



**UNDP-GEF
National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA)
Regional NCSA Meeting in Arab States
17-19 June, 2005, Tunis, Tunisia**

Report of the Meeting



[Back to Main Menu](#)

OUTLINE

[List of acronyms](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

[Executive summary](#)

[1. Meeting background](#)

[1.1. Objectives of the NCSA Regional meeting in Arab States](#)

[1.2. Status of NCSA projects in Arab States](#)

[1.3. Participants to the First NCSA Meeting](#)

[2. Reports of meeting discussions](#)

[2.1. Report of Day 1](#)

[2.2. Report of Day 2](#)

[2.3. Report of Day 3](#)

[3. Meeting Recommendations](#)

[4. Synthesis of Meeting Evaluation](#)

[Annex 1. Detailed Agenda](#)

[Annex 2. List of Participants](#)

[Annex 3. List of Background documentation](#)

[Annex 4. Guidance for Working Groups](#)

[Annex 5. Results of meeting evaluation forms](#)

- [Annex 5-A- Meeting Evaluation Form of Project Managers](#)
- [Annex 5-B- Meeting Evaluation Form of UNDP Staff](#)

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge UNDP-Tunis, specifically Samia Biri and Nadia Bechraoui, for supporting the organization of the meeting and for dedicating extensive time and efforts to the meeting. Special thanks go to the "Rapporteurs", namely Mohamed Bayoumi, Batir Wardam and Peter Paap for providing detailed reports on the meeting sessions. Special thanks also go to Ketí Chachibaia, Tom Twining-Ward and Linda Ghanime for their extensive technical support.

List of acronyms

BDP	Bureau for Development and Policies
CDAC	Capacity Development and Adaptation Cluster
CEDARE	Centre for Environment and Development in the Arab Region and Europe
CITET	Tunis International Centre for Environmental Technologies
E&E	Energy and Environment
EEG	Energy and Environment Group
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NAP/CD	National Action Plan to Combat Desertification
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NCSA	National Capacity Self Assessment
NEAP	National Environment Action Plan
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RCUs	Regional Coordination Unit
SURF-AS	Sub-Regional Facility for Arab States
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

Executive summary

The main objective of this regional NCSA meeting was to strengthen the technical basis of the inception phase of the NCSAs in Arab States. Given that most projects are just starting, the meeting aimed at addressing the various phases of the NCSA process, i.e. the stocktaking, the thematic assessments, the cross-cutting capacity assessment, prioritization and planning. Throughout the meeting, technical presentations on these NCSA steps were made, and were followed by the experience emerging within the region as well as beyond the region at the level of each step. The national NCSA projects were the key source of the region-based experience; findings were presented from the NCSA projects in Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan and Morocco. Regional institutions and experts complemented the picture at the regional level as none of the NCSAs in the region are at an advanced stage. Experience and lessons learned from other regions and at global level were also highlighted to support a better visualization of the NCSA process by the participants.

This first meeting also provided an opportunity for key national stakeholders involved in the NCSA process, to position the NCSA within the global environmental agenda and the MDGs in specific. The meeting agenda was slightly revised to include a presentation on broad concepts of poverty indicators and country based indicators for MDG1 in Arab States. This presentation, together with Linda Ghanime's overview on capacity development, was used as a model for integrating MDGs and international commitments into national policies. This has also allowed participants to better identify modalities for integrating the NCSA process into national policies and plans by introducing country specific MDGs for example.

A final objective of this meeting was to initiate a network of regional support to the NCSA process through corporate as well as regional resources and identify modalities to ensure required support for the NCSA process in the region. Given the different stages of progress of the NCSA implementation in the region, it was agreed to solicit several groups of participants to ensure a maximum of adherence and support to the NCSA process in the region:

- 1. NCSA project managers*
- 2. GEF Government focal points or NCSA Government focal points*
- 3. UNDP E&E focal points*
- 4. Regional experts and institutions*
- 5. UNDP practitioners*

At the time of the meeting (June 2005), 6 project managers were on-board, and were able to attend the meeting. Moreover, 6 Government representatives have attended the meeting, and were able to provide the Government views and feed-back on the NCSA process. The UNDP E&E focal points were expected to attend at least Day 1 of the NCSA meeting. In total, 11 UNDP staff attended the first day of the NCSA meeting, while 5 E&E focal points have been able to attend the whole meeting. One regional expert and 2 regional institutions involved in capacity development for the global environment have also been able to attend the meeting and provide insights on relevant activities in the region and ways to link them to the NCSA process. The meeting has also brought together practitioners from UNDP involved in this field at regional and global level, to strengthen the knowledge base regarding the NCSA process and to give insight on experiences in other regions and in related fields.

The meeting report has been structured in a way it captures all the emerging points during the various sessions and working groups. This was made possible thanks to the detailed reports provided by the different "Rapporteurs" assigned to the meeting sessions. It was therefore possible to provide a full analysis of the key issues raised during the meeting, by reporting on key issues raised at the level of

each day, at the level of each working group and at the level of key sessions, namely the session with the UNDP E&E focal points, the session on UNDP support to NCSA process and on the future of NCSA's in Arab States. The report of the meeting will therefore be used as a situation analysis of all the challenges and opportunities available for the NCSA process within the region, it will also be a benchmark for setting future steps and actions needed to respond to the expressed needs and for monitoring their implementation.

The key recommendations emerging from the meeting were focused around 4 key areas of intervention, namely:

1. Agreeing on timelines, commitments and resources for moving forward the NCSA process
2. Establishing a regional network
3. Engaging regional centers
4. Implementing the NCSA outcomes

It was therefore possible to conclude on the following plan of action related to the NCSA process in the Arab States:

- Inception meetings in start up countries, namely Egypt, Tunisia and Sudan will be conducted by September 2005
- All project managers for approved NCSA projects, namely Djibouti, Lebanon, Syria and Yemen should be on-board by September 2005
- Necessary support and follow up should be made to engage and ensure the approval of remaining NCSA projects in Bahrain, Libya and Saudi Arabia
- Necessary support should be provided by the RCU and the Global Support Programme to strengthen the initiation phase of the NCSA projects
- Project managers and UNDP should identify the value added of the NCSA projects according to national specificities and link these to national strategic priorities, with special attention to the MDGs 1 and 7
- A regional e-network should be activated to facilitate discussion on regional-specific issues and strengthen information and knowledge exchanges between NCSA projects, Government and other national counterparts, UNDP staff and regional centers and experts.
- A follow-up meeting should be organized to ensure provision of necessary support for new manager, exchange of expertise, analyzing the progress made and an opportunity for more in-depth discussion on NCSA methodologies.
- An increased role for regional centers should be sought as these are key backstopping institutions and can contribute in their specific areas of excellence and provide an opportunity for ensuring linkages to other conventions
- The region should benefit from GEF 3 allocation for capacity building projects by June 2006 and proceed with preparation of PDF-A proposals as soon as possible
- The NCSA stakeholders should ensure that GEF will not be the only donor in NCSA and should undertake an active dialogue with other donors
- The NCSA stakeholders should seek necessary support from the Global Support Programme to analyze regional trends to inform the NCSA process in the region.

The meeting evaluation has revealed a difference in the evaluation results and thus in the perception of the meeting at the level of the two key participants of the meeting, namely the NCSA project managers and the UNDP E&E focal points in charge of the NCSA projects. The general appreciation of the meeting was therefore diverging among the two groups of participants, a majority of project managers found the meeting "Very satisfactory" (65% very satisfactory and 35% satisfactory) while the UNDP staff majority scored as "Satisfactory" (40% very satisfactory and 60% satisfactory). The main

concern raised by the UNDP staff related to the fact that they could not attend the whole meeting, which would have been beneficial in their views. Overall comments raised by the participants regarding substantive issues were in line with the overall meeting recommendations which were captured in the meeting report and specifically the plan of action.

Despite the differences in the evaluation of specific issues related to the meeting, a common impact of the meeting could be concluded in terms of the benefit of the meeting in skills development, whereby a majority of 65% of project managers and 75% of UNDP staff were "Very positive" regarding meeting their skills development objectives.

1. Meeting background

1.1.Objectives of the NCSA Regional Meeting in Arab States

The main objective of this regional NCSA meeting was to strengthen the technical basis of the inception phase of the NCSAs in Arab States. Given that most projects are just starting, the meeting aimed at addressing the various phases of the NCSA process, i.e. the stocktaking, the thematic assessments, the cross-cutting capacity assessment, prioritization and planning.

This first meeting also provided an opportunity for key national stakeholders involved in the NCSA process, namely the GEF Government focal point, the UNDP country office and the NCSA project manager to position the NCSA within the global environmental agenda and the MDGs in specific, and agree on the way forward to meet the strategic objectives of the NCSA process. The meeting agenda was slightly amended to include a session on poverty indicators for MDGs in Arab states as a case study of linkages between NCSAs and the various MDG topics.

A final objective of this meeting was to initiate a network of regional support to the NCSA process through corporate as well as regional resources and identify modalities to ensure required support for the NCSA process in the region. The regional meeting was an opportunity to initiate discussions in view of forging a network between the NCSA Projects, relevant UNDP programmes, regional centers, regional experts and other related stakeholders. Annex 1 provides the detailed agenda of the meeting and the resource persons solicited in this respect.

1.2.Status of NCSAs in Arab States

UNDP is the implementing agency for 10 NCSA projects in the Arab region, while 1 NCSA (in Algeria) is implemented through UNEP. Three additional countries have also initiated preparations for NCSAs through UNDP but these have not been approved yet. Table 1. below provides a summary of the actual status of NCSAs in Arab States as of June 2006. Accordingly, UNDP's advantage at the NCSA front in Arab States justifies a consolidated regional approach for the implementation of the NCSAs and their follow up through UNDP and its regional partners.

Table 1. Summary of the actual status of NCSAs in Arab States as of June 2006

Status of NCSA Activity	Country in the current status	Expected date of NCSA initiation
GEF approval	Bahrain, Saudi Arabia,	TBC

	UAE	
Project document development	Libya,	TBC
Project Manager appointment	Djibouti, Yemen, Syria, Lebanon	September 2005
Under implementation	Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Sudan	
Under implementation	Algeria (through UNEP)	
Total	14	

1.3. Participants to the Regional NCSA Meeting

Given the different stages of progress of the NCSA implementation in the region, it was agreed to solicit three groups of participants to ensure a maximum of adherence and support to the NCSA process in the region:

1. NCSA project managers
2. GEF Government focal points or NCSA Government focal points
3. UNDP E&E focal points

At the time of the meeting (June 2005), 6 project managers were on-board, and were able to attend the meeting. Moreover, 6 Government representatives have attended the meeting, and were able to provide the Government views and feed-back on the NCSA process.

The UNDP E&E focal points were only expected to attend Day 1 of the NCSA meeting, i.e. on 17 June, as the meeting was held back-to-back with the Regional E&E Focal Points Meeting. In total, 11 UNDP staff attended the first day of the NCSA meeting, while 5 E&E focal points have been able to attend the whole meeting.

Resource persons were mainly solicited from within UNDP and have included representatives from the different UNDP-GEF RCUs (Arab states, Europe and CIS, West and Central Africa) in addition to members of the CDAC unit in headquarter. Resource people for the meeting have also included representatives from UNDP BDP-EEG and SURF-AS.

The meeting has also called upon regional institutions and experts in the field, two regional centers were able to attend the meeting, and these were CITET and CEDARE, while IUCN-Mediterranean office was not able to attend due to logistical problems. One regional expert has also attended the meeting. Annex 2 provides a full list of participants with e-mail contacts.

2. Reports of meeting discussions

2.1.Report of Day 1

Setting the scene of the NCSA process

The first session of the meeting aimed at positioning NCSAs within the Global Environment Agenda and MDG in Arab States. Linda Ghanime made an overview of capacity development and explained the objectives and levels of capacity development. In her presentation, she highlighted linkages between environmental management and poverty alleviation. In addition, she stressed the importance of integrating NCSA into national policies and plans through vehicles like introducing county specific MDGs. In this respect, she highlighted the difference between global and local MDGs and emphasized that countries would need to report to UN only on the global targets but reporting to local MDGs would be on the national level. Tom Twining-Ward presented GEF and Capacity Development: historical background and future perspectives. He elaborated on the GEF capacity development initiatives that respond to introduction of new thematic areas and create opportunities for funding NCSA action plans.

Adib Neemeh made a presentation on broad concepts of poverty indicators and country based indicators for MDGs in Arab states. Adib presented the MDGs as a strong tool for advocacy and negotiation and gave a recipe for integrating MDGs and international commitments into national policies aiming to reduce poverty. The presentation was followed by a plenary discussion for identifying constraints and opportunities for linking the NCSAs to national development plans and MDGs in Arab States.

Introduction to NCSAs:

UNDP/GEF Peter Paap demonstrated the key principles of NCSA while Stephane gave a presentation on the main concepts and key steps of the project. Lamia Mansour presented an overview of the status NCSA projects in the Arab States.

Planning the NCSA process

Lamia Mansour presented key aspects related to the planning phase of the NCSA process. Early experiences from the region, specifically in Egypt and Tunisia, related to the planning phase were presented. Yasmine Fuad presented the case of Egypt showing the planned linkages to be set between NCSA and the national plans including the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP). Mongi Zouaghi presented Tunisia's experience for getting started and positioning the NCSA within the national agenda.

Stocktaking

Keti Chachibaia gave a presentation on the need for the NCSA and showed the detailed steps and recommendations for carrying out the stocktaking exercise stressing the importance of country ownership and participation of all stakeholders.

Key issues from Day 1

The discussion in the different sessions highlighted the following:

- CDAC and RCU need to prepare and provide clear guidance notes on application and implementation of the NCSA to cope with fast changes in GEF priorities and criteria for funding.

- Projects should ensure NCSA coordination and linkages with other national and regional plans and policies including NEAP, PSRP, MDGs and NEPAD etc while not creating over expectations from the project. The project has to also show linkages between MDG7 and MDG1.
- Projects are encouraged to utilize NCSA strategically on the national level to support the environmental management process and sustainable development at large such as by developing country specific MDGs, etc. in the process to building capacity for responding to international conventions.
- Projects should work on ensuring national ownership, building on existing mechanisms and creating high level support for the process in a participatory approach.
- NCSA would identify opportunities for GEF funding of NCSA programmes.
- Projects should build on activating and supporting existing mechanisms.
- Time line for implementation of the NCSA project can be longer than the assigned one and half year.
- Networking on the regional and national level is an important element for the success of this project.

Evening session with UNDP-CO staff

The main purpose of the sessions was to identify means to mainstream NCSAs in UNDP programmes and provide necessary support to provide to the NCSA process. It was agreed that the special nature of the NCSA process (limited scope for implementation of concrete activities through the project) provides limited incentives to UNDP/Government. In addition, there was an overall feeling of saturation from project dedicated to capacity building and technical assistance in most countries. CDAC should not try to compare countries; rather support networking and exchange of experience among all concerned stakeholders.

It was proposed that it is important to identify the value added of the NCSA projects according to national specificities and link these to national and strategic priorities. Examples of linkages given by UNDP representatives at the level of each country are the following:

- Egypt: linkages to the High Commission for Sustainable Development, MDGs specifically support to target 1 and goal 7, and GEF Steering Committee
- Jordan: linkages to capacity development plans and to the on-going administrative reform efforts even if these might slightly delay the NCSA process
- Morocco: linkages to the National Initiative for Human Development should be made
- Sudan: linkages to the reform should be sought
- Yemen: linkages to the NEAP process
- Syria: the 10th 5-years plan could offer an opportunity for integrating the NCSA outcomes
- Bahrain: linkages to the NEAP and the fulfillment of the global reporting requirement within the NEAP
- Djibouti: the NEAP approach could be strengthened through the NCSA process

The UNDP E&E focal points have made the following recommendations in the continuation of the NCSA process:

- Encourage holding sub-regional meetings for the NCSA stakeholders as a smoother and more practical approach than regional meetings
- Ensure that the UNDP-E&E focal points are involved in the e-network and exchanges

- Ensure that maximum support is provided to the NCSA process in the region through the Global Support Programme

A special discussion was dedicated to the case of the NCSAs in Saudi Arabia and Bahrain, both of which will need to fulfill their reporting requirements to be able to submit their NCSA project for GEF funding. Both countries are proceeding with finalization and submission of national report to the global environment conventions before end of 2005 and will also seize the GEF Council to ensure smooth access to resources.

2.2. Report on Day 2

Thematic Assessments

Keti Chachibaia presented key issues related to thematic assessments. This was followed by a presentation by Batir Wardam Jordan's experience for conducting the stocktaking and thematic assessments. Hassane Bendahmane also presented Morocco's experience in conducting the thematic assessment

Working groups on Stocktaking and Thematic Assessments

Two groups were established and followed the working groups guidelines (refer to Annex 4 for the details of guidelines) in conducting the working groups discussions on stocktaking and thematic assessments. Reports from the working groups are found in Table 2 and 3 below.

Table 2. Group 1 report on working group discussions

Stocktaking: purpose? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background information on 3 thematic areas • Different stakeholders (stakeholders analysis) • Current institutions structure for running the conventions (ToRs for institutions and their mandates) • Identify gaps from the beginning while collecting
Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual meetings with technical focal points • Official institutional commitments • Collection of documents such as NAP, reports of different contracting parties, national environmental plans, strategic developments plan of country • Other assessment studies • Let the process flow and do not impose recommendations from the beginning
Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk reviews • Interviews with Government officials, NGOs, private sector • Questionnaire (request from WG to have a

	model of a questionnaire) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings
Output- remarks on report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and comprehensive enough to be the basis of the assessment study • Format should include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. listing of donors, other on-going activities 2. stakeholders analysis 3. analysis of current situation
Timing of Stocktaking:	2 months
Thematic assessment: purpose? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify gaps based on stocktaking regarding implementation of conventions • Challenges and opportunities • Capacity building at three levels: individual, institutional and systemic • Review of existing national policies related to the conventions • Mention cross-cutting issues at this stage
Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWOT analysis as it is much more appropriate to give overall comprehensive picture • 3 months for the exercise • postpone recommendations until prioritization
Output	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report is too detailed and needs fine-tuning according to each country

Table 3. Group 2 report on working group discussions

Stocktaking Why do the stocktake?	1-Documenting the country specific obligations under each convention. 2- Documenting all information sources indicating the progress in relation to the conventions. A critical challenges since information may not be easily available. Transparency Technical capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May commission additional studies to cover lack of information and co-finance the study. ▪ Adapt the budget to the emerging needs for additional studies.
Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents: ▪ National Communications ▪ NBSAP ▪ NAPs ▪ Steering Committee (Resource persons)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use them as resource persons and capitalize on their experience and provide active involvement in the process. ▪ Other projects related to capacity development
Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the best sequence of stocktaking • Critical start-up is a national inception meeting to present the NCSA principles and how to involve the participants
Output	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Convention documents: especially capacity guidelines. ▪ Environmental performance reviews (if available). ▪ Stakeholders Analysis: Categorize stakeholders according to their particular interests and role in the NCSA in different stages
Thematic assessment: purpose? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess the capacity situation in each thematic area. ▪ Do we have experts, effective institutions, coordination activities, how we are progressing. Why? ▪ Five Functions of capacity across three levels should be used as a checklist.
Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus on common requirements that have the potential of synergies ▪ Developing the criteria for prioritization. ▪ When to do prioritization: as early as possible ▪ Set immediate, short-term and long-term priorities

Cross-cutting assessment and NCSA report and action plan

Keti Chachibaia presented key issues related to cross-cutting assessments and NCSA report and action plan. Samir Amous made a presentation on capacity development issues related to climate change in the region. A plenary discussion replaced the working groups on cross-cutting assessment and NCSA report and action plan.

Key issues from Day 2

The following issues were raised:

- Show examples of questionnaires of the thematic assessments and place them on the website.
- Previous strategies related to conventions should be consulted but the NCSA process should not make the same mistakes.
- Focus on networking with other initiatives and searching for c0-financing activities.
- Prioritization exercise is better to be conducted at the end of each phase to ensure focus.
- If information is hard to find in stocktaking then there is a capacity problem in that

regards.

- The NCSA process may commission additional studies to cover lack of information and co-finance the study. Adapt the budget to the emerging needs for additional studies
- The critical start-up is a national inception meeting to present the NCSA principles and how to involve the participants.
- Stakeholders Analysis: Categorize stakeholders according to their particular interests and role in the NCSA in different stages.
- In thematic assessments, we do not need descriptive documents but thorough analysis.
- In cross-cutting analysis, focus on priority issues covering all the conventions.
- In the action plan, develop a practical tool for resource mobilization.
- Always aim for the highest level of endorsement.
- Focus on no-budget and low-budget action with direct impacts.
- Define roles and responsibilities in a clear way.

2.3. Report of Day 3

General overview of the key findings of NCSA in the other regions

Tom Twining-Ward presented the results of the global NCSA evaluation. The key points raised in the discussions were the following:

- In NCSA implementation, it should be explained why the ministry of environment is responsible for the implementation of activities, and that this should be actually done by others; assistance of other partnering ministries and agencies should be put down in the organizational structure
- We should not confuse coordination with control; we should use the soft touch by giving advice, pushing a little, promoting, orienting, but definitely not ordering. Nevertheless, the last is often our habit: more or less ordering other ministries in areas in which they have far more experience. That does not make us popular.
- Some participants recognized that there is sometimes a need to push other ministries to comply with the agreements that have been made on environmental issues; for instance on Environmental Impact Assessments. The laws are in place, but there are no good teams to execute. Furthermore, experts keep hitting walls in other ministries as there are too many different interests defended.
- For new programmes, ministries usually set up new committees, which are good for political decisions, but usually do not have the technical know how for guidance of implementation.
- Another remark was that we cannot allow other agencies to do the Ministry of environment work, because they have other aims; sometimes you have to be aggressive.
- Overall, it is concluded that experience from other countries shows that each country has to find its own way in enforcement.
- What happens to the NCSA at the end of the process and what will be put forward for the institution that will do follow-up? It is too early to say in the global NCSA process; nevertheless, some countries have already started looking for funding of their activities, from GEF, other donors or agencies;
- A follow up evaluation in time will be done, the results of which will be shared with the countries via the website and the global support programme; this evaluation will shed

- more light on the future of NCSA;
- Furthermore, it is up to the countries how they want to go on: some smaller countries are using NCSA to set up GEF coordinating committees to promote synergy between the activities within the focal areas;

Experience of regional institutions

Two regional institutions, namely CITET and CEDARE, involved in capacity development for the Global Environment in the Arab States made presentations.

The key issues raised by the participants in light of the presentations were the following:

- Although the systems seem to be overlapping; CEDARE works with the Arab Knowledge society for environment and development programmes on this issue. ISO certification is an important part of this, there are less than 500 institutions that can do certification in the region for over 25 000 enterprises. Also CEDARE recognizes that information is scattered over all kinds of partners in development and a standardized environmental information system to be used in the countries in the region could help out.
- Monitoring and evaluation as well as information management are seen to be very necessary by the participants. Out of Evaluation of NCSA in the European and CIS region, it was concluded that much data is available, but no coordination is present to put it to use. Often the same information gathering exercise is done over and over again by different partners. This is a very costly affair.
- CEDARE offers its expertise to cooperate in an information management system for NCSA to mobilize relevant information from different players; one might think of an NCSA indicator level for reporting to the different conventions in the present CEDARE information management systems.

UNDP support to NCSA process

Tom Twining-Ward presented the Global Support Programme. Key issues raised were the following:

- Participants agree that it is considered necessary to see the NCSA assignment as more than just an exercise for synergy between the 3 conventions; we should broaden the scope to include the usefulness of NCSA for broader sustainable development
- Participants had utter criticism on the GEF approach to assign a relatively small amount of money to cross-cutting initiatives and focus more on focal areas; they suggested that GEF should allocate more to the CB-2 initiative.
- Regarding the quality requirement to the NCSAs, it was agreed that only a good analysis of the capacity needs will lead to logically formulated projects with realistic cost-analysis.
- GEF's idea is to use as many existing structures as possible during the NCSA process, so their capacity can be built to keep the process running after the NCSA project is over. But also new structures should be embedded in the existing institutional framework (like the GEF coordination committees) for this reason.
- Clarifications on how to mainstreaming has been included in the existing Strategy and Action Plans were requested. Although this issue was not clear from the NCSA evaluation report, experience from Europe and CIS shows that one has to look for relevant exercises already underway in the country and establish strong links between the activities in the action plan and these exercises: for instance in Tajikistan the NCSA action plan was wholly embedded in the NEAP. In Armenia, activities from the NCSA action plan have been included

in the Forestry Action Plan and other similar plans and strategies.

- Mainstreaming of the conventions in the legislative frameworks is an important issue; the EIA's are an example of this. A good indicator framework is considered of extreme importance.
- Experience from Europe and CIS, where an evaluation is underway, has shown that many issues on a systemic level are cross-cutting by nature, which can make reporting in one focal area difficult. A problem that has been identified is that the Ministry for Environment is still considered as a sectoral ministry, whereas it is more a coordinating intersectoral ministry. In addition, in difficult circumstance, downsizing of personnel results in the departure of most technical personnel, whereby only administrative and logistical personnel remains.
- Participants agree that they can use their region's representative (Djibouti) in the GEF council to get the council to change its vision on CB-2 projects and allocate more money to cross-cutting activities
- A high interest from institutions and focal points in the NCSA process has been noted; in some countries this high interest even lead to a shift of the NCSA focal point to another institution to make better use of the process. The need for outreach and promotion of the NCSA process by project managers is necessary.

The future of NCSA's in Arab States

A plenary discussion of the next steps at national and regional level was held to conclude the meeting and inform its recommendations. The key issues raised were the following:

- Egypt, Tunis and Sudan should hold an inception meeting soon:
 - o Egypt can arrange this meeting in July; the stocktaking and thematic assessments can be done in September
 - o Tunis will not hold an inception meeting, but a planification meeting with stakeholders. But this is not going to be soon, because the team has to be created. The meeting will probably be in September.
 - o Sudan: There will be a major shake-up in July, so the inception meeting cannot be organized until end of July, but before that there will be already a lot of discussion taking place between stakeholders.
- Morocco is used as an example where the time between the recruitment of the project manager and the inception meeting has taken too long. This was justified by the fact that the guidelines were a lot less clear and that the time was used to get high level support from stakeholders and sensitizing other partners, which is considered a very important step in paving the way for a smooth process.
- Djibouti brings up the issue that in their country, environmental management is a relatively new field and that it is difficult to find good consultants and capable people to take up the role of project manager. Mostly these people are based in ministries and have a lot of other activities, which makes their possible time investment limited. Recruiting regional or international consultants is an option, although GEF does not prefer this and only allows it to support a national project team. But these cost more money. Djibouti will receive a list of regional consultants that can aid in the process from the COs and the RCU's.
- Jordan stresses the need for training for the project manager on budgeting (Atlas), timeline management, and project cycle management issues.
- Regional centers can act as backstopping agents for NCSA process. Every project must have high information capturing components, for which regional centers may provide consultants.

- A best practice in South Practices showed that when dealing with limited resources, countries there have agreed to work together with a regional body that was mandated to deal with the NCSA support in the region. The countries have set aside a budget from their national NCSA budget for this regional body, which could be used to hire a regional consultant for closer technical backstopping and facilitating of the processes in the country.
- As for support from RCU's, participants are reminded not to be afraid to brainstorm with the NCSA RC's on early drafts of document to ensure a higher quality.
- Countries would prefer the follow up to be held in one of the countries that are furthest in the process, so that stakeholders could be given some time to express their views as well.
- Also, the mainstreaming of NCSA into overall sustainable development and poverty alleviation programmes should get more attention in a follow up meeting.
- Experience from Europe and CIS has shown that more presentations by practitioners in a structured way is beneficial; more meetings on methodology. So the next step would be deeper methodology treatment and more detail on the content of the different NCSA products. That would mean that representatives should be strong in the technical area. Furthermore, in working towards the new meeting, a more intensive email exchange between the project managers, including the convention focal points in the list to keep them abreast of things, would be beneficial. We should also involve project managers from advanced countries as participant in a national inception meeting.
- The Global Support Programme support will come as backstopping in NCSA via development of tools and instruments and problem solving, as well as providing support in organizing regional meetings.

3. Meeting Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Moving forward the NCSA process in Arab States: timelines, commitments and resources.

- Timing of inception meetings in start up countries:
 1. Egypt: by September 2005.
 2. Tunisia: September 2005
 3. Sudan: September 2005.
- All project managers should be on-board by September 2005
- Strengthen the initiation phase of the NCSA projects:
 - 1- Establishing the project team and constituency should be used as an investment for project promotion
 - 2- National expertise can be further strengthened by calling upon the NCSA network, regional centers, other donor and technical corporation agencies
 - 3- Early support from UNDP CO in providing guidance on procedures is needed
 - 4- Role of the Regional Coordination Unit in exchange of information, best practices and technical support
 - 5- For the national inception meeting, invite experienced NCSA coordinators in view of twinning countries.
 - 6- Project managers and UNDP should identify the value added of the NCSA projects according to national specificities and link these to national strategic priorities, with special attention to the MDGs 1 and 7.

Recommendation 2: Establish a regional network

- Start by creating a regional e-network to facilitate discussion on regional-specific issues and strengthen information and knowledge exchanges between NCSA projects, regional centers and experts.
- A follow-up meeting should be organized with the following objectives:
 - 1-Inception for new managers.
 - 2-Exchange of expertise.
 - 3- Analyzing the progress made.
 - 4- In-depth discussion of methodology.
 - 5- Involve NCSA professionals.
- Calling upon the Global Support Programme at the following level:
 1. ensure support to some activities within the limited budget available
 2. develop the NCSA website.
 3. ensure Linkages to regional organizations that will be identified
 4. communicate as a resource desk
 5. develop tools and methodologies to support NCSA activities
 6. identify potential funding sources for implementing the NCSA

Recommendation 3: Engage regional centers

- Backstopping institutions- what can they contribute in specific areas of excellence.
- Seek ways of mobilize technical resources from regional centers for various NCSA

activities as the NCSAs progress.

- Opportunity for linkages to other conventions

Recommendation 4: Implement the NCSA outcomes

- Need to benefit from GEF 3 allocation for capacity building projects by June 2006.
- Prepare PDF-A proposals as soon as possible
- To ensure that GEF will not be the only donor in NCSA, aggressive promotion with other donors has to be undertaken
- Get support from the Global Support Programme to analyze trends

4. Synthesis of Meeting Evaluation

The meeting evaluation has revealed a difference in the evaluation results and thus in the perception of the meeting at the level of the two key participants of the meeting, namely the NCSA project managers and the UNDP E&E focal points in charge of the NCSA projects. Table 4 below provides a detailed review of the ratings and the concerns raised regarding the different aspects of the meeting, while Annex 5 provides the detailed results of the meeting evaluation.

The evaluation was structured around the following issues:

- Specific technical aspects of the meeting
- General skills development
- General appreciation of the meeting
- Overall comments regarding the meeting organization
- Overall comments regarding substantive issues

Disparities in the views were identified at the level of each issue questioned in the evaluation between the project managers and the UNDP staff. The general appreciation of the meeting was also diverging among the two groups of participants, a majority of project managers found the meeting "Very satisfactory" (65% very satisfactory and 35% satisfactory) while the UNDP staff majority scored as "Satisfactory" (40% very satisfactory and 60% satisfactory).

At the level of the technical aspects of the meeting, the project managers were very positive to positive but raised concerns regarding the limited time allocated to practical and work groups, while the concerns of the UNDP staff were much more varied and tackled various aspects of the meeting. Overall comments regarding the meeting organization have also varied among the two groups, the project managers were very satisfied with the meeting organization; they however recommended that more time should be dedicated to future meetings, specifically for working groups. The main concern raised by the UNDP staff related to the fact that they could not attend the whole meeting, which would have been beneficial in their views.

Overall comments regarding substantive issues were in line with the overall meeting recommendations which were captured in the meeting report and specifically the plan of action.

Despite the differences at the specific issues, a common impact of the meeting could be concluded in terms of the benefit of the meeting in skills developments, whereby a majority of 65% of project managers and 75% of UNDP staff were "Very positive" regarding meeting their skills development objectives.

Table 4. Summary of meeting evaluation results comparing NCSA project managers and UNDP staff findings

	Meeting Evaluation of Project Managers	Meeting Evaluation of UNDP-Staff
Specific meeting aspects	<p>All ratings were very positive to positive regarding all meeting aspects.</p> <p>The only exception concerned the balance between theory and practice and the impact of the work groups where 50% of participants rated it as fair, 50% as positive.</p>	<p>There are more disparities in the evaluation of the meeting with UNDP staff. There has been low ratings mainly reflected at aspects such as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This meeting answers my concerns • I felt actively involved in this meeting • The balance between theory and practice • The duration of the meeting
General skills development	65% very positive 35% positive	75% very positive 25% positive
General appreciation of the meeting	65% very satisfactory 35% satisfactory	40% very satisfactory 60% satisfactory
General Comments regarding the meeting organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is overall large satisfaction of meeting quality. Four out of six managers commended the extra efforts given to the fine details of organization which made the event very smooth, the pleasant atmosphere kept by the organisers, and a very well structured workshop. • Main concerns reflected on the need for additional one or at least half a day more, to allow more time for working group and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main comments raised by UNDP-CO representatives concerned their interest to have been able to attend the whole meeting. Four out of eight participants reflected this issue as key issue within their comments. • One comment was raised on the need to ensure strict facilitation to guide the discussions.

	to reduce presentations so that more discussion between participants would take place.	
General Comments regarding substantive issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One main concern raised reflected the need to ensure follow-up and establish a sustainable network and exchange system in the region. A request was made to SURF-AS office and UNDP/GEF in the region to put the NCSA process as a priority. • Another concern reflected the need to strengthen the programme focus at cross cutting issues as an important investment in this NCSA process. • A recommendation was made to ensure that new project managers will be exposed to the same experience before they start. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More in-depth discussions were needed regarding the planning stages of the NCSA • A similar workshop should be programmed in 2005. • The meeting will be beneficial for the coming up WCA Regional NCSA workshop.

Annex 1. Detailed Agenda

Day	Agenda	Resource person
Day 1: 17 June 2005 (Friday)- Reporting: Mohamed Bayoumi		
9:00-10:45	Opening session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø UNDP- RC note Ø Introduction of participants and overview of the meeting agenda Setting the scene: Positioning NCSAs within the Global Environment Agenda and MDG in ARAB STATES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Capacity development: definitions, key functions, key methodologies for capacity assessment Ø GEF and Capacity Development: historical background and future perspectives 	Facilitator: Lamia Mansour Narjess Saidane, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP-Tunis Lamia Mansour, UNDP/GEF
10:45-11:15	Coffee break	Linda Ghanime, UNDP/BDP
11:15-13:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Presentation on broad concepts of poverty indicators and country based indicators for MDGs in Arab states Ø Plenary discussion: Linking the NCSAs to national development plans and MDGs in Arab States - constraints and opportunities 	Adib Neemeh, SURF-AS
13:00-14:00	Lunch break	
14:00-14:45	Introduction to NCSAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Key principles Ø Key concepts and key steps Ø NCSA regional overview: where we are and where we are heading 	Peter Paap, UNDP/GEF Stephane Simonet, UNDP/GEF Lamia Mansour, UNDP/GEF
14:45-		

15:30	Planning the NCSA process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Technical session Ø Tunisia's and Egypt's experience for getting started and positioning the NCSA within the national agenda Ø Discussion 	Lamia Mansour Mongi Zouaghi, NCSA-Tunisia; Yasmine Fuad, NCSA-Egypt
15:30-15:45	Coffee break	
15:45-17:00	Stocktaking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Technical session Ø Discussion 	Keti Chachibaia
19:30-21:00	Evening session with UNDP-CO staff Mainstream NCSAs in UNDP-CO programmes, support to provide to the NCSA process.	
Day 2: 18 June 2005 (Saturday) Reporting: Batir Wardam		
9:00-10:30	Thematic Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Technical session Ø Jordan's experience for conducting the stocktaking and thematic assessment exercise Ø Morocco experience in conducting the thematic assessment Ø Discussion 	Facilitator : Nadia Bechraoui Keti Chachibaia Batir Wardam, NCSA-Jordan Hassane Bendahmane, NCSA-Morocco
10:30-10:45	Coffee break	
10:45-13:00	Working groups on Stocktaking and Thematic Assessments	Facilitators: Tom Twining-ward, Keti Chachibaia, Lamia Mansour, Peter Paap, UNDP/GEF
13:00-14:00	Lunch break	

14:00-15:30	Cross-cutting assessment and NCSA report and action plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Technical session Ø Capacity development issues related to climate change in the region Ø Discussion 	Facilitator: Linda Ghanime Ketí Chachibaia Samir Amous, Regional Expert
15:30-15:45	Coffee break	
15:45-17:30	Plenary discussion on Cross-cutting assessment and NCSA report and action plan	Facilitator: Linda Ghanime
18:00-22:00	Guided tour of the Medina and Dinner in the Medina	

Day 3: 19 June 2005 (Sunday) Reporting: Peter Paap		
9:00-9:30	General overview of the key findings of NCSA in other regions	Facilitator: Mohamed Bayoumi Tom Twining-ward, UNDP/GEF
9:30 - 11:00	Experience of regional institutions involved in capacity development for the Global Environment in the Arab States Coffee break (at conference room)	CITET CEDARE
11:00 - 11:30	UNDP support to the NCSA process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø NCSA Global Support Programme Ø GEF RCU and UNDP-CO support Ø GEF resources to implement the NCSA Ø Other resources 	Tom Twining-ward, UNDP/GEF
11:30 -	Open Discussions on Future	Facilitators:

13:00	Perspectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø Preparation for the next steps Ø A regional approach and methods of collaboration Ø Other.... 	Lamia Mansour, UNDP/GEF; Batir Wardam, NCSA-Jordan
13:00- 14:00	Lunch break	
14:00- 15:00	Summary of meeting recommendations and Closing	Facilitator: Lamia Mansour, UNDP/GEF
15:00- 15:15	Coffee break	
15:00- 17:00	Clinics Resource persons will discuss various issues with participants on bilateral basis	

Annex 2. List of Participants

National participants

Country	Government GEF FP	Project Manager	UNDP-GEF FP
Algeria			Djahida Boukhalfa djahida.boukhalfa@undp.org 17-18 June
Bahrain			Mohamed Al Sharif m.alsharif@undp.org 17 June
Djibouti	Mr. Aden Atteyeh, Ministry of Home, Urbanism, Environment and Land Planning aboubaker_douale@hotmail.com		Hassan Ali hassan.ali@undp.org 17 June
Egypt		Ms Yasmine Fouad Assistant Project Manager yasminefouad@link.net	Mohamed Bayoumi mohamed.bayoumi@undp.org 17-19 June
Jordan	Dr. Kamal Khdeir GEF Gov. Focal point Ministry of Planning	Batir M. Wardam Project Manager batir@nets.io	Helena Naber helena.naber@undp.org 17 June
Lebanon			
Libya			
Morocco	Mr MyHassan Badraoui Director of Planning Department of Environment Ministry of Environment and Land-use Planning depp@minenv.gov.ma	Hassane Bendahmane Project Manager bendahmane@ancree.ma	Myriem Noussairi Myriem.Noussairi@undp.org 17-19 June
Saudi Arabia	Mr. Osama Qurban General Director of Response, Monitoring and Forecasting Presidency of Meteorology and Environment (PME) tahazat@yahoo.com	Dr. Taha M. Zatari Project Coordinator Director of Environmental Standards Presidency of Meteorology and Environment (PME) tahazat@yahoo.com	Asim Salah asim.salah@undp.org 17-19 June
Sudan	Dr. Nadir Mohamed Awad GEF Operational Focal Point Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR) nadirawad@yahoo.com	Dr. Salah Hakim Project Manger salahhakim2001@yahoo.com	Hanan Mutawkil hanan.mutwakil@undp.org 17-19 June

	Mr. Yassin Eissa GEF Political Focal Point Ministry of International Cooperation		
Syria			Shaza Al Joundi syriaenvironment@undp.org 17-18 June
Tunisia	Nabil Hamada DGEQV Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable Hazar Belli NCSA Unit Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable dgeqv@mineat.gov.tn	Mongi Zouaghi Project Manager ancrsynergie@yahoo.fr Fadoua Dimassi Project Assistant	Nadia Bechraoui nadia.bechraoui@undp.org 17-19 June
UAE			
Yemen			Fuad Ali fuad.ali@undp.org 17 June

NCSA Resource Persons	Date of participation
Ø UNDP- BDP/SURF-AS	
Mr. Iyad Abu Moghli, Practice Manager, EEG, UNDP-BDP Iyad.AbuMoghli@undp.org	17 June
Ms Linda Ghanime, Environment Policy Advisor, EEG, UNDP-BDP Linda.ghanime@undp.org	16-18 June
Mr. Adib Neemeh, Regional Poverty Policy Advisor, UNDP-SURF-AS Adib.neemeh@undp.org	
Ø UNDP-GEF	
Mr. Tom Twining-ward, Capacity Development Specialist, UNDP-GEF tom.twining-ward@undp.org	16-19 June
Mr. Peter Paap, NCSA Regional Coordinator, UNDP-GEF RCU-WCA Peter.paap@undp.org	16-19 June
Ms. Ketí Chachibaia, Portfolio Manager, UNDP-GEF RCU-CIS Keti.Chachibaia@undp.org	16-19 June
Mr. Stephane Simonet, Programme Officer, UNDP-GEF RCU-AS Stephane.Simonet@undp.org	16-18 June
Ms. Lamia Mansour, CDAC Task Manager, UNDP-GEF RCU-AS Lamia.mansour@undp.org	16-19 June

Ms Samia Biri, Programme Associate, UNDP-Tunis samia.biri@undp.org	16-19 June
Ø Regional Centers	
Mr. Hossam Allam, Senior Regional Programme Specialist, Centre for Environment and Development for the Arab Region and Europe (CEDARE) hallam@cedare.org.eg	16-19 June
Mr. Rachid Nafti, Regional coordinator of METAP-EIA Center, Tunis International Center for Environmental Technologies (CITET) citet.metap@citet.net.tn Mr Faouzi Hamouda, Directeur Formation et Renforcement des Capacités, CITET formation@citet.nat.tn	19 June
Ø Regional experts	
Samir Amous, International Expert in Energy and Environment, Tunisia amous.apex@gnet.tn	18 June

Annex 3. List of Background documentation

Available at UNDP-GEF-NCSA websites: <http://ncsa.undp.org/> or <http://www.undp.org/gef>

1. National Capacity Self-Assessments: A Resource Kit, Updated: October 2004, UNDP/GEF.
2. NCSA Evaluation Criteria.
3. Implementation Monitoring protocol (IMP) for the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) (UNDP/GEF).
4. Capacity Development Indicators, UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 4); November 2003; UNDP/GEF.
5. Global Evaluation of the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) Evaluation Report, Final Draft, May 24th, 2005, Baastel/UNDP/GEF.

Available at GEF website <http://www.gefweb.org/>

6. A Guide For Self-assessment of Country Capacity Needs For Global Environmental Management, prepared by the GEF Secretariat with assistance of UNDP, UNEP, the World Bank, the Secretariats of UNFCCC, UNCCD, CBD, National GEF Focal Points and UNITAR , Revised Draft, April 2005.
7. Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building, GEF, December 2003.
8. Improving GEF Performance: New Directions to Enhance Impacts and Results.

Provided by Linda Ghanime during the meeting

9. Country-specific targets and indicators for environmental sustainability in the Arab State region. A discussion Paper for the Energy and Environment Practice Meeting, Arab State Region, March 2005. Linda Ghanime, Laura Lee, and Noha Aboueldahab, Energy and Environment Group, Bureau for Development Policy.

Annex 4. Guidance for Working Groups

Guidance Notes

Topics for discussion

Two group exercise sessions are envisaged, focusing on:

- § Stock-taking and Thematic Assessments
- § Cross-Cutting Assessments and Action Plan and synthesis report

Membership

Two to three Working Groups are to be established. The constitution of the groups will be announced after a coffee break of the Thematic Assessment Session of the meeting. The following principles will be applied:

Participants will be invited to inform facilitators of their preference to join this group. Where possible, representatives from the same country will not be in the same group.

Organization

At the outset of the first group exercise session, each Working Group should appoint a Chair-person. The Chairperson should also participate fully in the discussions. The Chair-person is responsible for:

- § Ensuring the agenda items are covered;
- § Ensuring all group members can, and do, fully participate;
- § Ensuring the discussions is orderly.

At the outset of the first group exercise session, each Working Group should appoint a note-taker. The note-taker is responsible for reporting back to the Plenary. The note-taker shall participate fully in the discussions.

At least one external facilitator will participate in each Working Group. The external facilitator is responsible for:

- Clarifying the agenda and discussion topics, as required;
- Answering technical queries;
- Stimulating discussion;
- Assisting the chairperson to ensure that all agenda items are appropriately covered.

Duration and logistics

Group exercise sessions last approximately 120 minutes.

Lamia fills in the logistic part, if necessary.

Session 1 - Stock-taking and Thematic Assessment

Discussion on Stocktaking:

Purpose (10 minutes): why do the stock-take?

Approach (20 minutes): Where to start and what to consider? How to add to what has been done previously (and not just repeat)? How to organize data and information? Which documents should be considered in the stocktake? How best to use the stakeholder analysis? How to do it and when? How to link the stock-take to the thematic assessments? Is the baseline assessment part of the thematic assessment or a separate exercise

Tools (15 minutes) Which tools to use - questionnaires, desk studies, interviews? Meetings etc? Advantages and disadvantages? How long should this step take? How participatory should it be?

Structure of the Output (10 minutes): Is the suggested format useful? What can be the other options?

Discussion on Thematic Assessments

Purpose (10 minutes): why do the Thematic Assessments?

Approach (20 minutes): How to balance the need for participation with the need for time-effectiveness? Does high-participation make consensus difficult? How to avoid conflicts? How to link with the cross-cutting assessments and the action plan? Does five-function-and- three-level approach make sense? What is the sequence of the assessment? What is the desired composition of experts for the assessment?

Tools (20 minutes) Which tools to use - questionnaires, desk studies, etc? SWOT? Problem Trees? How long should this step take? How participatory should it be? When to set priorities in the assessment? How to do prioritization? In-depth analysis? Is it time for recommendations?

Structure of the Output (10 minutes): Is the suggested format useful? What can be the other options?

Session 2 - Cross-cutting Assessments, Action Plan and Synthesis Report

Discussion on Cross-cutting Assessment:

Purpose (10 minutes): why do Cross-cutting Assessments? What is the difference between the cross-cutting and thematic assessments? What are cross- cutting 'requirements', 'constraints' and 'opportunities'? Is the difference clear, it is a useful distinction?

Approach (15 minutes): Is the approach different that of for the Thematic Assessments? How to

coordinate the three groups? Who are the cross-cutting stakeholders? Is this a fourth assessment, or a synthesis of the three thematic assessments? Do we do prioritization at this stage? What is the desired composition of experts for the assessment?

Tools (15 minutes) Are the tools the same as with the Thematic Assessments? How to avoid the overlap with thematic assessments, and to move forward from the thematic assessments?

Structure of the Output (10 minutes): Is the suggested format useful? What can be the other options?

Discussion on Action Plan and Synthesis Report

Purpose (10 minutes): why prepare an Action Plan?

Approach (15 minutes): How to avoid a Plan that is not implemented but stays on a “shelf”? How to choose the type of Plan and a format for the Plan? Who are the stakeholders (linkages and clients)? How and why to mainstream actions into other plans and still ensure the monitoring and quality control of the activities that are mainstreamed into other plans?

Tools (15 minutes) How to ensure that the Action Plan is a real tool for planning future activities and taking decisions? Which new tools to use: the logical framework, budgeting, role allocation? How long should this step take? How to get the high level endorsement?

Structure of the Output (10 minutes): Are the suggested elements useful? How detailed the Logframe should be? how to choose which alternative is most suitable for the country?

Synthesis Report - NCSA Document (10 minutes): Why to do it? Is the suggested format useful? Is the Action Plan an integral part of the final document? Or it is a separate report?

Annex 5- Results of meeting evaluation forms

Annex 5-A- Meeting Evaluation Form of Project Managers

Meeting Evaluation Forms from 6 project managers

You will find below a set questions related to the NCSA meeting which you have just attended. Please, indicate for each of these questions your level of agreement or disagreement (*using the following scale : Very positive, positive, fair, negative*).

If you have further comments, do not hesitate to express them below.

	<i>Very Positive</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Negative</i>
This meeting corresponded to my level of knowledge	4	2		
This meeting answers my concerns	1	5		
This meeting corresponded to the announced objectives	1	5		
I felt actively involved in this meeting	2	3	1	
The exchanges among participants were interesting	2	3	1	
The meeting conditions were satisfactory	2	3	1	
The presentation were of good quality	2	4		
The balance between theory and practice was satisfactory		3	3	
The work groups had a positive impact on the meeting		3	3	
The documents provided at the meeting were valuable	4	2		
The pace of the meeting suited me		6		
The duration of the meeting was appropriate		6		

If the meeting gave you the opportunity to gain sufficient knowledge through the presentations, discussions and working in group ... would you say that:

	<i>Very Positive</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Negative</i>
It will be useful in my professional situation	4	2		

Finally, would you say about this meeting that:

<i>It was very satisfactory</i>	4
<i>It was satisfactory</i>	2
<i>It was unsatisfactory</i>	
<i>It was not satisfactory at all</i>	

Do you have any additional comments you would like to bring to the attention of the organizers?

Meeting organization:

- There is overall large satisfaction of meeting quality. Four out of six managers commended the extra efforts given to the fine details of organization which made the event very smooth, the pleasant atmosphere kept by the organizers, and a very well structured meeting.
- Main concerns reflected on the need for additional one or at least half a day more, to allow more time for working group and to reduce presentations so that more discussion between participants would take place.

Substantive level:

- One main concern raised reflected on the need to ensure follow-up and establish a sustainable network and exchange system in the region. A request was made to SURF-AS office and UNDP/GEF in the region to put the NCSA process as a priority.
- Another concern reflected to strengthen the programme focus at cross cutting issues as an important investment in this NCSA process.
- A recommendation was made to ensure that new project managers will be exposed to the same experience before they start.

Annex 5-B- Meeting Evaluation Form of UNDP-Staff

Meeting Evaluation Forms from 8 UNDP staff members

You will find below a set questions related to the NCSA meeting which you have just attended. Please, indicate for each of these questions your level of agreement or disagreement (*using the*

following scale : *Very positive, positive, fair, negative*).

If you have further comments, do not hesitate to express them below.

	<i>Very Positive</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Negative</i>
This meeting corresponded to my level of knowledge	3	5		
This meeting answers my concerns	2	2	4	
This meeting corresponded to the announced objectives	2	6		
I felt actively involved in this meeting	2	4	2	
The exchanges among participants were interesting	2	5	1	
The meeting conditions were satisfactory	2	5	1	
The presentation were of good quality	2	4	1	1N/A
The balance between theory and practice was satisfactory		5	2	1N/A
The work groups had a positive impact on the meeting		4	2	2N/A
The documents provided at the meeting were valuable	2	6		
The pace of the meeting suited me	1	5	1	1N/A
The duration of the meeting was appropriate		4	2	1, 1N/A

If the meeting gave you the opportunity to gain sufficient knowledge through the presentations, discussions and working in group ... would you say that:

	<i>Very</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Negative</i>
--	--------------------	------------------------	--------------------	------------------------

It will be useful in my professional situation	6	2		
--	---	---	--	--

Finally, would you say about this meeting that:

<i>It was very satisfactory</i>	3
<i>It was satisfactory</i>	5
<i>It was unsatisfactory</i>	
<i>It was not satisfactory at all</i>	

Do you have any additional comments you would like to bring to the attention of the organizers?

Meeting organization:

- The main comments raised by UNDP-CO representatives concerned their interested to have been able to attend the whole meeting. Four out of eight participants reflected this issue as key issue within their comments.
- One comment was raised on the need to ensure strict facilitation to guide the discussions.

Substantive issues:

- More in-depth discussions were needed regarding the planning stages of the NCSA
- A similar meeting should be programmed in 2005.
- The meeting will be beneficial for the coming up WCA Regional NCSA meeting.