Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4254	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Mitigation Options of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions in Key Sectors in Brazil	
Country/Countries		Brazil	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Enabling Activity	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Science and Technology	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		CNI (the National Confederation of Industry); CAN (the Agriculture and Livestock Confederation); World Wildlife Fund (WWF); World Resources Institute (WRI); Brazilian Forum on Climate Change - Through consultation	
Private sector involvement		Brazil Steel Institute; the ABI Vidro (Brazilian Technical Association of Automatic Glass Industries); ABAL (Brazilian Aluminum Association) and Petrobras (a semi-public Brazilian multinational petroleum industry corporation): Lead executing agency; secondary executing agency; one of the beneficiaries; through consultations]	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 16, 2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 22, 2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 30, 2015	
Actual date of project completion		January 31, 2018	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.04	0.04
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		4.18	3.86
Co-financing	IA own	0.1	0.1
	Government	11.89	14.35
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		4.18	3.86
Total Co-financing		11.99	14.45
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		16.17	18.31
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2018	
Author of TE		Pamela Ransom, Gonçalo Cavalheiro and Gustavo Ribeiro	
TER completion date		December 2018	

TER prepared by	Ritu Kanotra
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Spandana Battula

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the implementation of project activities by the country was expected to generate indirect global environmental benefits through reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG). 'The information raised by the Project (abatement costs and potentials) was fundamentally necessary for the country to implement its Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), by detailing the emission reduction targets established by the National Policy on Climate Change. Effectively implementing these Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions would provide global benefits in terms of reducing Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. The Project has the potential to help change Brazil's policies on energy efficiency (and associated Greenhouse Gas emissions) and assist the country in moving towards a less carbon-intensive and more sustainable energy consumption path'. (PD, Pg 19).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the project's Development Objective was 'to assist the Government of Brazil to strengthen its technical capacity in supporting the implementation of its mitigation actions for greenhouse gas emissions in key economic sectors (industry, energy, transportation, household and services, Land use, Land use change and Forestry (LULUCF), waste management and other cross-sector alternatives) in Brazil' (CEO Endorsement, Pg1). The project is organized into three project components:

Component 1: Mitigation alternatives identified and respective potential and costs quantified for industry, energy, transport, household and services, LULUCF, waste and cross-sector mitigation alternatives for the periods 2012-2035 and 2035-2050

Component 2: Integrated analysis of the different mitigation alternatives in an integrated optimization framework, considering the non-additivity of the different mitigation alternatives and other economic considerations; and an evaluation of the possible impacts of different climate policies on the Brazilian economy; testing domestic measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of proposed mitigation alternatives.

Component 3: Capacity building delivered for federal, state and 2014 FIFA World Cup host cities government institutions, as well as civil society organizations, for implementation of mitigation actions for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in key economic sectors

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

The Global Environmental and Development Objectives of the project remained unchanged 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 project was formulated to support the Government of Brazil in its efforts to reduce emission and, at the same time, allow the country to grow sustainably. To this effect, the project was designed within the framework of the government's policy regarding Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission reduction as stated in in the National Plan on Climate Change (PNMC) and the National Policy on Climate Change. The Project aligned with Brazil's 2012-2015 UNDAF, more specifically with Output 2 "Green Economy and Decent Jobs in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication". The Project was part of the National Strategy for Science, technology and Innovation 2012-2015 (ENCTI 2012-2015), which directs actions of Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTIs) – the main executing agency, as well as to several other national level initiatives for the promotion of environmental sustainability, increasing efficiency in public spending and fostering education science and technology. The Project also aimed to contribute to the implementation of the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) presented by Brazil at Cop-15 (CEO Endorsement, Pg 17).

This project was consistent with GEF's operational criteria for enabling activities in the area of climate change that aim to facilitate the implementation of GEF operational programs. The project aligned with the area of mitigation within the GEF 5 priority strategy framework (2010-4). The project worked on the sectors the GEF strategy prioritized to create a favorable policy and regulatory environment for renewable energy and promote Land use, Land use change and Forestry (LULUCF) activities aimed at "reducing forest emissions and promoting forest conservation, afforestation and reforestation, and sustainable forest management". The project was also linked to the Third National Communication of Brazil to the United Nations Framework for Climate Change (UNFCCC), which was again funded by the GEF, with strong synergies between the two projects.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE assesses effectiveness based on a weighted aggregation of ratings for delivery of outputs, achievement of direct outcomes and likelihood of impact and assigned it a rating of 'moderately satisfactory'. However, this TER has assessed effectiveness on the basis of achievement of the project outcomes and outputs stated in the project document and assigned it a 'satisfactory' rating.

The project produced a wealth of technical reports (141), and final publications (23) on subjects including sectoral and integrated mitigation, economic modelling and public policy instruments needed to achieve required Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions reductions. The TE confirms that the analysis generated helped in building scenarios of greenhouse gas emissions for the key sectors including a reference or baseline, low carbon scenarios with innovation and updated data through projections for two future periods (2012-2035 and 2036-2050). The project produced useful lists of priority policies for target years based on considerations of barriers and costs. There is also evidence of several events and training, on a range of topics, including construction of low carbon scenarios, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions' reduction potential, costs for the different sectors of the economy and low carbon technologies for the key sectors. The trainings and outreach efforts included key government agencies, some of the private sector and civil society.

However, the project experienced delays due to several reasons which in turn impacted the dissemination strategy as the final report was disseminated close to or after the project termination, not leaving much time for wider outreach.

Component 1: Mitigation alternatives identified and respective potential and costs quantified for industry, energy, transport, household and services, LULUCF, waste and cross-sector mitigation alternatives for the periods 2012-2035 and 2035-2050 –**Satisfactory**

As per the TE, all the reports related to assessment of the potential for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission reduction and estimation of abatement costs were completed for the industrial sector (11 identified sub sectors). As per the target, the project carried out the assessments for energy, transport, household and service sector and LULUCF sectors that also led to development of policy instruments for all the sectors covered under the project. However, although reported as completed, some of the modeling reports of low carbon options produced during the project were not made available for some of the sub-sectors (food and beverage, cement, Pig iron and Steel, Ceramic, Mining and Thermonuclear industries, renewable energy ad biofuels) during the TE. Outputs in terms of quality of reports and process adopted to produce these reports and publications were found satisfactory.

Component 2: Integrated analysis of the different mitigation alternatives in an integrated optimization framework, considering the non-additivity of the different mitigation alternatives and other economic considerations; and an evaluation of the possible impacts of different climate policies on the Brazilian economy; testing domestic measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of proposed mitigation alternatives- **Satisfactory**

This output was a critical part of the project and all the reports were completed 'satisfactorily'. This output included the process of integrated analysis of mitigation alternatives, evaluation of impacts on the Brazilian economy and finally, testing, domestic measurement, reporting and verification of the mitigation alternatives. The activities for this component were characterized as dependent on the

sectoral analysis and technical reports produced in Output 1 of the project as delays in Output 1 resulted in delays in Output 2. This phase of work produced 16 reports and two publications. The publications "Integrated Modeling and Economic Impacts of Low Carbon Sectorial Options" and the "Mitigation trajectories and public policies to meet the Brazilian Paris Agreement Targets" published in the website are evidence for this output and were made available to the evaluation team and within the project, thus meeting end of project targets.

Component 3: Capacity building for federal, state and 2014 FIFA World Cup host cities government institutions, as well as civil society organizations, for implementation of mitigation actions for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in key economic sectors **– Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates this component as 'highly satisfactory'. But based on the evidence in the report, this TER assesses it to be 'moderately satisfactory'. As per the TE, over 1,000 people participated in the trainings organized by the project. As per the outputs under this component, the trainings were targeted at the federal and state level institutions and 2014 FIFA World Cup host cities and civil society organizations on climate change mitigation, and were considered to be 'highly satisfactory' as per the interviews conducted during TE (Pg 74). Another output expected under this component related to dissemination strategy for targeted stakeholders representing different communities and sectors. The technical coordinator of the project attended various relevant international forums like COP21 in Peru and Paris including Adaptations Future 2014 and 37th International Association for Energy Economics (IAEE). However, as the TE noted, despite efforts like project reports posted on websites and use of media, issues like 'communication plan developed later in the project', 'dissatisfaction with the recommended strategies of the consultant hired for communication', limited the scope and time available for report dissemination and media outreach. Moreover, release of the final report of the project towards the very end of the project was another factor that constrained the extensive additional communication and dissemination of the project results.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the efficiency of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project was delayed and granted one year no-cost extension. As per the TE, some of operational hurdles faced during the project included shift from hiring an institutional partner for industrial sector to individual consultants, transition to a new financial system within UNEP that delayed payments and other administrative processes including processing contracts, agreements and payments. This also exacerbated the workflow problems causing delays during the initial years of project implementation. While delays in the project implementation had a negative impact on some aspects of the project outputs, like dissemination of results but time saving measures such as use of existing institutions and partnerships improved the efficiency of the project.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

The TE assesses the sustainability of the project as 'satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the TE in terms of the overall financial, institutional and socio-political risks to the sustainability of the project outcomes, this TER assigns it a rating of 'moderately likely'. The details along the four dimensions of sustainability are given below:

Financial: Moderately Likely

The TE rates the risk to financial sustainability as 'moderately satisfactory', which this TER assessed as 'moderately likely'. The TE reviews the overall financial and economic environment in Brazil to assess funding for climate change mitigation related interventions in the future. The TE notes a positive trend towards climate funding over recent years with the evidence such as climate change policy funded through domestic sources and Brazil's financial institutions prepared to finance low Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emitting technologies. But, the TE also highlights the role played by international cooperation in financing mitigation in Brazil, with reported cuts in budget in recent years including the budgets of major Ministries (up to 50%) such as the Environment Ministry, which raises issues with respect to the Government's ability to monitor deforestation adequately (Climate Action, 2017 as cited by the TE, Pg 105). In sum, while there is an interest and positive trend towards climate funding in Brazil, recent cuts in the international funding pose risk to the financial sustainability, bringing the rating to 'moderately likely'.

Socio-political: Moderately likely

As per the TE, the project had 'high level of ownership, interest and commitment among government' (TE, pg 103) towards climate change mitigation. The ownership was evident by a number of government Ministries that supported the project and had 'close engagement with Technical Consultative Committee (comprised of members from 14 ministries)'(TE, Pg. 103). According to the TE, some of the ministries adopted or changed policies on the basis of project inputs. For instance, 'The Ministry of Transport utilized information from the project in development of its Environmental Guidelines, with suggestions it will influence sectoral plans' (TE, Pg. 103). While, the TE cautions that ownership could be at risk in case of future changes in the government, but it notes that Brazil's historic leadership and mechanisms embedded in the national political system make climate change mitigation a priority across governments. The likelihood of Brazil hosting UNFCCC COP in 2019 is another sign of Brazil's commitment to climate change. While high level of interest among civil society and the private sector also contribute to enabling environment, involvement of some of the sectors such as livestock and agriculture in adopting measures related to climate change mitigation may pose greater challenge, due to which the risk to overall socio-political environment is rated as 'moderately satisfactory' and this TER rates it as 'moderately likely'.

Institutional: Moderately likely

The TE rates the institutional sustainability as 'moderately satisfactory'. As per the TE, the country had a 'robust institutional mechanism' in place to sustain and support the direct outcomes of the project. The TE confirms that Brazil has already started the discussion on an implementation strategy of the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) that would result in adoption of policies and measures based on the project outputs. Moreover, the project enhanced the capacity of the relevant individuals at the federal, state and city levels to support the project outcomes in the future. The TE also notes that, except in few instances, the staff turnover and loss of institutional capacity at the federal level was also not a major concern since some of the posts were held for several years (more than 10 years in some cases). However, the situation varied across different states. While the larger states and cities had the history of participating actively in the project, the TE notes challenges in maintaining the outcomes in other states and cities due to both staff retention and lack of resources, due to which the risk to overall institutional framework for sustaining project outcomes is rated as 'moderately likely'.

Environmental: Likely

There are no environmental risks identified in the TE due to which it is a assigned a rating of 'likely'.

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?

According to the TE, the project raised a co-financing of $14,455,564 as against a planned target of $11,992,400. While the contribution from the UNEP was same as planned ($102,400), the in-kind contribution from Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication (MCTIC) was $14,353,164 as against a planned contribution of $10,812,000. However, the cash contribution from MCTIC didn't materialize as all of their co-financing was in-kind. The TE doesn't discuss the impact of enhanced co-financing on the project outcomes and sustainability. The enhanced in-kind contribution could possibly be due to extension of the project closing date.

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 planned project closing date, as per the available documents, was November 30, 2015 and the project actually closed on January 31, 2018. So, the project was delayed by almost 3 yrs. The project experienced delays due to administrative reasons (such as delays in hiring the technical consultants for the industry sector and delays in fulfilling payment commitments due the change of the financial systems at UN Environment). This led to revision in work plans to reflect new economic situation that further delayed the project. Moreover, as per the TE, the process of reviewing and editing the reports also required greater time than was originally foreseen. All the outputs were interlinked and delays in reports generated under Output 1 led to delay in start of the activities under Output 2. But, as per the TE, the project was able to overcome these challenges and complete most of the activities except that the time allocated to disseminate the final products of the project was not adequate due to delays.

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:

As per the TE, the project had good ownership by the country both during the design and implementation with all the official channels and procedures properly established (the Steering Committee) that had positive effect in achieving outputs. The project was also supported through the working relationships and close engagement from the public sector institutions and a number of government ministries (representatives from 14 ministries) through their membership in the Technical Consultative Committee. According to the TE, some of the ministries were planning to use and build on the data from the project for future initiatives. For instance, the Ministry of Transport utilized information from the project in development of its Environmental Guidelines, suggesting the ownership and uptake of some of the project outputs.

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 rates the M&E Design at entry as 'satisfactory' and this TER concurs with the rating. The M&E plan outlined in the project document, was quite comprehensive including data collection methods, frequency of data collection and a results framework with deliverable, benchmarks and targets for each outcome. The framework clearly demarcated reporting responsibilities at the outset of the project with adequate budget allocation for different monitoring activities. As per the TE, the indicators originally decided at the project design were reviewed by the members of the project team and Steering Committee members in 2015 to make these more specific and measurable.

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

As per the TE, the M&E implementation was 'satisfactory' and this TER agrees with the rating. All the Project Implementation Reports (PIR) were completed in time, were quite detailed except few flaws, and issues raised in the reports were followed up during the Steering Committee meetings for adaptive management. The Steering Committee was instrumental in reviewing the outputs regularly and made recommendation about the project, including the project extension, discussions around budget and involvement of the state. But the TE notes that the membership base of the Steering Committee was not as broad and inclusive as originally planned, probably because there was another committee constituted – Technical Consultative Committee that was also involved in reviewing the project outputs and providing recommendations on the technical aspects of the project. The baselines and the indicators were also revised once the project started. The project decided not to carry out the mid-term evaluation but, as per the TE, the project prepared half yearly reports but these couldn't be made available for reference during the TE. But, overall, the project seemed to have systems in place for regular monitoring and adaptive management.

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 TE neither assesses nor assigns a rating to the quality of the project implementation. But based on the narrative in the report, this TER assigns it a rating of 'satisfactory'. The project was implemented by UN Environment's Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (UN Environment DTIE), through a task manager and financial management officers. The UN Environment office in Brazil provided the required support to the project management at Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication (MCTIC) through a project officer and financial assistant. As per the TE, the project faced delays largely due to UN Environment's administrative issues (change in their financial system). But the TE also notes that the change in the financial system was an organization wide phenomena and financial staff of UN Environment provided support and worked in collaboration with the project staff to adopt to the new financial system. It also supported the project with an extensive review of project targets, indicators and adjustment of the budgetary surplus resulting from a depreciation of the Real compared to the US dollar. Overall, there is no indication in the TE that the project didn't get adequate support from the UN Environment, due to which the quality of project implementation is rated as 'satisfactory'.

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

The TE doesn't assess the 'quality of project execution'. But based on the narrative in the TE, this TER assesses the quality of project execution as 'satisfactory'. The project was executed by the Brazil Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication (MCTIC) that contributed a budget of $18,635,564 as compared to the $16,172,400 originally approved. Apart from the Project Steering Committee, the project also constituted a Technical Consultative Committee composed of 14 ministerial agencies that helped to facilitate interagency coordination and adaptive management through reviewing the project outputs regularly. The project team also hired a technical coordinator, who according to the TE, played a key role in the production of the outputs and in achieving the outcomes. The project seemed to have adequate support from the officials at the municipal and state level, facilitated through the efforts of the Steering Committee and the Technical Consultative Committee.

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 project was an enabling activity and was not designed to bring any immediate environmental changes.

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 doesn't provide information on any socio-economic changes brought about by 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

As per the TE, the project built technical capacity in universities and through the numerous (37) training events reaching 659 participants, of which over half were federal government employees and the rest from state, municipal governments and civil society. Trainings covered different topics, including construction of low carbon scenarios, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions' reduction potential, costs for the different sectors of the economy and low carbon technologies for the key sectors. In addition to trainings, the project sought to engage through workshops with industrial sector associations, that although sometimes controversial, also brought enhanced attention to the issues surrounding mitigation options.

The regional trainings (6 cycles in 6 cities – one for each region of Brazil + Brasilia) focused on issues including Monitoring Verification and Reporting (MRV) and the use of the SIRENE system - the platform of the national inventory of greenhouse gases. The project exceeded its target of technicians from at least 20 states trained with 21 states represented. Participant survey conducted during the TE provided evidence for both training benefits and limitations (benefits include: evidence of fairly widespread National Inventory database access; low database difficulty; with relatively high representation of women and engineers. However, limitations include: challenges in the numbers and distribution of those trained not actually dealing with mitigation or using it for monitoring or mitigation actions, and increased needs for databases to be regionally sensitive, cover more sectors, and for greater attention to alignment between federal and regional policies) this mixed feedback demonstrates the need for additional follow-up and new strategies.

b) Governance

The project activities led to the identification of policy instruments to promote Greenhouse Gas (GHG) abatement in each of the target sectors. However, as per the TE, 'the policy making process in Brazil will now enter a slow phase, in anticipation of the 2018 presidential elections, which may lead to delays in the use of project outputs in the adoption of new Greenhouse Gas (GHG) mitigation policies' (PD, Pg 56).

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 doesn't note any unintended impacts 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.

There is no clear evidence in the report on this aspect.

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 key lessons listed in the TE are given below:

1. The process of engagement with the industrial sector outreach should begin early with negotiations to lay the groundwork for future project data needs and requests. Attention should be paid to a range of processes to ensure appropriate planning of travel arrangements for outside participants, design of short sessions rather than day long meetings and increased use of technology such as group skype or teleconferencing.
2. The Technical Consultative Committee for agencies should be combined with a project specific Citizens Advisory Committee/Sectoral Working Groups involving civil society, think tanks, academia and private sector groups, which should be established to build ongoing project understanding and buy in overtime and to ensure a consistent pace of consultation throughout the project.
3. Need for regular contact with stakeholders through sharing newsletters, publications and involving strategies like online/remote consultations.
4. Project oversight should ensure opportunities for GEF to interact with management through occasional key event attendance or video conference consultation for regular updates.
5. Need to strengthen financial management and project monitoring and reporting through financial backups by maintaining spreadsheets; improving project report number and dating system for easy retrieval of repots and document review and holding meetings between project staff and field UN staff early in the project.
6. The Project Technical Coordinator role, which manages the project deliverables, is essential for the success of the project.

7. For the technical training on the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) inventory, need to tailor these to the needs of dealing with mitigation and careful guidance on monitoring or mitigation actions; needs for databases to be regionally sensitive, to cover more sectors, and for greater alignment between federal and regional policies.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations listed in the TE are listed below:

1. As part of an exit strategy, the Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication team is advised to hold a follow-up meeting with all key relevant ministries to discuss and handover the recommendations under the project.
2. Create specific titles in key Ministries, federal and state agencies and legislative bodies of those who a) need to have understanding of project findings and recommendations over time b) those with actual control over greenhouse gas mitigation policy development, implementation and monitoring. Also consult with sample experts in diverse disciplines at universities about creative methods to ensure project history/ dissemination. Get feedback from key target audiences (through interview, survey or focus group) to improve access to, use and understanding of info on Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication website.
3. A project follow-up Key Sector greenhouse gas Mitigation Action Plan should be developed that identifies specific key target actors and type of follow up/ information and/or additional training needed to enhance project understanding and movement forward on policy objectives and mitigation actions.
4. Develop a shorter single report/document that consolidates, ties together and summarizes key highlights of what a reader needs to understand from all of the project components and policy recommendations.
5. To overcome challenges of possible 'elite capture' and 'gender blindness' special efforts for outreach related to gender and marginalized groups can occur through a targeted seminars and creation of a resource guide to map and connect relevant resources and groups by city, state and region.
6. For Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication events and trainings, create formal systems or templates for more consistent labelling of cycles, events and trainings.

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 TE has made quite a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and the evidence presented complete and convincing for most of the topics covered as part of evaluation. However, the TE didn't make an assessment of the quality of the implementation and execution. Although the report has some evidence on these two aspects but it is not comprehensively covered under one section.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section of the report was well written with adequate evidence from the field.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented in the main report.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE made an assessment of the quality of the design of the M&E system as well as its implementation including the processes adopted by the project to take the information into consideration for adaptive management.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

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

The TER used only the TE for information.