

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4229	
GEF Agency project ID		4371	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Fifth National Communication on Climate Change to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	
Country/Countries		Mexico	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CC-4	
Executing agencies involved		National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		World Wildlife Fund (WWF) UNAM Center for Atmospheric Science; the Mexican Institute of Water Technology; and the Center for Scientific Research and Higher Education at Ensenada	
Private sector involvement		Not given	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		July 13, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2012	
Actual date of project completion		January 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.04	NA
	Co-financing	.04	NA
GEF Project Grant		2.71	Not given ¹
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	4.44	Not given ²
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.75	NA
Total Co-financing		4.48	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		7.23	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			

¹ The TE does not provide the final figures for GEF funding at completion. The TE notes that \$2.69 million had been disbursed by the end of 2013, however the project was completed in 2015 (pg. 26).

² The TE does not provide final co-financing information, noting the project did not monitor the contributions of the Mexican Government (pg. 26). However, the 2013 PIR states that \$4.22 million in co-financing had materialized by June 30, 2013. The 2013 PIR also notes that British Embassy and USAID in Mexico contributed an additional \$2 million to the project (pg. 18).

TE completion date	January 21, 2015
Author of TE	Dr. Arnoldo Matus Kramer
TER completion date	2/19/2016
TER prepared by	Laura Nissley
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Watts

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		S ³	--	ML
M&E Design		NR ⁴	--	MU
M&E Implementation		NR	--	UA
Quality of Implementation		NR	--	MS
Quality of Execution		NR	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	U

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not explicitly state the Global Environmental Objectives of the project. However, it does note that “No direct environmental benefits are associated to the proposed Enabling Activity Project but the implementation of the project activities is expected to generate global environment benefits through the studies and information which will be the basis for efforts to mitigate Mexico’s GHG emissions and enhancement of sinks, and to reduce its vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. The updated GHG emissions inventory to 1990-2009 will assist in the development of more efficient and effective policies and measures to address climate change in key sectors at the Federal and State levels. The expected outcomes of this project will improve Mexico’s capacity to combat climate change, in conformity with sustainable development. The project development of the Fifth National Communication represents the fulfillment of Mexico’s commitments as a non-Annex I Party to the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol” (PD pgs. 16-17).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not explicitly state the Development Objectives of the project, however its overall objective is to “assist the Government of Mexico in strengthening its capacity to design public policies, including mitigation and adaptation policies and measures, and to evaluate the environmental,

³ The TE uses a different scale for project sustainability, which it rates as “Satisfactory.”

⁴ The TE does not provide separate rating for M&E design and M&E implementation, however it does provide an overall rating of Moderate Satisfactory for M&E.

social and economic impacts of their implementation, in order to fulfill its commitments to the UNFCCC, in particular by preparing its Fifth National Communication” (PD pg. 26).

The expected outcomes of the project included:

- Outcome 1: The National Greenhouse Gas (GHG) inventory for 1990-2009 has been produced
- Outcome 2: Sector, local and national impacts, vulnerability and adaptation policies and measures to address climate change, variability and extreme events have been assessed and adaptation activities, measures and programs implemented between 2009 and 2012 to address climate change, variability and extreme events have been described
- Outcome 3: GHG mitigation policies and measures implemented between 2009 and 2012 at national, state and local levels have been described and analyzed; GHG emissions scenarios from sources and sinks have been generated; and potential future GHG mitigation options have been assessed, including their economic impacts
- Outcome 4: Update information for 2009-2012 regarding national circumstances and national and regional development priorities, as well as key additional information, and the needs identified during the preparation of the FNC has been described
- Outcome 5: The Mexican FNC has been approved, published and the information contained has been disseminated

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

There were no changes to the objectives or activities during implementation.

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
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project relevance, and this TER concurs. As a non-Annex I party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Mexico is obligated to prepare national communications on the status of its commitments to address climate change. The

objective of this project is to prepare the Mexico's Fifth National Communication for the UNFCCC. Mexico has used past national communications as an instrument to set national, state, and local policies and strategies to address climate change. Specifically, Mexico incorporated climate changes issues into its agenda for the National Development Plan (2007-2012); the Sectoral and Institutional Programs (2007-2012); and the Special Program on Climate Change (PECC) (2009-2012). The project objectives and outcomes are also consistent with the Climate Change Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4, under which the GEF agreed to continue to finance enabling activities for preparing national communications for UNFCCC (PD pgs. 14-15).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project achieved its objective, and the Fifth National Communication (FNC) was published and submitted to the UNFCCC in December 2012. Although the majority of the project results were achieved, the project experienced moderate shortcomings. In particular, some of the studies were not completed in time to be included in the FNC (TE pg. 21). Additionally, the TE noted that some of the studies were of low quality (pg. 21).

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

- **Outcome 1: The National Greenhouse Gas (GHG) inventory for 1990-2009 has been produced:** Under this outcome, it was expected that the GHG inventory would be updated, published, and made available to the public on the National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC)'s website. It was also expected that a GHG inventory system would be developed, along with guidelines for organizing activity data validation and quality control to improve subsequent inventories. Additionally, the national emission factor for the petroleum industry would be determined; methodologies for estimating emissions in the transport sector developed; and the GHG emissions inventory for the LULUCF sector⁵ would be recalculated. The TE notes that all of the results under this outcome were achieved by project end, except for the guidelines for organizing activity data validation and quality control. The project team prioritized other studies given the short timeframe for finalizing the FNC (TE pg. 20).
- **Outcome 2: Sector, local and national impacts, vulnerability and adaptation policies and measures to address climate change, variability and extreme events have been assessed and adaptation activities, measures and programs implemented between 2009 and 2012 to address climate change, variability and extreme events have been described:**

⁵ Land use, land-use change, and forestry sector

Under this outcome, it was expected that methodologies and tools would be developed for assessing the impacts, vulnerability, and adaptation options. It was also expected that programs and strategies implemented between 2009 and 2012 would be assessed. Additionally, regional climate change scenarios would be generated. It was also expected that a portfolio of adaptation options would be prepared, along with an analysis of financial schemes for adaptation projects. The TE notes that all expected results under this outcome were achieved by project end (TE pg. 19). Additionally, the Climate Change Modeling Network was created, and for the first time all national research groups on climate modeling worked together to create climate change scenarios (TE pg. 21).

- **Outcome 3: GHG mitigation policies and measures implemented between 2009 and 2012 at national, state and local levels have been described and analyzed; GHG emissions scenarios from sources and sinks have been generated; and potential future GHG mitigation options have been assessed, including their economic impacts:**

Under this outcome, it was expected that GHG mitigation policies implemented between 2009 and 2012, as well as potential future policies, would be analyzed. It was also expected that the macroeconomic impact of proposed policies would be assessed, and that technology and MRV (measurement, report, and verification) recommendations would be provided. Additionally, it was also expected that GHG emissions scenarios would be projected. The TE notes that all expected results under this outcome were achieved by project end (TE pgs. 19-20).

- **Outcome 4: Update information for 2009-2012 regarding national circumstances and national and regional development priorities, as well as key additional information, and the needs identified during the preparation of the FNC has been described:**

Under this outcome, it was expected that a report on the national and regional development priorities would be prepared, including environmental and economic indicators relevant to climate change. This report would include information relevant to the implementation of the UNFCCC; a needs and constraints assessment; and a financial resources and technical support assessment. By project end, the report had been developed and included the relevant sections identified in the project design (TE pg. 20).

- **Outcome 5: The Mexican FNC has been approved, published and the information contained has been disseminated:**

Under this outcome, it was expected that the GHG inventory for 1990-2009 and studies conducted under the project would be presented to the government and other relevant stakeholders. Additionally, it was expected that the FNC would be published and submitted to the UNFCCC. It was also expected that a special FNC document would be prepared and made accessible to the general public. The results under this outcome were largely achieved by the end of the project. The FNC was submitted to the UNFCCC in December 2012. However, some of the studies were not completed in time to be included in the publication of the FNC.

Additionally, a special FNC document was prepared however it was not available for public consumption by the end of the project (TE pg. 20-21).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE notes that the project managed its financial resources in a cost-efficient manner, and the project was able to achieve its outcomes within the established budget (pg. 31). The Project Document was signed in August 2011 and the Fifth National Communication (FNC) had to be submitted to the UNFCCC by December 2012, leaving only 17 months for implementation. Given the short timeframe for implementation, timely procurement for the scientific studies became an issue for the project. UNDP procurement guidelines required that the project team evaluate at least three different proposals for each study. The TE notes that the team had difficulty finding highly qualified consultants capable of responding to requirements of the procurement process, which resulted in delays (pg. 18). The FNC was ultimately submitted to the UNFCCC on time, however some of the studies were not completed in time to be included in the final draft (TE pg. 21).

The original end date for the project was December 2012, however the project was extended to September 2013 in order to complete key activities, such as the presentation of the FNC to key stakeholders (2013 PIR pg. 17). Although all activities were completed in 2013, the project received another extension until October 2014 in order to complete the TE (2014 PIR pg. 9). The TE was not completed until January 2015, in large part due to the restructuring of the executing agency, changes in the federal government administration, and staff turnover at the UNDP country office (TE pg. 9).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project sustainability. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Moderately Likely**. The Mexican Government has developed the necessary legal and institutional arrangements for addressing climate change, and national stakeholder participation in the development of the Fifth National Communication (FNC) was comparatively strong. Moderate risks include the underrepresentation of the private sector and legislature, which could weaken support for the long-term objectives of the project. Additionally, it should be noted that the TE does not provide enough information to assess the sustainability of financial resources and environmental risks.

Financial Resources

The TE does not provide enough information to assess the sustainability of financial resources.

Sociopolitical

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for sociopolitical sustainability. The TE does not note any political risks that could undermine the longevity of project outcomes. Compared to the development of previous national communications, stakeholder participation was strong from the government sector, scientific community, and non-governmental organizations (TE pg. 24; 30). The TE does note however, that the private sector and legislative representatives were underrepresented which could weaken the long-term objectives of the project.

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

This TER provides a rating of **Likely** for the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance. The TE notes that the Mexican Government has developed the necessary legal and institutional arrangements for addressing climate change. In 2005, the government established the Inter-Ministerial Climate Change Commission (CICC), which coordinates the formulation and implementation of national policies for greenhouse gas mitigation and sequestration and climate change adaptation (PD pg. 15). In 2012, the Mexican Congress passed a General Law on Climate Change, which provides the necessary regulatory framework for climate change activities (TE pg. 28). Mexico has also demonstrated its commitment to fulfilling its international commitments. At the time of the TE, Mexico was also the only non-Annex I country to have submitted five national communications to the UNFCCC (TE pg. 27).

Environmental

The TE does not provide enough information to assess environmental sustainability.

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?

It was expected that the Mexican Government would provide \$4.4 million in co-financing for the project. The TE does not provide actual co-financing information, noting that the project did not monitor the contributions of the Mexican Government. The TE does notes that, "there is sufficient evidence through the interviews to state that there was an important in kind contribution by the Mexican Government to successfully implement the project" (pg. 26). On the other hand, the 2013 PIR states that \$4.22 million in co-financing had materialized by June 30, 2013, and that British Embassy and USAID in Mexico provided an additional \$2 million to include Green Growth in the Fifth National Communication (FNC) (pg. 18). This TER is unable to verify the figures reported in the 2013 PIR.

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?

The project was slated to end in December 2012 upon the submission of the FNC to the UNFCCC. The FNC was submitted on time, however the project was extended to September 2013 in order to complete key activities, including the presentation of the FNC to key stakeholders (2013 PIR pg. 17). The project was extended again to October 2014 in order to complete the TE (2014 PIR pg. 9). However, the TE was not completed until January 2015, in large part due to the restructuring of the executing agency, changes in the federal government administration, and staff turnover at the UNDP country office (TE pg. 9).

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:

The TE does not directly assess country ownership over the project, however it does note that the Government of Mexico was committed to the timely development of the FNC. The executing agency for the project was the National Institute of Ecology (INE)⁶, a decentralized body of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) (PD pg. 34). The exact amount of co-financing contributed by the government is unclear, however the government did invest resources in the project. Representatives from the federal, state, and municipal agencies were involved in the development of the FNC, along with representatives from the scientific community and non-governmental organizations (TE pg. 22). Without the contributions of key stakeholders it is unlikely that the FNC would have been completed on time.

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E design at entry. The logic behind the results framework is sound, although the wording of the objective and outcomes is confusing. The results framework does

⁶ The INE was later renamed the National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC).

not include indicators, SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely) or otherwise. The indicators and targets provided merely restate the project’s outputs. For example, Indicator D for Outcome 3 is: “Macroeconomic assessment of GHG mitigation measures,” which is the same as Output 1.D. Similarly, the target for this indicator is: “Macroeconomic impact of proposed GHG mitigation measures has been assessed” (PD pg. 29).

The Project Document does include a general M&E plan, outlining M&E activities (development of M&E system, baseline, annual reviews and reports, and a final evaluation) and the associated responsible parties, timeframe, and budget. In total, the Project Document provides a dedicated M&E budget of \$45,000. The M&E budget accounts for approximately 2% of the overall GEF grant, which is relatively low for a project of this size. Overall, the M&E approach contains significant shortcomings and is inappropriate for the project.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E implementation, and notes that there was no documentation available to confirm whether or not the monitoring of project activities occurred. The TE notes that some interviewees claimed that an M&E system was operational throughout the life of the project, however the TE was unable to verify this. A review of the Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) indicates that the indicators were not revised and the reports themselves contained very little detail. The TE was completed, however it was significantly delayed due to the restructuring of the executing agency, changes in the federal government administration, and staff turnover at the UNDP country office (TE pg. 9).

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: Moderately Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for quality of project implementation. As noted above, the project design contained a number of flaws, including an inadequate M&E approach. Although the Fifth National Communication (FNC) was submitted to the UNFCCC on time, the quality of some of the scientific studies was affected by an overly ambitious timeline. UNDP's procurement process also delayed the start of project activities, as it was difficult for the project team to find the required number of qualified consultants to submit proposals for the scientific studies (TE pgs. 17-18). The TE also notes that the restructuring of the UNDP Country Office contributed to delays in completing the TE.

The TE does not assess the quality of supervision and assistance provided to the executing agency. The 2013 PIR does allude to the financial and technical support provided by UNDP, however no other details are provided (pg. 9). Overall, this TER assesses the quality of project implementation to be **Moderately Satisfactory**.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for the quality of project execution. The executing agency for the project was the National Institute of Ecology (INE), a decentralized body of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT). In 2012, the General Law on Climate Change was passed, which broadened the mandate of the INE and renamed it the National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC). The restructuring of the executing agency resulted in staff changes and increased responsibilities. The TE notes that these changes in the executing agency contributed to the delays in completing the project, especially in regard to completing the TE (pg. 9). Additionally, the INECC was responsible for monitoring project activities and results. As mentioned above, it's unclear whether this occurred, however the project reports were incomplete. Despite these shortcomings, project outcomes were largely completed on time, which is notable given the short timeframe for completing the Fifth National Communication (FNC). Therefore, a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project execution is justified.

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

The TE notes that the development of the Fifth National Communication (FNC) contributed to the improvement of the scientific understanding of climate change and enhanced national awareness on climate change (TE pg. 27). The TE does not, however, provide evidence to support these claims.

b) Governance

The TE notes that the development of the FNC influenced the decision-making process that leads to the formulation of climate policies in Mexico. For example, the FNC contributed to the

development of the Special Climate Change Program (2014-2018) (pg. 27).

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 notes that for the first time all national research groups on climate modeling worked together to create climate change scenarios for the FNC. As a result of this work, a Climate Modeling Network emerged (TE pg. 21).

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.

The TE does not cite any GEF initiatives that were adopted at scale by the end of the project.

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.

The TE does not provide any lessons learned.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE states the following recommendations (pg. 29):

- The scope of the outputs and associated studies in the NC [National Communication] should consider: (a) time constraints in the implementation phase, (b) the financial resources available, and (c) the complexity of the scientific investigation. As indicated in the analysis of this TE, it is not recommendable to initiate a complex scientific study with limited time available, since this will lead to unrealistic working calendars and diminished quality of the outputs. ^[L]_[SEP]
- INECC's monitoring and reporting system of activities related to future NCs must improve to enable a more complete, consistent, transparent and accurate verification of the implementation of the project. It is recommended to link the monitoring and reporting to the SIAT-PECC.⁷ ^[L]_[SEP]
- The monitoring and reporting system should include a financial report associated to the contribution in kind in order to enhance transparency and accountability. ^[L]_[SEP]
- The creation of the National Climate Change System, the National Safeguards System for REDD, the National Registry for REED and the National Registry for Emissions should take into account in their design the needs of data and information of NC. These climate policy instruments should enhance and facilitate the flow of information in future NC. ^[L]_[SEP]
- Future NC should integrate better local inputs and knowledge. For example, NC could enhance the participation of NGOs and institutions that work on climate change at a local level in order to understand better best practices and barriers at the local level. ^[L]_[SEP]
- Executive summaries for each chapter could enhance the impact and increase the audience of future NCs and also facilitate the work for the main executive summary of future NCs. ^[L]_[SEP]
- Sectoral executive summary for policy-makers should be developed to enhance public policy impact of future NC. In particular, if the NC tackles specific sectors in-depth. ^[L]_[SEP]
- The publication of NC should not coincide with administrative federal electoral cycles and

⁷ The information monitoring system for Mexico's Special Program on Climate Change (PECC)

changes in administration since this reduces the impact of the NC in public policy. [11]
[SEP]

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 report's assessment of outcomes and impacts is weak. The project results and effectiveness sections read as inventories of interview findings rather than a comprehensive and systematic analysis.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, however the evidence presented is weak. A table is included which indicates that 27 out of 28 outputs were completed, however very little supporting detail is provided.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability was adequately addressed for sociopolitical risks and institutional frameworks and governance. Environmental sustainability and financial resources were not addressed at all.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are not provided. The recommendations provided are supported by the observations provided in the report.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include the final project costs or co-financing. The report does note that the evaluator did not have access to documentation to verify co-financing.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does assess the quality of the project's overall design, however M&E is not adequately addressed. The report provides a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for M&E overall, however it provides no evidence to support this rating.	U
Overall TE Rating		U

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

No additional sources of information were used.