

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2017

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3999	
GEF Agency project ID		4299	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Third National Communication to the UNFCCC	
Country/Countries		Brazil	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Enabling Activities	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Science and Technology (MCT)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Project stakeholders	
Private sector involvement		Project stakeholders	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		July 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 29, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 30, 2010	
Actual date of project completion		June 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		5.72	5.72
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	6.5	6.5
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		5.72	5.72
Total Co-financing		6.5	6.5
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		12.22	12.22
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		September 2016	
Author of TE		Mary Dayse Kinzo	
TER completion date		5/8/2018	
TER prepared by		Selin Erdogan	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes		S	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	L	L
M&E Design		S	S	S
M&E Implementation		S	S	S
Quality of Implementation		HS	S	S
Quality of Execution		HS	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	MU	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project Document (PD) does not explicitly state Global Environmental Objectives, however the project goal is “to enable the Government of Brazil to enhance available emission data, performing targeted research, and strengthening technical capacity and institutions to address both mitigation and adaptation.” (PD, pg.14) As the project is categorized as an Enabling Activity, no direct environmental benefits are associated to the project, though it was expected to generate indirect local and global environmental benefits through the studies and information that would be the basis for efforts to reduce GHG emissions as well as to adapt and to increment resilience to climate change impacts. (PD, pg.14)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is “to assist the Government of Brazil to perform the activities necessary to prepare the Third National Communication to the Conference of Parties in accordance with the UNFCCC” (PD, pg.14). The project was expected to achieve the following outcomes:

Outcome #1: The national GHG inventory 2000-2010 has been produced and time-series 1990- 2000 have been refined for key emission sectors

Outcome #2: National circumstances, steps taken or envisaged, constraints and needs have been assessed as input for the implementation of the UNFCCC in Brazil.

Outcome #3: Sector and regional vulnerabilities to climate change have been assessed using improved methodologies and climate models.

Outcome #4: The Brazilian Third National Communication has been published and presented to the Government and national stakeholders.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes to the Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives of the project.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

At the time of project approval, Brazil already had a number of governmental programs and initiatives aimed at reducing greenhouse gases. Brazil also adopted its National Plan on Climate Change in December 2008, which defined actions and measures aimed at mitigation and adaptation to climate change, followed by the establishment of National Policy on Climate Change through Law no. 12, 187/2009. This law established the national voluntary commitment to adopt mitigation actions to reduce the country's GHG emissions between 36.1% and 38.9% compared to projected emissions by 2020. Federal Law no. 12,144/2009 established the National Climate Change Fund to provide financial support for the actions of mitigation and adaptation, using resources for petroleum royalties. The Third National Inventory proposed as part of the Third National Communication has been updated and improved; these inventories have supported the provision of the input data to calculate the expected emission levels and reductions that can be achieved through appropriate measures in the key sectors involved. (TE, pg.46)

This project has been prepared according to UNFCCC guidelines for National Communications and according to the Climate Change Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4, enabling activities would continue to be financed by the GEF, as national communications represented an obligation of non-Annex I parties under the UNFCCC. (Request for CEO Endorsement, pg.6)

Given limited financial resources at government level, the GEF intervention has been instrumental in preparation of the three volumes of the Third National Communication document to the UNFCCC.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness together with efficiency; this TER also rates the effectiveness as Satisfactory. The project achieved its main objective of preparation of the Third National Communication (TNC) and the main studies were carried out by the Climate Network partners through its subnetworks under the supervision and monitoring of actions carried out by the executing agency Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication (MCTIC) Coordination and UNDP.

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

Outcome #1: The national GHG inventory 2000-2010 has been produced and time-series 1990- 2000 have been refined for key emission sectors

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) GHG inventory available for the period 1990-2010, including refinement of time-series 1990-2000, (2) Analysis of key GHG emission categories and uncertainty analysis available, and a QA/QC plan and data base of emission factors established. This outcome was achieved as the preparation of the National Inventory for GHG sectors was completed and approved by the Brazilian government in 2016. The general coordination of the Climate Network mobilized a group of experts on climate change in 2013 who performed the analysis of the categories of emission and assessed the quality of data and methodological aspects by 2015. A national GHG emissions platform was completed and entered the validation phase by the technical team of MCTIC. (TE, pg.40)

Outcome #2: National circumstances, steps taken or envisaged, constraints and needs have been assessed as input for the implementation of the UNFCCC in Brazil

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) National circumstances in Brazil have been assessed, taking into account development priorities, institutional arrangements and concerns that derive from climate change effects, (2) Activities and climate change measures to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil have been defined and described, including an assessment of needs and constraints. The results of this outcome have been satisfactory. The national circumstances volume included information made available by government institutions and was compiled into a single document and reviewed by various government partners. The document was evaluated and released by the Brazilian government in 2016. The assessment of the sectorial evolution of GHG emissions was carried out to verify the effectiveness of mitigation efforts and the review of the National Climate Change Policy was completed with the participation of governmental partners. (TE, pg.41)

Outcome #3: Sector and regional vulnerabilities to climate change have been assessed using improved methodologies and climate models

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) The Brazilian global climate model “Global Model of the Climate System (MBSCG)” has been completed, (2) The regional climate in Brazil has been modelled using the MBSCG in combination with models from climate centers abroad, including simulation of relevant climate change scenarios (3) Studies at a regional level using different climate change scenarios and impact assessments for key sectors have been carried out and (4) A mapping of regional and sector vulnerabilities to climate change effects has been performed. This outcome has been achieved. By 2015, the Global Climate Model System (Brazilian Model of the Global Climate System) and the regional model were developed and improved with higher resolution to a higher domain. Climate scenarios for the next 100 years have been continuously prepared by experts in climate modeling of the Climate Network used by the IPCC. In 2013, specialists of specific sub-networks within Climate Network were mobilized to analyze the predictive climate modeling results. In 2015, all ToRs prepared by Climate Network subnets were used for the hiring of consultants who analyzed data generated by the scenarios. The reports were assessed by National Space Research Institute (INPE) senior researchers and compiled into a single document, describing vulnerability for each sector. (TE, pg.43)

Outcome #4: The Brazilian Third National Communication has been published and presented to the Government and national stakeholders

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) National GHG inventories, publications and documents from the NC have been disseminated to the IPCC, national stakeholders and the public (2) The Third National Communication has been published and presented to the national Government and (3) A monitoring and evaluation program has been designed and implemented. In 2015, a team of experts and consultants involved in the TNC, following the advice of the MCTIC press office, defined the activities for publication in different media of all TNC products and results. The data platform for the GHG inventory was completed and submitted for validation and testing. The TNC report is available in three volumes in print and in electronic form and can be downloaded from the climate change website of (MCTIC). (TE, p.47)

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------	--

The project rated efficiency and effectiveness together as satisfactory. This TE will rate efficiency as **Moderately Satisfactory** mainly due to project delays. TE notes that the project suffered a few operational problems during project implementation regarding the bureaucratic rules of bidding and financial performance, which sometimes caused delay in achieving the outputs and outcomes, although delays were primarily attributed to changes in project strategy. (TE, pg.35) In terms of co-financing, the Government of Brazil committed in-kind support for an amount of US\$ 6,500,000. TE notes that the resources were used according to the budget and mainly for hiring consultants and services from national providers and the project partners kept track of committed resources using acceptable accountancy standards, as per applicable rules and regulations. (TE, pg.30)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
--------------------	-----------------------

The TE rates project sustainability as Likely, but does not provide a detailed discussion examining the four dimensions of financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks to sustainability of outcomes. This TER rates sustainability as Likely due to availability of potential financial resources and government commitment despite likelihood of political or institutional changes.

Financial Resources Sustainability: Likely TE states that “considering the period after the TNC execution, a new financial resource was foreseen to prepare implementation of the next National Communication to complement and update the TNC”, however does not provide any more details on potential sources. (TE, pg.50)

Sociopolitical Sustainability: Likely TE does not provide much information on sociopolitical effects except claiming that the socioeconomic and environmental trends pointed to the continued implementation of the Convention as per national commitments to reduction of GHG emissions. Nevertheless, the project has made an important contribution to mainstream climate change policies, emissions mitigation options, reduction of vulnerabilities and ways of adapting to climate change which makes the sociopolitical sustainability likely. (TE, pg.49)

Institutional Framework and Governance Sustainability: Moderately Likely Although not very critical to the sustainability of the project, “limited political support to climate change” by the government is one of the risks identified at the project document and there were delays in the delivery of reports during implementation, mainly because of problems related to Brazil’s political and institutional changes that caused delay in delivery of documents to the UNFCCC. (TE, pg.67)

Environmental Sustainability: Likely TE notes that the Government of Brazil is strongly committed to meeting its obligations under the international agreements on climate change and reducing emissions. The TE does not note any environmental risks to continuation of project benefits.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The Government of Brazil committed in-kind co-financing for an amount of US\$ 6,500,000. According to the TE, the level of expected co-financing has been realized and the resources were used according to the budget and mainly for hiring consultants and services from national providers, according to UNDP ATLAS budget lines 71300 and 72100. (TE, pg.30)

5.2 Project extensions and/or 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

TE notes that use of a supercomputer requiring competent and responsible experts as well as political and institutional changes that led to divergent views among Brazilian government managers on methodologies and models on GHG emissions have caused the delay in complying with commitments under the Convention. (TE, pg.24-25) The Third National Communication products and results were prepared and submitted in April 2016, because of the delays and political/ institutional risks.

5.3 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:

Despite the political risks, the government of Brazil is committed to the sustainability of the project as evidenced by the past engagements and activities of the executing agency. Brazil was the first signatory to the UNFCCC in June 1992 followed by Ratification by Congress in 1994. Brazil presented its Initial National Communication in December 2004, the Second National Communication in November 2010 and the Third National Communication in April 2016.

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately

Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E Design at entry, and this TER concurs. According to the PD, the project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) would be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and be led by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from UNDP/GEF. The Strategic Results Framework provides performance and impact indicators with their corresponding means of verification. TE notes that the analysis of the project structure shows that the elements in the framework were clear and feasible to achieve the project results and deliverables and the indicators allowed periodic project monitoring and evaluation of implementation in relation to the established baselines. (TE, pg.22)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E Design at implementation, and this TER concurs. The project had a systematic monitoring of activities to obtain the outputs proposed through the preparation of periodic evaluation reports, according to the GEF/UNDP rules. Data for the reports came from workshops, meetings and field visits that were included in the work plans. Data requested by the Annual Progress Report/Project and Implementation Review (PIR) was used by UNDP/CO and UNDP/GEF to assess progress of activities and provide inputs to be used in mid-term and final projects reports, as indicated in the PD. (TE, pg.34) According to the TE, "the outcomes achieved were in accordance with the criteria "Smart" as they were: (i) consistent with the specific nature of the issues involved and presented in language accessible to target groups and with great transparency and accuracy; (ii) the planning of the outcomes was in accordance with established and relevant indicators requested by the UNFCCC; (iii) the outcomes were within the capacity of partners involved in implementation and (iv) were highly relevant at the national and international levels and contributed to the priorities set out in the Convention and Brazil's National Climate Change Plan; (v) the results were not an end in themselves, but the basis for the continued improvement of data and other findings to reduce the impacts of climate change. (TE, pg.35)

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The implementing agency of the project was UNDP. The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation, which this TER revises to **Satisfactory**. According to the TE, the UNDP Project Management Unit carried out activities to support the partners' implementation activities by assisting in developing terms of reference and making provisions for seminars and travel for data and information collection and participation in events, among other activities. Despite some delays in these activities and other procedures, it's claimed that outputs were achieved as planned.

As part of its supervisory role, progress reports were prepared by the project coordination with support from Project Management Unit/UNDP and their contents corresponded to factors involved in project implementation. (TE, pg.36)

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

The executing agency of the project was Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication (MCTIC). The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for quality of project execution, which this TER revises to **Satisfactory**. The TE notes that regarding the fulfillment of project term duration, the UNDP and MCTIC spared no efforts so that the deadlines could be met despite the delays in the presentation of project outputs and outcomes due to political and institutional changes within the MCTIC and government. One of the critical aspects of the project in achieving the anticipated outcomes was MCTIC mobilization strategy that involved many Brazilian experts through Climate Network Sub-networks focusing on climate change issues. With the financial support of MCTIC and GEF/UNDP, it produced information for the formulation and evaluation of public policies on climate change and offered contributions for Brazilian negotiations under the UNFCCC. (TE, pg.31)

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case

and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not cite any environmental changes that occurred by the end of the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not cite any socioeconomic changes that occurred by the end of the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

TE notes that “the TNC deepened and perfected data collection and analysis and produced more accurate knowledge in the area of vulnerability and adaptation to climate change through new studies with more consistent methodologies that help reduce uncertainties in the application of computational models.” (TE, pg.51)

b) Governance

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by the end of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end.

Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

TE notes that the project related publications disseminated both methodological and scientific progress and specific research results on vulnerability and adaptation, promoted by the MCTIC partnership with the Climate Network. This dissemination constituted a solid basis for replication at the national, regional and global levels. (TE, pg.27)

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations for future reports to comply with obligations of the country with the Convention are the listed in the TE as following (TE, pg.54):

- Since the short time available was a challenge for concluding the inventory of LULUCF sector emissions, it is recommended that the next National Communication carry out as soon as possible the signing of contracts needed for work on research and data collection and processing;
- The fact that the CGMC/MCTIC includes career civil servants was advantageous leads to the recommendation that more such people be incorporated in the team;
- Because of the precarious nature of fellowship grants, primarily for the Climate Network, it is recommended that high-level agreements between MCTIC and CNPq be made about continuity;
- Since there were difficulties in the use of the super-computer, it is recommended that resources be allocated to overcoming this weakness of infrastructure, namely, the use of data and forms of backup and storage. It is also recommended that a person be placed in charge of coordinating use of this infrastructure;
- Considering the importance of the training component in the implementation of the TNC, continuous investment is recommended in training new specialists for the preparation of the inventory of the sectors in question;
- Better understanding is need of stocks and flows of underground carbon under various land uses;

- It is also recommended also that there be a workshop to carry out comparison of different South American and Central inventories so that the various countries can share their difficulties, challenges and experiences;
- Considering the advance of forest inventories in the states, coordination is recommended between CGMC/MCTIC and the Brazilian Forest Service (SFB) of the Ministry of Environment (MMA) to integrate and use data from the National Forest Inventory (IFN);
- As recommended in an interview, there should be contact and cooperation with the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), which would be important for preparation of the Fourth National Communication;
- It was also recommended to prepare projections about the possible impacts of the adoption of various public policies on climate change;
- It was also recommended, according to a TNC participant, that the MCTIC seek partnerships not only with federal ministries, but also with state environmental agencies, so that they create teams to analyze GHG emissions with the support of the Ministry;
- Another recommendation that emerged from the assessment workshop in June of 2016 concerns the importance of enhancing the role of the Ministry of External Relations, which should be encouraged to participate in technical meetings;
- Finally, it was recommended that UNDP review the bureaucratic procedures to the extent possible under existing government regulations to expedite the execution of the next National Communication and its projects so that resources, hiring and services can be as expeditious as possible.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The assessment of relevant outcomes, impacts, and achievements of objectives is both thorough and consistent with the requirements of the results framework of the project design.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent in general, however not all ratings were thoroughly explained, and several elements of the project such as efficiency and effectiveness ratings were combined with a heavy focus on effectiveness.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides information on sustainability, however, the discussion on financial sustainability has been quite limited and not adequately substantiated	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and relevant recommendations are comprehensive and provides project related, evidence based information.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project includes actual total project costs, as well as costs per outcome.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report evaluates M&E at design and implementation together and could have been more detailed.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).