.6. Is the programme internally coherent in its design?
- I.7. How is the programme relevant in light of related initiatives in China?

Future directions for similar programmes

- I.8. What lessons have been learnt and what changes could have been made to the programme in order to strengthen the alignment between the programme and the Partners' priorities and areas of focus?
- I.9. How could the programme better target and address priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?

II. EFFECTIVENESS – *To what extent are the expected outcomes of the programme being achieved?*

- II.1. How is the programme effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
 - Mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning, and investment frameworks;
 - Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy;
 - Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanisms.
- II.2. What is the ownership of the process?
- II.3. How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?

Future directions for similar programmes

- II.4. What lessons have been learnt for the programme to achieve its outcomes?
- II.5. What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the programme in order to improve the achievement of the programme's expected results?
- II.6. How could the programme be more effective in achieving its results?

III. EFFICIENCY – *How efficiently have the programme resources been turned into results?*

- III.1. How well does the joint programme's management model contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?
- III.2. Has adaptive management been used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
- III.3. Do the programme result framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?
- III.4. Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for programme management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
- III.5. Are progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
- III.6. Is the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned?
- III.7. Are financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?

- III.8. How is RBM used during program implementation?
- III.9. Are there institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanism to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to programme design and implementation effectiveness are shared among programme stakeholders and partners involved in programme implementation for ongoing programme adjustment and improvement?
- III.10. Does the programme mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?
- III.11. How efficient are partnership arrangements for the programme?
- III.12. Does the programme efficiently utilize local capacity for its implementation?

Future directions for the Programme

- III.13. What lessons can be learnt from the programme on efficiency?
- III.14. How could the programme have more efficiently addressed its key priorities (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?

IV. IMPACTS - *What are the realized and potential impacts of activities carried out in the context of the programme?*

- IV.1. Will the programme achieve its strategy that is to:
 - a. Support national level policies needed to achieve climate change goals in China;
 - b. Promote dissemination of innovative pilot partnerships and technologies at the local level.
- IV.2. To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country's public policy framework?
- IV.3. What differential impacts and types of effect is the joint programme producing among population groups, such as youth, children, adolescents, the elderly, and rural populations?
- IV.4. How is the Programme effective in contributing to the MDGs?

Future directions for the Programme

- IV.5. How could the programme build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?

V. SUSTAINABILITY - *What are the probabilities that the programme achievements will continue in the long run?*

- V.1. Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in programme design?
- V.2. Are the CCPF achievements sustainable?
- V.3. Does the programme adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?
- V.4. Is there evidence that programme partners will continue their activities beyond programme support?
- V.5. Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the programme, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?
- V.6. Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?
- V.7. Are programme activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?
- V.8. What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts?

Future directions for the Programme

- V.9. Which areas/arrangements under the programme show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results?
- V.10. What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the programme initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed?

----- **End** -----

Annex 5: Evaluation Mission Agenda**CCPF Evaluation Mission Agenda
Monday 10th – Friday 21st May 2010**

Date		Evaluation Activities	
		AM	PM
Monday	10th May	Biogas and CA seminar (2.1.3)	UNIDO 2pm - 5pm PMC Co-Chair, Mr. Edward CLARENCE-SMITH Assistant Coordinator, Ms. Catherine WONG RCO Representative, Mr. Pablo BARRERA
Tuesday	11th May	Meetings with reference group members NDRC 10am - 12pm, PMC Co-Chair, Mr. JIANG Zhaoli NPC, Mr. WU Jianmin Assistant Coordinator, Ms. LI Yan <i>(Separate meetings back-to-back, Mr JIANG will be accompanied by Mr. Wu)</i>	Biogas and CA seminar site visit to field and extension service station, Daxing (2.1.3) 5pm Mr. LeRoy HOLLENBECK, UNAPCAEM
Wednesday	12th May	Session (1) UNIDO/MOA (1.1.2 & 2.1.2) 10-12pm Mr. Alessandro AMADIO, UNIDO Mr. James NEW, UNIDO Ms. Guiling WANG, MOA Mr. SONG, MOA Ms. ZHAO Wei, MOA 12.00- 12.45pm Mr. Edward CLARENCE-SMITH Ms. Catherine WONG	Session (2) FAO/CAAS (3.4.1) Prof. ZHA Yan, CAAS Prof. CAI Dianxiong, CAAS Ms. Amelia CHUNG, UNV Ms. JIANG Han, FAO
Thursday	13th May	Session (3) UNESCO/MWR/YRCC (3.3.1) Dr. Ramasamy Jayakumar, UNESCO Mr. LIU Ke, UNESCO Session (4) YRCC Mr. SUN Yangbo, Deputy Director, Department of International Cooperation, Yellow River Conservancy Commission	Session (5) ILO 2-3pm (1.2.3 & 3.1.3) Mr. Satoshi SASAKI, ILO Dr. Bill Xubiao ZHANG, ILO Mr. ZHU Changyou, ILO Counterparts to ILO (from CASS) Ms. ZHENG Yan, Researcher in CASS Ms. ZHANG Ying, Researcher in CASS Ms. QIAN Xiaohong, Division Director, Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security UNDP & counterparts 4pm - 6pm Wu Xiuhe, Director of Guangcai Liu Faxin (Ms.), Project Manager Dr. ZHANG Weidong, UNDP Ms. ZHANG Yu, UNDP Ms. HE Nan, NEA
Friday	14th May	Session (6) WHO 8:45am - 11am (3.2.1-4) Dr. Mukundan PILLAY, WHO Mr. MAO Jixiang, WHO Mr. Brent POWIS, WHO Ms. Arielle Eisenbaum, WHO UNDP & counterparts 11.30am - 12.30pm Xiaoyu, VP/SG of CIIMC, Han Fang (ms.), Assistant to SG	Session (7) UNDP & counterparts 2pm -3pm Wang Weiquan, Project Coordinator Fan Jingchun (Ms.), Project Coordinator 3.30- 4.30pm Mr. Edward CLARENCE-SMITH Ms. Catherine WONG <i>*Leave for Zhengzhou</i>
Saturday	15th May	Pilot site visit in Zhengzhou (3.3.1) Mr. LI Guoying, Commissioner, YRCC Mr. SHANG Hongqi, Director General, Department of International Cooperation, Science and Technology, YRCC	Pilot site visit <i>*Take bullet to Xian: will be met by local Chinese counterpart</i>

Date		Evaluation Activities	
		AM	PM
		Ms. SUN Feng, Director, Division of International Cooperation, Department of International Cooperation, Science and Technology, YRCC Mr. SUN Yangbo, Deputy Director, Division of International Cooperation, Department of International Cooperation, Science and Technology, YRCC	
Sunday	16th May	Pilot site visit in Shaanxi (3.3.2-4) Ms. LEI Jun, National Programme Officer, UNICEF Ms. HU Yaqiong, Senior Engineer, MWR Ms. Liu Cuizhu, Mr. GAO Zhanyi, TITLE, AFFILIATION Mr. YANG Jianqing, Deputy Director, Centre for Groundwater Monitoring, Ministry of Water Resources	Pilot site visit <i>*Return to Beijing</i>
Monday	17th May	Session (8) MOH (3.2.1-4) 10am <i>* WHO will escort to MOH, Meet in lobby of WHO Office</i> Mr. ZHAO Yuechao, MOH Dr. JIN Yinlong, Institute for Environmental Health and Related Product Safety Dr. DONG Shaoxiao, Institute for Environmental Health and Related Product Safety Dr. SONG Xiaoming, Peking University Dr. KAN Jianli, CDC China <i>* Lunch with WHO and MOH</i>	Session (9) (3.1.1-2) 2.00-4.00pm UNEP & counterparts Mr. Zhang Shigang, Country Coordinator, UNEP China Office Ms. Jiang Nanqing, Project Manager, UNEP China Office Mr. Shen Jie, Project Manager, Administrative Center, China's Agenda 21 PMO Ms. HE Xiaojie, Project Manager, Administrative Center, China's Agenda 21 PMO 4.00 – 5.30pm NDRC Mr. WU Jianmin, NPC Ms. LI Yan, Assistant Coordinator <i>*Meetings take place at UNDP conference room</i>
Tuesday	18th May	Session (10) 10 – 12pm Mr. Edward CLARENCE-SMITH Ms. Catherine WONG UNICEF and counterparts (3.3.2-4) Dr. YANG Zhenbo, UNICEF Ms. LEI Jun, UNICEF 1pm Note: Dr. YANG (UNICEF) was unable to attend at last moment due to extenuating circumstances and the meeting originally scheduled for 10am was moved back to 1pm.	Pilot site visit <i>* Leave approx 3pm for Shanxi</i>
Wednesday	19th May	Pilot site visit in Shanxi (2.1.2) James New, Industrial Development Officer, UNIDO CO Wang Guiling/Ms., Executive Deputy Manager Song Dongfeng, Project Coordinator Zhao Wei/Ms., Project Assistant Wang Dianhui, President, Juyi Group Kang Lingsheng, Deputy Director General, Xinrong Company Zhou Xuan, Deputy Team Leader for SC, Brick-making expert, Xi'an Research and Design Institute Wang Wenjun, Team leader for the SC	Pilot site visit <i>* Return to Beijing (2.1.2)</i>

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Date		Evaluation Activities	
		AM	PM
Thursday	20th May	<p>Session (11) UNAPCAEM & counterparts Prof. DONG Hongmin, IESDA/CAAS Prof. Li YU'E, IESDA/CAAS</p> <p>Ms. AI Yuxin, UNAPCAEM Ms Marina MA, UNAPCAEM</p>	<p>Session (12) 2 -3pm CICETE Ms. Tian Yuanshi, Deputy Director Divisions II, China International Center for Economic and Technical Exchanges, MOFCOM</p> <p>3 - 4pm UNDP Dr. ZHANG Weidong, UNDP Ms. ZHANG Yu, UNDP</p> <p>4.30pm MOFCOM Ms. LIANG Hong <i>*Mr. Pablo Barrera will escort Evaluator</i> 7.30pm Dinner with evaluation reference group at Din Tai Fung</p>
Friday	21st May	<p>Session (12) 10:00am De-briefing with evaluation reference group</p>	

Annex 6: List of People Met

Title	Name	Function
Ms.	AI Yuxin	UNAPCAEM
Mr.	AMADIO Alessandro	UNIDO
Mr.	BARRERA Pablo	RCO Representative
Prof.	CAI Dianxiong	CAAS
Ms.	CHUNG Amelia	UNV
Mr.	CLARENCE-SMITH Edward	PMC Co-Chair
Prof.	DONG Hongmin	IESDA/CAAS
Dr.	DONG Shaoxiao	Institute for Environmental Health and Related Product Safety
Ms.	EISENBAUM Arielle	WHO
Ms.	FAN Jingchun	Project Coordinator
Mr.	GAO Zhanyi	
Ms.	HAN Fang	Assistant to SG
Ms.	HE Nan	National Energy Administration
Ms.	HE Xiaojie	Project Manager, Administrative Center, China's Agenda 21 PMO
Ms.	HU Yaqiong	Senior Engineer, MWR
Mr.	HOLLENBECK LeRoy	UNAPCAEM
Dr.	JAYAKUMAR Ramasamy	UNESCO
Ms.	JIANG Han	FAO
Ms.	JIANG Nanqing	Project Manager, UNEP China Office
Mr.	JIANG Zhaoli	PMC Co-Chair
Dr.	JIN Yinlong	Institute for Environmental Health and Related Product Safety
Dr.	KAN Jianli	CDC China
Mr.	KANG Lingsheng	Deputy Director General, Xinrong Company
Ms.	LEI Jun	National Programme Officer, UNICEF
Mr.	LI Guoying	Commissioner, YRCC
Ms.	LI Yan	Assistant Coordinator to NPC
Prof.	LI YU'E	IESDA/CAAS
Ms.	LIANG Hong	MOFCOM
Ms.	LIU Cuizhu	
Ms.	LIU Faxin	Project Manager
Mr.	LIU Ke	UNESCO
Ms.	MA Marina	UNAPCAEM
Mr.	MAO Jixiang	WHO
Mr.	NEW James	Industrial Development Officer, UNIDO

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Title	Name	Function
Dr.	PILLAY Mukundan	WHO
Mr.	POWIS Brent	WHO
Ms.	QIAN Xiaohong	Division Director, Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security
Mr.	SASAKI, Satoshi	ILO
Mr.	SHANG Hongqi	Director General, Department of International Cooperation, Science and Technology, YRCC
Mr.	SHEN Jie	Project Manager, Administrative Center, China's Agenda 21 PMO
Mr.	SONG Dongfeng	Project Coordinator, MOA
Dr.	SONG Xiaoming	Peking University
Ms.	SUN Feng	Director, Division of International Cooperation, Department of International Cooperation, Science and Technology, YRCC
Mr.	SUN Yangbo	Deputy Director, Department of International Cooperation, Yellow River Conservancy Commission
Ms.	TIAN Yuanshi	Deputy Director Divisions II, China International Center for Economic and Technical Exchanges
Mr.	WANG Dianhui	President, Juyi Group
Ms.	WANG Guiling	Executive Deputy Manager
Mr.	WANG Weiquan	Project Coordinator
Mr.	WANG Wenjun	Team leader for the SC
Ms.	WONG Catherine	Assistant Coordinator
Mr.	WU Jianmin	NPC
Mr.	WU Xiuhe	Director of Guangcai
Mr.	YANG Jianqing	Deputy Director, Centre for Groundwater Monitoring, Ministry of Water Resources
Dr.	YANG Zhenbo	UNICEF
Prof.	ZHA Yan	CAAS
Mr.	ZHANG Shigang	Country Coordinator, UNEP China Office
Dr.	ZHANG Weidong	UNDP
Mr.	ZHANG Xiaoyu	VP/SG of CIIMC
Dr.	ZHANG Xubiao	ILO
Ms.	ZHANG Ying	Researcher in CASS
Ms.	ZHANG Yu	UNDP
Ms.	ZHAO Wei	Project Assistant, MOA
Mr.	ZHAO Yuechao	MOH
Ms.	ZHENG Yan	Researcher in CASS
Mr.	ZHOU Xuan	Deputy Team Leader for SC, Brick-making expert, Xi'an Research and Design Institute
Mr.	ZHU Changyou	ILO

Annex 7: Joint Programme Expected Results and Planned Activities

Output Description	Financial resources ¹⁵	Targeted direct and indirect participants and geographical scope	Main Implementation Partners	Activities
Outcome 1: Mainstreaming climate change mitigation and adaptation into national and sub-national policies, planning and investment frameworks				
OUTPUT 1.1 Improved policies and partnerships at national level to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation into policy frameworks	USD 1,916,000	<p>Activities under Output 1.1 have outcomes at a national level potentially affecting all of China's population.</p> <p>Other countries such as: Pakistan, Nepal, Laos, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh also benefit through trainings as part of South-South cooperation.</p>	<p>UNDP National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) National Energy Administration (NEA) China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development (CICCED) Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS)</p>	<p>1.1.1. Support to Post 2012 Frameworks 1.1.2. Support to establish a new Global Climate Change Centre 1.1.3. Support to establish a new High-Level Climate Change Task Force 1.1.4. Support to design China's new Basic Energy Law and series of Energy Strategies</p>
OUTPUT 1.2: UN-business partnerships and new 'green' financing mechanisms to mainstream climate change and energy into investment frameworks and business practices	USD 443,000	<p>UN Compact targets private and multi-national companies, specifically those located in Hebei, Guangdong and Guangxi provinces. Training materials produced could potentially benefit companies beyond those targeted in the programme pilots.</p> <p>UNIDO has also developed a project in the South African city of Durban, which will make use of materials compiled under this Output.</p> <p>Green Business Options (GBO) will benefit students and young people in 20 universities and training institutions across China. Other business starters will also benefit as GBO will be incorporated into</p>	<p>UNDP UNIDO ILO China Society for Promotion of the Guangcai Program Energy and Environmental Development Research Centre (EED) Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MOHRSS)</p>	<p>1.2.1 Engage multinational and local companies to increase awareness on climate change issues in China 1.2.2 Engage multinational and local companies through a UN-Business Compact on Climate Change 1.2.3 Demonstrate best practices of "green employment" in three selected companies with UNIDO and FAO</p>

¹⁵ Funding from MDG-F unless otherwise stated

Output Description	Financial resources ¹⁵	Targeted direct and indirect participants and geographical scope	Main Implementation Partners	Activities
		MOHRSS Start and Improved Your Own Business (SIYB) program.		
Outcome 2: Establishment of innovative partnerships and dissemination of technologies to mitigate climate change and increase local access to sustainable energy				
OUTPUT 2.1: Development and dissemination at the local-level of innovative models for energy efficiency:	USD 1,895,000 USD 5,000,000 (from the private sector)	This output targets specifically those private enterprises participating in the mitigation pilots and replication activities in Shandong, Shanxi, and Inner Mongolia. The results of the pilots will benefit other companies beyond the pilots	UNDP UNIDO UNAPCAEM China International Institute of Multinational Corporations (CIIMC) Ministry of Agriculture Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development in Agriculture - Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (IESDA-CAAS)	2.1.1 Pilot and disseminate clean coal technology 2.1.2 Develop and disseminate technology and policy for production of bricks from coal gangue 2.1.3 Promote policies, technologies, and practices for biogas and conservation agriculture, with an aim at CDM facility
OUTPUT 2.2: Development and dissemination at the local level of innovative models for renewable energy in rural areas.	USD 371,000	Government and private enterprises participating in biomass pilot related activities in Henan and Shandong	UNDP National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC)	2.2.1 Develop and disseminate a new biomass pellet system, and increase capacities and disseminate productive applications associated with off-grid rural renewable power stations
Outcome 3: Accelerated action by China in assessing vulnerability to climate change and developing adaptation plans and mechanism				
OUTPUT 3.1: Climate proofing of poverty reduction in less developed areas of West China and vulnerable coastal areas of Southeast China.	USD 1,275,000	National and local policymakers, local communities in Gansu, Guangdong, Xinjiang and Zhejiang. Findings and policy recommendations on low carbon economy and employment focus on coal, wind and solar energy, forestry and cement sectors.	UNEP ILO National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MOHRSS) Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS)	3.1.1 Analyze key climate risks to poverty reduction and livelihoods in selected areas in the Himalayan Region 3.1.2 Assess the impacts of rising seas levels on the Southeast coast of China 3.1.3 Map the employment and income impacts of climate change in China, including the detection of potential for green jobs and the need for managed transitions in the labour market
OUTPUT 3.2: Policies and capacities developed to manage	USD 1,395,000	National and local health officials, health Inspection Institutes, universities and professionals in	WHO Ministry of Health	3.2.1 Benchmark Environmental Health best practice and support leadership development for climate change policy and

Output Description	Financial resources ¹⁵	Targeted direct and indirect participants and geographical scope	Main Implementation Partners	Activities
environmental health issues from climate change.		Chongqing, Gansu, Guangdong and Jiangsu.		practice 3.2.2. Develop effective local action plans to protect human health from climate change risks considered by local authorities and in the framework of the NEHAP 3.2.3. Strengthen capacity to assess and respond to key climate risks, and identify the health aspects of climate change mitigation policies 3.2.4. Enhance capacity for monitoring, analysis and reporting progress on impact of climate to health
OUTPUT 3.3: Capacities enhanced and policies developed for understanding and adapting to impacts of water management changes on China's environment and development.	USD 1,864,500	National and local policymakers, trade union and enterprise union representatives, academia, including local young researchers, Farmers, famers associations, technicians. local Government and communities in and around Yellow River Basin area, Qinghai, Hebei, Shaanxi and Shandong,	UNESCO UNICEF MWR Yellow River Conservation Commission (YRCC)	3.3.1 Undertake comprehensive assessment of climate risks to water resources, defining risk scenarios and local actions to prevent impacts on MDGs 3.3.2 Build capacities to track the effects of climate change on groundwater 3.3.3 Monitor and analyze groundwater level & quality, develop and test a model of management and control of ground water level 3.3.4 Organize a series of training workshops and on-site trainings for information and experience dissemination
OUTPUT 3.4: Enhanced strategies for climate-proofed and environmentally sound agricultural production: Agricultural development in selected agro-ecosystems of the Yellow River Basin.	USD 1,488,000	Farmers, famers associations, technicians, local Government authorities and villages/ communities in pilot provinces of Henan, Ningxia, Shaanxi and Shandong	FAO UNV MOA Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS)	3.4.1 Establish multidisciplinary teams at national and provincial levels, develop multi-sector IS, and conduct situation analysis 3.4.2 Train the MDTs, select pilot agro-ecosystems, and involve authorities to develop a roadmap for communities and farmer associations participation 3.4.3 Compile suitable agricultural practices to address C-PESAP and an operational plan, and feed into the IS to shared with stakeholders 3.4.4 Train field technicians and farmer

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F China Joint Programme on Environment and Climate Change

Output Description	Financial resources ¹⁵	Targeted direct and indirect participants and geographical scope	Main Implementation Partners	Activities
				associations in selected agro-ecosystems, and pilot suitable agricultural practices with farmers/farmers associations 3.4.5 Formulate four to five provincial action plans for C-PESAP based on experience derived from the project
Outcome 4: Project monitoring and evaluation				
OUTPUT 4.1: Management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation				4.1.1 Project coordination and administration, reporting, audit and evaluation 4.1.2 PMO administration cost 4.1.3 UN Programme Coordinator