GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	March 30,2009
GEF Project ID:	1650		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P078143	**GEF financing:**	1.14	1.14
Project Name:	Enabling activities leading to Second National Communication of the Argentine Government to the Conference of the Parties to UNFCCC	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.00
Country:	Argentina	Government:	0.71	0.50
		Other*:	0.00	0.00
		Total Cofinancing	0.71	0.50
Operational Program:	Enabling activity - CC	**Total Project Cost:**	1.85	1.64
IA:	World Bank	Dates		
Partners involved:	EA: Instituto de Geocronología y Geología Isotopica (INGEIS); Others: Secretaria de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable; UIP Segunda Comunicacion Cambio Climatico; Fundacion Bariloche; Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Comercio Internacional y Culto; Secretaria de Ciencia y Tecnologia	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		02/09/2004
		Closing Date	Proposed: 09/30/2006	Actual: 03/31/2007
Prepared by: Meg Spearman	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 32 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 38 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 6 months
Author of TE: Sustainable Development Department; Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay Country Management Unit; Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office		TE completion date: 12/01/2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: March 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 3 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	**S**	**S**	S	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	---	---	Negligible	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	**S**	---	NA	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	---	**S**	S	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	---	---	NA	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why? Yes, the TE complies with GEF guidelines and provides a comprehensive and candid evaluation of the project successes and shortcomings.
2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.? None noted.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The project document does not state any explicit global environmental objectives, as this is an enabling activity. As the primary objective is to support the development of the Second National Communications of the Government of Argentina to the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC, the indirect benefits from this project could include improved quality and resilience of ecosystems to climate change, and also reduced GHG and air pollution from the implementation of a national adaptation and mitigation plans, respectively.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

The development objectives of this project were to support enabling activities for the preparation of the Second National Communications of Argentina to the COP of the UNFCCC. The project document notes the following four interrelated development objectives:"a) Update and improve GHG National Inventories
b) Strengthen local capacities to integrate climate change issues into the planning process and develop public awareness
c) Assist in the preparation of national mitigation policies and measures, including identification of mitigation opportunities in transport and electric energy demand side management (DSM)
d) Assess vulnerability and adaptation options for key ecosystems and agricultural regions."

No changes occurred during implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S
The project is a set of enabling activities that are highly relevant to the climate change focal area both in terms of mitigation and adaptation, and are consistent with country priorities in reduction of GHG emissions through sustainable development.
A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:
(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?
The 2000 Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) of the World Bank intended to address Argentina's need to promote sustainable growth via pollution reduction, and thus monitored the government's fulfillment of commitments to global environmental agreements such as the UNFCCC. Water resources were identified as a major development priority, which present complex water resource management due to high climate variability (extreme drought and floods, in different regions). The ICR also identifies land management needs in terms of preparation for climate-related events, which may affect or be amplified by unsustainable land use, soil degradation (e.g. salinization) and deforestation. Third, addressing human settlements and urban zoning is a major development challenge, due in large part to the expansion of cities into flood-prone areas.
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?
This project builds on Argentina's commitments to the UNFCCC and the First National Communications proceedings, and as a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol. Following the deep recession of the 1990s and subsequent recovery, which peaked in 1997, a number of key initiatives allowed for a decreasing trend of emissions: i) increased power generation from clean energy sources; ii) replacement of the public transportation fleet with cleaner vehicles; and iii) reduction of total heads of cattle with a resulting decrease in enteric emissions. The ICR comments that although links between scientific facts about climate change and preventative decision-making remain weak at all levels, climate change is becoming increasingly linked to national planning and there is a perceived need for a National Mitigation Program, with public awareness promotion and the development of institutional frameworks to carry out these plans. Also, in 1997, the Bank sponsored the first Argentine National Strategy Study (NSS) - a study on opportunities under the flexible mechanisms recently established by the Kyoto Protocol.
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?
This project addresses GEF's support for the UNFCCC through enabling activities for producing National Communications and strategies to improve capacity and implementation of adaptation and mitigation measures at a national level. It is consistent with the GEF mandate for to "support sustainable measures that minimize climate change damage by reducing the risk, or the adverse effects, of climate change."
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)
The project is directly relevant to the fulfillment of obligations of Argentina as a signatory of the UNFCCC, namely the preparation of and implementation of activities through the National Communications framework.
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership[1]
Other than the international cooperation fostered under the UNFCCC national communications process, no specific project objectives were geared toward regional or global cooperation / partnerships.
b. Effectiveness Rating: S
The project satisfactorily achieved all measurable outcomes in the PAD and the ICR indicates that institutional capacity was strengthened and results from this project are contributing to the development of national and regional policies to reduce emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Follow-up activities are also under way. According to the ICR, this is the status of the following indicators (outputs/objectives) and resulting outcomes: 1. Institutional procedures in place to prepare National communications – Compilation of environmental, economic and social indicators / Draft communication / Consultation with authorities and main stakeholders - Second National Communications completed 2. Update GHG emission inventory and trend analysis – GHG inventory updated 3. Local emission factors and carbon sequestration - Local emission factors obtained 4. Harmonized Energy Balance - (make them homogenous compared to Inventory Emission Source Categories; commercial, public and residential, which were lumped into one category prior to this project) - Energy balance Harmonized 5. Assessment of vulnerability of particular ecosystems to climate change – Environmental indicators and data sets / Hydrological budget from various regions/ Mapping of several indicators / Identification of institutional capacity / Review of regulatory framework- Vulnerability of four ecosystems and the energy sector completed - Nine studies (including Adaptation Plan and RCM) were completed 6. Assessment of economic impact of Climate Change - Information gathering from various economic sectors / Data processing - Study on economic and social impacts of climate change completed

[1] Please consider for regional and global project only

7. Design of adaptation measures - Draft National Adaptation Plan completed
8. Regional climate change projections from modified general circulation model - Regional circulation model completed and results from scenarios (SRES) obtained
9. Assessment of Technologies and policies that aim at reducing the effects of climate variations - Three studies on mitigation options in energy and transport sectors, energy efficiency and renewable energy completed
10. Assessment of priorities and opportunities for mitigation carbon sequestration and technology transfer - EMM opportunities / Assessment of opportunities for energy efficiency in transport / Assessment of opportunities for carbon sequestration and substitution- Study on opportunities for carbon sequestration completed - Five studies under the Mitigation component of the project completed
11. Strengthen local capacities to integrate climate change issues in planning and in the development of public awareness - Fostering awareness, Knowledge on how climate change functions, Attitudes regarding personal and environmental motivation, ability to identify and investigate climate change problems - Five seminars carried out, teaching material developed, TV and radio ads published, participation in TV interviews

The ICR also examined "intermediate indicators" related to outputs; these are integrated into the relevant component above.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: UA (N/A)**

As an enabling activity, there was no formal economic analysis for investment at appraisal or completion.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

Under the UNFCCC, ecological and economic impact assessments are promoted for mitigation and adaptation activities. The ICR states that sustainable development initiatives in Argentina have been hindered by weak connections between climate change (science) and national (development) planning, but there are no explicit trade-offs outlined in this project. ICR and project document suggest that project objectives were in line with development projects as the GOA had already undergone the First National Communications to the UNFCCC and incorporated lessons learned, new national policies and strengthened institutional capacity into the project process and goals.

There is evidence from the project delay explanations, however, (described in the sustainability section below) to suggest that the strong role of the Steering Committee, vs the national government, created tension in the funding approval process; but it is uncertain whether this tension may have affected the decisions juxtaposing environmental and development priorities.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts[2] (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources **Rating: L**

There is no evidence presented in the ICR to suggest that Argentina will not continue to devote time and resources to climate-proof their economy and most vulnerable environments and sectors to the extent possible.

b. Socio-economic / political **Rating: L**

The ICR notes a strong sense of country ownership for this project and a strong stakeholder component. There is no evidence to suggest that the political and socio-economic sustainability is at risk.

c. Institutional framework and governance **Rating: L**

The likelihood of institutional frameworks and governance sustaining efforts toward climate change mitigation and adaptation is relatively strong. Both mitigation and adaptation national plans were established through this project and the combined improvements of technical capacity with government buy-in provides an environment for continued support for initiatives begun through the second NC.

d. Environmental **Rating: L**

[2] Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

There is no evidence to suggest that there are environmental risks to this project. The adaptation strategy, in particular, very closely links development and environmental factors, as it builds on very particular regional projections for climate change.
e. Technological **Rating: NA**
The project did not promote specific technologies and does not face technological risks.

4.3 Catalytic role[3]

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders
The incentives for behavioral changes through project activities were build on economic and environmental scenarios for particular regions and sectors. As climate change science and projected scenarios are only now beginning to be incorporated into the national planning process, it is too early to determine how or in what ways these incentives might lead to catalyzing changes in stakeholders.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
The ICR notes that one of the key aspects of this project was for Argentina to develop circulation models in order to forecast changes in climate. These could be utilized to create and analyze potential scenarios to enhance decision-making; all of the vulnerabilities studies relied upon these tools. In this respect, the project catalyzed technological capacity which fed into a larger political, economic and institutional framework. Also, the SAyDS (Secretariat of Environment and Sustainable Development) has strengthened the climate change unit as a result of the project, and now has two sectors dedicated solely to Adaptation to Climate Change and the development of the Third National Communications. SAyDS is also working actively on CDM projects.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
Policy changes through this project are a result of working through the UNFCCC national communications framework. The National Mitigation Program and the Adaptation Strategy (based on the projects' vulnerability studies) each contributed significantly to the economic and development policy frameworks of Argentina as they touch on a matrix of critical decisions pertaining to potential future environmental (climate) and economic scenarios. The mitigation plan addresses: 1) Energy Efficiency Measures (EEM), 2) GHG Emission Mitigation in the Transport sector, 3) Renewable energy sources (RE), 4) Carbon dioxide sequestration, and 5) Reduction of methane enteric emissions. The adaptation strategy, based on the key vulnerability studies, address in particular the anticipated hydraulic changes, but also proposes measures that are "numerous and various, covering an extensive spectrum of sub-sectors, regions and actors." Each of these policy frameworks will have bold repercussions at the national level.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
It is unclear how or whether this project created opportunities for catalytic financing outside the project boundary. Funding was dispersed based on IA approval at each step of the NC, and there is no mention of a creation of opportunities or incentives for outside investment in the timeframe of implementation.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
None noted.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The Government of Argentina was the only partner to provide cofinancing; neither the PAD nor the ICR provides information on the significance of this co-financing in attaining project outcomes or their sustainability. Implicitly, the contribution of the government is important to the concept of country-ownership.
b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The project was extended twice: first, from March 31, 2006 to December 31, 2006 in order to allow the studies contracted to be completed, and to allow time for the main consultant to compile all the results and write the actual National Communication; second, from December 31, 2006 to March 31, 2007, in order to allow the government to

[3] Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

review the SNC (delivered by the consultant in December 2006). The ICR also states two other reasons for project delays: first, the strong role of the Steering Committee (explained below in 4.4.c.); and, second, the time necessary to contract and develop the Regional Circulation Model for forecasting weather changes and analyze vulnerabilities. There is no evidence to suggest that these extensions negatively affected the quality of outcomes or sustainability.
c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.
The ICR notes that one major reason for delays in implementation was the strong role of the Steering Committee, which ended up approving every step of the consultation process. "The GOA [Argentinean government] faced a trade-off between country ownership of the project and speed of execution, and gave a higher weight to country ownership. In hindsight, the project could have limited the responsibilities of the SC to a more strategic scope and rely more on the Project Implementation Unit to handle the procurement processes."

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): S
M&E was designed to consist of a series of progress, evaluation, and completion reports for each output and subsequent outcome. The M&E system was, in general, well designed and produced measurable, verifiable results using indicators and performance targets appropriate to activities. Outreach activities and information providing for the sake of national, provincial and district authorities, and stakeholders, were the tasks of the Secretariat of Sustainable Development and Environmental Policy, the Secretariat of Science and Technology, the Secretariat of Agriculture, the Secretariat of Energy, the Secretariat of Transport and the Secretariat of Industry. The Federal Council on the Environment (COFEMA) was to disseminate information on climate variation impacts, and Inter-Province Boards were established to implement coordination measures to address adverse effects of heavy precipitation and flood events. The project document also states, "This project is oriented to further the continuous monitoring of national emissions conditions, implementing newly available guidance material developed by the IPCC, which will provide for an improved assessment of emissions from all sources and a better definition of appropriate monitoring systems." The project was to be monitored and reported on via the delivery of the Second National Communication, the National Mitigation Program, and other sector work by the World Bank. Also public awareness and involvement was to be measured through i) utility bills ii) enrollment figures at education institutions iii) balance sheets of pro-environmental companies. The data collection system pertaining to each of the project activities, made possible via 'intermediate outcome indicators' (such as GHG emissions data, adaptation and mitigation studies, seminars, etc.), were appropriately targeted and related directly to the preparation of the Second NC.
b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): S
According to the ICR, implementation of M&E was the responsibility of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) and the Fundación Bariloche, with the oversight of the Steering Committee (SC). The functions of the Steering Committee were to direct the planning, implementation, and monitoring stages of the project, by: (a) reviewing and defining terms of reference; (b) approving final structure of project documents; (c) overseeing the selection of consultants; (d) defining the procurement and implementation plans; (e) reviewing studies and implementation progress; and (f) setting strategic orientation for the project outputs. The PIUs "routinely updated and submitted to the World Bank a report on the status of each component, the next steps, and estimated timeframe to carry them out." The Bank approved the release of funds at each stage of the development of the studies. Also, the minutes from each SC meeting were prepared. In the TE, the results and findings gathered from monitoring activities was broken into 10 global environmental objectives and 5 intermediate outcome indicators. It is presumably difficult to track the implementation of monitoring across such an enabling activity, which is divided into several sub-projects and studies spread across the country. However, TE does not address arrangements for the tracking and reporting of specific indicators and progress from the EA to the World Bank, and rather focuses on the organizational arrangements and end results.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Evidence in the ICR seems to suggest that there was ample funding for M&E activities but there is no direct commentary on this particular aspect of M&E implementation.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Evidence indirectly suggests that there was adequate and timely funding, although there was a notable trade-off between country-drivenness and Steering Committee approvals of disbursements.
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? The two key tools for providing information to develop the national mitigation and adaptation strategies, were the GHG inventory and the regional circulation model (RCM), respectively. The Secretariat of Environment updated and maintained the GHG inventory and the RCM was developed and utilized for the nine studies on vulnerabilities.
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so,

explain why.
In terms of monitoring and approval, as stated above in 4.4.c, the Steering Committee played too strong a role and thus forced a trade-off between country ownership and project-divineness. Otherwise, the M&E plan was executed as designed and functioned well for this project.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution. According to the ICR, the initial role of the World Bank is this project was to assist the GOA in writing the TORs and provide comments on the documents as needed. The Bank carried out regular missions and was "in constant contact with the client," working closely to ensure project outcomes. The lack of procurement experience by the FB also led to an additional supervision efforts the Bank team, as they complied with a request by the Bank Procurement Team to review all project activities prior to review by the Bank. The Bank team is noted to have provided "due attention and technical support to the client in the preparation and implementation of the project."
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[4] (rating on a 6 point scale): S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency. The ICR notes that The Fundación Bariloche played a dual role in this project. First, as direct recipient of the funds, the PIU handled procurement and the FB dealt with contracting and payment to consultants. Second, the FB was also in charge of 'component 1' of the project: updating GHG emissions inventory, developing national emission factors, and harmonizing national energy balances and GHG emissions inventories. Their work was "high quality" and delivered in a timely manner. There were no also negative issues reported with regards to the management of funds.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects
As noted in the ICR: 1. Quality of SNC. The key to develop a high quality SNC rested in obtaining high quality products (i.e. inventory, vulnerability, and mitigation studies). Generally the local consultants in Argentina had high technical capacity; therefore the quality of the products was good. Additionally, the PIU worked closely with contracted firms as soon as they were selected, providing feedback on their proposals and early drafts ensuring these would meet their objectives using technically sound methods. 2. National Ownership. As described above, there was a trade-off between speed of execution and project ownership on behalf of the GOA. There was a strong presence of the SC in all procurement steps, causing it to slow down the process, while ensuring that the final products are satisfactory to the government. The project could have sought to redirect the focus of the SC to more technical aspects. But having a SC would still be useful. In this way, the different institutions can participate in the development of the strategic documents where there are many cross sectoral issues such as energy efficiency, forestry, socio economic impacts, etc. To complement, the role of the PIU should be stronger. 3. Development of Future Climate Scenarios. In the climate change context, the only methodology accepted by the international community to estimate future climatic conditions is the development of climate scenarios. The methodology most commonly used is the use of global climate model combined with high resolution regional models. Nonetheless, these models have some shortcomings in the simulation of median and extreme precipitation in the Plata river basin. These models do not reproduce adequately the magnitude, the annual cycle and the characteristics of extreme precipitation. The project opted to develop a regional circulation model that reduces the uncertainty found in global climate models when applied at the local scale.
b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
There are no key recommendations stated in the ICR, although the lessons learned above encapsulate the recommendations for project performance, process, and outcomes based on the findings in specific components.

[4] Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The ICR provides	5
b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The ICR is consistent in its findings and points are substantiated with evidence whenever possible. However, ratings are not always convincing without further explanation. Also, there could have been more information on M&E implementation and funding and overall recommendations.	4
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The ICR does address project sustainability but does not fully explicate the environmental, economic and political risks to sustainability if the proposals of the NC are fully implemented.	5
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes, evidence in the ICR is consistent with lessons learned.	6
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes; financial spending was itemized and thorough.	6
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The ICR could have provided more information on monitoring and real-time adaptive measures or decisions based on feedback, and also could have supplied more evidence on use of funding.	5

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ENDORSEMENT:
Name: Raúl Estrada Oyuela
Organization: Secretariat of Foreign Affairs
Title: Ambassador / GEF Focal Point
Date: February 14, 2002

IA CONTACT:
Karin Shepardson, GEF Regional Coordinator
Latin America and Caribbean Region
Tel. (202) 473-8954
Fax: 202-676-9373
Internet: Kshepardson@worldbank.org

Other general beneficiaries as stated in the ICR:
- National and provincial governments, as their capacity for incorporating climate change dimensions into their planning was strengthened, both in terms of mitigation and adaptation responses;
- Stakeholders, whose awareness about climate change impact will allow informed decisions relating housing, water and energy use, and productive activities;

- Coastal and delta area communities and tourism interests directly affected by flooding, temperature changes, and sea level rise;
- General population from urban centers affected by air pollution and, in particular, vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly;
- NGOs, members of the public and academic institutions will benefit from additional training and information from project activities.

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)