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# Executive Summary
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Project Description

This Enabling Activity project will assist Brazil to prepare the Fourth National Communication (4NC) and Biennial Update Reports (BUR) required to meet obligations under the UNFCCC. The objective is to extend coverage of the annual Brazilian Inventory of Anthropogenic GHGs to period 1990 – 2014 focusing on the sectors/gases that have a significant share of GHG emissions and/or present a large degree of data uncertainty. The Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM) and downscaling with the Regional Earth System Model, developed to reduce the uncertainties in V&A assessments for different sectors, will be used to document climate scenarios. Furthermore, Brazil’s description of national circumstances will be updated, as well as the steps to be taken or envisaged to implement the Convention. Finally, the project will continue to build institutional capacity for implementing the Convention in Brazil including undertaking activities related to climate change education and awareness.

Project Progress Summary

**Progress towards Project Objective**. Substantial progress towards the PO has been made since project initiation. This includes: (i) status of the national GHG inventories based on progress against specified requirements in on-going sector-based LOAs (LULUCF [58%], Energy [50%], and Waste and Agriculture [33 %]), respectively; (ii) contributions to the Status of Assessment National Circumstances (of the 20 products defined to support the NC Nat Cir chapter 9 have been submitted and validated [45%]); (iii) level of institutional capacity (increased) in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change a number of outputs have been achieved to date which include preparation of a communication plan, MCTIC publications, development of infographics (10), translation of IPPC reports into Portuguese for distribution to Lusophone countries; and (iv) BUR 2 and BUR 3 have been prepared, approved and submitted and the outcome achieved. Given that the PMU has staffed up, LOAs are now in place, most work is near or above 50 % completion at the time of the MTR the Mission believes that progress towards the project objective is satisfactory based on the results of three of the five outcomes. One outcome, the preparation of the 4NC itself will not occur until 2020 but given satisfactory progress on the main inputs to the NC this should not be an issue. For the remaining outcome, it is not clear how the reparation and distribution of knowledge products will lead to increasing level of institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change and should be reconciled either in modification of the indicator/target or in the monitoring and reporting.

**Progress Towards Outcomes.** There is also substantial evidence of progress at the outcome level. The difficulty is quantifying what point progress has reached at the time of the MTR with respect to EOP targets. It is clear that outcome 6 has been achieved (BUR2 and BUR3) and inputs are still being finalized before Outcome 5 can be initiated (4NC). Reports are being completed in anticipation for review and comment in April 2019 under Outcome 2 (National Circumstances) so this appears to be on the verge of completion. Progress towards achieving an improved and updated National GHG Inventory (Outcome 1) ranges from 30 to 58 percent based on delivery of sector-specific products through their respective LOAs. Under Outcome 3 (Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures) the scenarios using the BESM have been developed and provided to the international ESGF-INPE platform and are available for researchers contracted under this component to complete their work. Progress has also been documented for other non-model related activities under this outcome. However, the establishment of a network of low cost data collection devices for the assessment of the human perception of climate variability (extreme events) and change, to be used as a metric for adaptation policies may be dropped from the Project though the survey to assess human perception of climate variability and change will be retained..

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | **Objective Achievement**: To assist the GoB to perform the activities necessary to prepare the 4NC and BUR in accordance with the UNFCCC.Achievement Rating: 5 (S) | See outcome achievement descriptions below. |
| **Outcome 1:** National GHG inventory is improved and updated Achievement Rating: 5 (S) | - technical meetings: (i) methodological approach to inventory, (ii) w/ MCTIC staff (SIRENE improvements), (iii) w/partners in support of inventory- finalized LOAs w/ partners;- time serie extension to 2016;- secured arrangements with public/private sectors to gain access to data;- Rede CLIMA mobilized a network of experts responsible for the evaluation and analysis of methodological applications related to GHG emissions. Workshops conducted to evaluate the data quality and methodological aspects with government and sector specialists to discuss improvements for the next inventory; and- SIRENE in the process of being improved that includes requirement assessments (Step 1) completed for Energy, Industrial Processes and Waste Treatment sectors and are under development for the LULUCF and Agriculture sectors. Delivery: By sector (based on letters of agreements): LULUCF (58%); Energy (50%); Waste and Agriculture (33 %). |
| **Outcome 2:** National circumstances, envisaged steps for the Convention implementation, and other relevant information**.** Achievement Rating: 5 (S) | - organized a number of meetings to facilitate Rede CLIMA support to the 4NC as well as secure assistance of other partner to provide inputs/support to the process; - hired consultants to assist with preparation of documents; and- collection of information on needs and gaps carried out to prepare BUR3 was used to update this 4CN and will be discussed with the government to obtain additional inputs in April.Delivery: of 20 products defined to support Nat Cir chapter, 9 have been submitted and validated (45%) |
| **Outcome 3:** Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures. Achievement Rating: 5 (S) | - BESM scenarios generated since the TNC were submitted to the CMIP5 project and are available through the ESGF-INPE platform. Project team is in discussions with INPE to assess if possible to incorporate BESM data into 4CN;- following technical meetings in 2016/2017 it was agreed approach to sub-component would be based on “transversal” topics (e.g., Food Safety, Energy Security, Water Safety and Socio-environmental Safety) . These studies are in the final phase and will be delivered shortly and be used to discuss options in support of adaptation in a workshop in later April / early May, 2019; and- impact and vulnerability studies are in process of being completed for the subcomponent and assessing the use of biomes as an approach to regional impact analysis |
| **Outcome 4:** Public Awareness and Education Strategy in Place. Achievement Rating: 5 (S) | - meetings in support of preparation of a communications strategydefinition of a CC-based communication strategy; - MCTIC publications to increase public awareness of national emissions and Policy of Climate Change (PNMC) completed for years 2016 and 2017 and currently in preparation for 2019;- MCTIC contracting of specialized company to develop infographics to be made available on the MCTIC and SIRENE websites (10 developed to date);- new SIRENE web site was launched in December. 2018 with a new structure and ease of access to information by the general public; - participation of representatives of 4NC project management and technical team in workshops / events to share experiences and promote knowledge dissemination and capacity building (e.g., Government of Pernambuco, Climate Observatory NGO, GIZ/ Ministry of Cities, MMA/REDD+ among others); and- IPPC report on impacts/significance of CC-related increases in temperatures translated into Portuguese and made available to lusophone countries |
| **Outcome 5:** Publication and submission of the 4NC. Achievement Rating: 5 (S)  | - hiring of English translator consultant, definition of 4NC's preliminary index and sharing of proposed index with government; and- scope and structure of Reference Reports defined and shared with the partners through letters of agreement |
| **Outcome 6:** Preparation and submission of Biennial Update Reports (BUR) in 2016 and 2018. Achievement Rating: 6 (HS) | - BUR 2 prepared and submitted to UNFCCC in March 2017; and- BUR 3 prepared and submitted to UNFCCC in March 2019Outcome achieved |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | Achievement Rating: 5 (S) | Management arrangements were found to be sound having evolved from previous NCs. The TPC was to meet semi-annually but has only met once at the time of MTR. The PMU is efficient and respected by its partner institutions. The AWP process is also satisfactory with only minor budget reallocations made over the first half of the Project. . The PRODOC and Results Framework had a number of weaknesses; the latter does not appear to be used as an M&E tool. Quality of execution, in particular following the signing of LOA is proceeding with few delays and the disbursement gap appears to be narrowing. Supervision has been satisfactory. Financial management, disbursement and audit all seemed to be in compliance at the time of the MTR. |
| **Sustainability** | Achievement Rating: 3 (ML) | An analysis of risks from the time of the PRODOC indicated they are either no longer relevant (e.g., finding and contracting high quality individuals for the PMU) or continue to be categorized as low (e.g., financial and public support of the 4NC process). It is the Mission’s view however that the Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability, initially ranked as low at the time of project preparation, has increased due to the need for additional caution associated with any change of government that could either directly or indirectly influence progress towards achieving a project objective and has been upgraded from “low” to “medium. |

Summary of Conclusions

Despite an initial delay in project start-up reflected in lags in disbursement, the 4NC Project appears to be progressing satisfactory at the time of MTR. Delays in implementation appeared to be more due to the need to review draft Letters of Agreement (*cartas de acordo*) among the legal units of some of the project partners (either because they were new partners to the process and/or had a change of staff) reflecting due diligence regardless of whether these were new or a continuation of previous agreements. As a result the disbursement curve shows a gap in the first year though this is also due to UNDP’s structural approach to project disbursement over LOP, rather than a delay in the implementation of project activities. A review of PIR 1 and the partial PIR 2 shows progress though somewhat difficult to evaluate due to lack of targets and indicators included in the PRODOC for use at the time of the MTR per GEF policy at the time (GEF 4). In discussions with the PMU significant budget revisions appear not to be needed at this time and/or can be addressed through the continuation of minor budget revisions typical of those realized during the implementation of the first half of the project. Finally, a review of the main outputs of a recent PMU Strategic Workshop held in February 2019 appears sound and projects the submission of an approved 4NC to UNFCCC on December 2020 assuming there are no delays in securing GoB approval, some 4 months later than initially projected in the PRODOC.

An analysis of risks from the time of the PRODOC indicated they are either no longer relevant (e.g., finding and contracting high quality individuals for the PMU) or continue to be categorized as low (e.g., financial and public support of the 4NC process). It is the Mission’s view however that the Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability, initially ranked as low at the time of project preparation, has increased due to the need for additional caution associated with any change of government that could either directly or indirectly influence progress towards achieving a project objective. Fortunately support appears to remain strong within MCTIC and several of its national collaborators (e.g., the Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Food, Mines and Energy and Foreign Affairs). Nevertheless, in at least one case it is unclear to what degree future collaboration will occur with MCTIC. For this reason the risk was upgraded from “low” to “medium.”

The NC process is really a program linked by a sequence of NC projects in which each current project is linked to the previous one (sequentially programmatic) dependent on the approval and submission of the previous NC by the non-Annex 1 country. In the case of Brazil, in addition to the EA budget allocation to support the NC process, GoB has sought additional resources through its GEF STAR allocation for activities complementary to the NC process and in support of the country’s CC programme. Given the size and significance of Brazil in terms of global CC this appears completely justified and certainty within GEF’s policies as STAR allocation is designed to allow countries to prioritize what are the among global issues to justify GEF support. The issue however is the STAR allocation process is separate from the EA allocation process, the former being highly competitive requiring the submission of project concept (PIF) early to GEF in parallel to the still uncompleted NC process due to the need to “lock-in” a project design and budget that has not benefited fully from the on-going NC process. This is not efficient and can affect the smooth transition between NCs (e.g., through staff disruption, barriers to fully take advantage of lessons-learned from the previous NC into the design to the next NC and risk to maintaining continuity with partners).

No NC in Brazil has yet to be submitted and approved within the timeframe stated in the EA project design. In the TNC this took 15 months. While in practice, PMU/MCTIC represents the Brazilian government in fact it cannot guarantee that the document can be approved and delivered on a timely basis. Delays, where they occur, may be due to lack of consensus among two or more ministries and the need for their resolution. Mitigating these differences is one of the key roles of MRE in the NC process. The task of the PMU is to reduce the risk of lack of consensus among counterpart ministries collaborating in the process before it reaches the end of the process. MCTIC is fully aware of the importance of continued outreach and engagement with other ministries during the NC process.

 Over the previous three NCs a series of inter-institutional relationships, facilitated by Rede CLIMA and individual collegial relationships have built up that has proven critical to the NC process. Other key factors include: (i) accumulated (and retained) experience derived from earlier NCs; (ii) putting in place a solid PMU team (many bringing experience from earlier NCs) that based on the Mission’s discussions with partner institutions, is highly respected by their counterparts; (iii) commitments from a range of individuals/partners to the “cause” (as evidence by working as volunteers or taking on supplementary duties); and (iv) support from UNDP. Taken as a whole all the above factors appear to have combined to contribute to overcoming the shortcomings of the PRODOC and associated Results Framework/Logframe.

Many of the issues associated with PRODOC and Results Framework/Logframe could have been resolved with an Inception workshop. This was recognized in the revised 2016 version of the earlier PRODOC in making a number of recommendations to be addressed in a proposed IW following approval. Nevertheless, the workshop never took place (though there was a meeting of partner institutions following project approval, but UNDP was not represented, and it did not address many of the weaknesses of the PRODOC and Results Framework).

Recommendation Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Recommendation** |
| Revisions to PRODOC Results Framework/Logframe | Given that the Project is at the midpoint of implementation and progress seems to be proceeding satisfactorily with no major issues found it is not recommended to revise the Logframe (e.g., replacing existing indicators with SMART indicators and estimating new, quantifiable targets) at this time. However, in looking ahead to the Terminal Evaluation (TE) there are several issues that should be addressed at this time. These are: - project extension. The existing PMU strategy for the remaining half of the Project calls for submission of an approved NC in December 2020, 4 months later than is called for in the PRODOC and additional 12 months for outreach, communication and information dissemination activities following the NC submission for a total of 16 months. The Mission believes that a no-cost extension is warranted;- elimination of a component activity. Under Component/Outcome 3, the PRODOC calls for the establishment of a network of low cost data collection devices for the assessment of the human perception of climate variability. This appears to be an “orphan” activity and should be dropped (or modified) and the indicator/target eliminated (or revised); and- revision of indicator (or revision of means of monitoring/reporting). Under Component/Outcome 4 it is not clear how the preparation and distribution of knowledge products as reported in the PIR 1 and partial PIR 2 will lead to increasing level of institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change (the respective Results Framework/Logframe indicator). Either the indicator should be changed or provide a different means of monitoring and reporting progress against it.It is further recommended that these changes and more generally, the main results and recommendations resulting from the PMU strategic planning workshop held in February 2019 should be put into a proposal including budget and calendar to cover the remainder period of project implementation (including the extension) to review and discus with UNDP. |
| Transition between 4NC and 5NC | The PMU/UNDP should avail of the opportunity to bring the lessons learned derived from the 4NC into the project design of the 5NC formerly and work for a more robust and clearer PRODOC and a Logframe that can be used as a useful M&E and reporting tool. The recommended “no cost” extension above would provide an ideal opportunity to do this in parallel to the other proposed activities following the submission of the 4NC. |
| Consideration to expand/diversify 5NC initiatives | The 5NC process provides the opportunity to continue to build on the strength of previous NCs. It is suggested that the PMU, building on many of its own initiatives, should consider supporting: (i) greater inter-ministerial outreach; (ii) broadening the circle of traditional partner institutions; (iii) increasing public awareness and communication; (iv) incorporating State and municipal governments into the process; (v) putting greater emphasis on broadening and diversifying the message of the NC to reach “the people;” and (vi) developing a communication strategy and plan to be incorporated into project design of the 5NC. |
| Use of process indicators | Simple process indicators should be developed and included in the 5NC results framework to facilitate tracking and evaluating project progress perhaps using the LOAs as a basis to identify indicators and targets per component/sub-component. |
| Inception workshops | For the 5NC it is recommended that an inception workshop, scheduled for the first trimester following project initiation, be built into project design with accompanying indicator and budget |
| UNDP project support | In the coming 5NC, dependent on staff changeover in the PMU and broadening and inclusion of new partners, UNDP may want to consider supporting additional workshops early during the implementation of the project in particular in explaining administrative, budgeting and reporting requirements. |
| Strategic workshops | The Mission recommends that the PMU consider the increased use of strategic workshops (e.g., similar to the February 2019 workshop) perhaps on an annual basis starting during the PRODOC design process of 5NC and followed in anticipation of AWP preparation. |
| Tripartite Committee | The Mission recommends that the Tripartite Committee TPC should meet on a “when and as needed” basis |
| Co-financing | Though not a GEF requirement for EA projects, the PMU and UNDP may want to consider identifying and tracking sources and amounts of co-financing to have on hand at the time of the Terminal Evaluation (TE); always useful to report as an indicator of government and public support for the NC process. |
| Wider dissemination of Brazil’s NC experience | Brazil’s cumulative and evolutionary experience over 4 NCs has led to the development of relative sophisticated and effective institutional arrangements and processes, particularly in the preparation of the GHG Inventory. This approach appears to be both highly valuable and likely to be unique. It is suggested external resources should be sough, perhaps with the assistance of UNDP/GEF/UNFCCC to support greater efforts to disseminate these experiences (e.g., an international workshop attended by other countries to share experiences and compare lessons learned). |

# I. Introduction

1. The stated purpose of the Mid-term Review (MTR) is to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes of the Project leading to the preparation and submission of Brazil’s Fourth National Communication (4NC) and Biennial Update Reports (BURs) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) as specified in the Project Document (PRODOC) and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the Project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR is also intended to review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability.
2. The Terms of Reference (TORs) state that the MTR is expected to provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR Mission Leader is expected to review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. Project Identification Form [PIF], UNDP Initiation Plan, the PRODOC, project reports including Annual Project Reviews, Project Implementation Reports [PIR], project budget revisions and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).
3. The MTR team is further expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office (CO), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser (RTA), and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is considered vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: representatives from the executing agency and from the project´s Steering Committee, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts in the subject area, project stakeholders and academia. Additionally, the MTR team leader (the Consultant) is expected to complete one field mission to Brasília, Brazil.
4. In the MTR’s review and assessment of the Project specific tasks were to be addressed under the following four aspects:

- Project Strategy.The main tasks under the assessment of project strategy was to focus on project design and quality at time of entry into implementation to includereviews of: (i) the problems to be addressed by the Project and the underlying assumptions, (ii) relevance of the project strategy and how it addresses country priorities and (iii) decision-making processes. Under this task a detailed assessment would be completed of the project’s objectives, outcomes and components/activities to determine feasibility of design, funding levels and time frame to achieve stated objectives/outcomes. A key task was to evaluate the project’s logframe including an assessment of indicators and targets (to include gender aspects);

- Progress Towards Results. The main task under this category was to review the progress towards the stated project outcomes achieved at the time of the MTR and complete an assessment of the likelihood of meeting the stated end-of-project (EOP) targets using UNDP’s Progress Towards Results Matrix for presentation purposes. Key elements under this task were to identify key constraints faced by the Project to achieve EOP outcomes and where necessary, propose mitigative measures as well as identify opportunities in which the Project could further expand on the achievement of stated benefits;

- Project Implementation and Adaptive Management.Under this task, the Consultant was to review the project’s management arrangements (overall effectiveness, quality of Executing Agency [EA] / Implementing Agency [IA] execution and level and quality of supervision support provided by UNDP); timeliness and quality of project implementation; financing and co-financing (including issues associated with budget reallocation if necessary); flow of funds and existence and application of effective financial controls; design, application and effectiveness of a project-level M&E systems; stakeholder engagement; reporting; and communications; and

- Sustainability.An assessment of risks identified during project design and implementation was to be completed to confirm if correctly identified and addressed. In this assessment specific reviews of potential risks associated with financial, socio-economic, institutional (including legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures) and the environment to the sustainability of project objectives and outcomes should be completed.

1. The main focus of the MTR is to be on explicit products and processes leading to the preparation and presentation of the 4NC and Biennial Update Reports (BURs) to the UNFCCC. Nevertheless, the evaluation included a review of all relevant “contextual” documentation (e.g., the Third National Communication [TNC], and 1st BUR, etc.) and where activities/issues/lessons-learned were identified as relevant, these were brought into the evaluation.
2. The final report is to describe the approach to and rationale behind the MTR making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach to the review.
3. The approach to the MTR was phased sequentially. Prior to the arrival of the mission in Brasilia this consisted of the following: (i) an initial teleconference with UNDP staff; (ii) agreeing, securing and reviewing project documentation including an evaluation for completeness; (iii) preparing a list of data needs and tables to provide the Project Management Unit (PMU) in anticipation of the Mission’s arrival in Brasilia to complement the field portion of the MTR; (iv) researching the internet for relevant non-project related documents (e.g., national government plans and strategies, updates on the MCTIC webpage, project documents and strategies, etc.); (v) preparation of an interview guide to discuss with UNDP for use with project stakeholders not possible to meet personally during the mission; (vi) drafting and finalizing a list of meetings with UNDP of partners and other relevant individuals/institutions to meet during the visit to Brasilia; and (vii) preparing and submitting a MTR inception report to UNDP prior to travel.
4. Following the Mission’s arrival in Brasilia initial meetings were held with the project team. This was followed by a number of meetings over the course of the 5 days in Brasilia that included a day trip to Campinas and Sao Jose dos Campos, sites of several of the project partners (see Annex F for specifics). On the afternoon of the final day the Mission provided a Powerpoint presentation to the project team on the Mission’s initial findings for purposes of review for accuracy of the factual characteristics of the Project and an exchange of views on the initial subjective conclusions; both providing the needed inputs for the completion of the evaluative sections of the MTR. Following the Mission’s departure from Brasilia the drafting of the MTR was finalized at the consultant’s home base.
5. The main constraint faced by the MTR was the limited field time available to assess a national project addressing climate change issues and processes in a country the size of Brazil. Moreover, there are a number of different groups of partners in the Project including data managers, data providers, researchers, and administrators some, particularly with respect to the data providers representing the industrial and LULUCF sectors, that for the most part are located outside of the Federal District (FD). Fortunately, the 4NC approach and processes demonstrated in the Project at the time of the MTR appear to have benefited from the development of a relative “mature” institutional framework since Brazil’s signing of the UNFCCC in 1992 that includes public, and private sectors as well as a broad participation of civil society. Moreover, many of the processes and activities leading to the achievement of the stated 4NC objective and outcomes evolved and developed from the first three previous national communications. Finally, MCTIC prepared an intense work schedule for the Mission spanning the week in the field that reflected the broad diversity of institutions that participated in the process leading to the development of a much better understanding of how the process works and the roles and responsibilities of each group, in particular with respect to the GHG Inventory (Component 1). A second constraint at the operational level was the absence of use of SMART indicators for several of the outcomes exacerbated by the absence of MTR indicators and targets in the project’s Results Framework (this was not a requirement at the time of the PRODOC under GEF 4 requirements). This has been discussed in greater detail in the section on Main Findings, below. Following the convention used in the preparation of the first PIR, no achievement ratings and justification for rating was included in the Progress Towards Results Matrix (see Annex M, Table 2).
6. The main structure of the MTR consists of 4 sections consisting of a brief introduction, followed by project description and background context, the MTR’s main findings, followed by a final section on conclusions and recommendations. The main findings of the report are divided into sections addressing the following issues: project strategy, progress towards results, project implementation and adaptive management and sustainability. The conclusions and recommendations section is divided into two sub-sections which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the Project linked to the MTR’s findings based on factual evidence (conclusions) and any proposed corrective actions and proposals (recommendations) designed to correct, reinforce and/or provide future directions to be considered by Project team to increase chances of achieving project objectives in a cost-efficient manner. The main body of the report is followed be 12 annexes as called for in the MTR Terms of Reference (TOR) and an additional, optional annex that provides selected results from data tables filled out by the PMU that were too lengthy to include in the main body of the text. No information was provided on co-financing (Annex H) and METT scorecards (Annex L) as these were not required for an EA activity at the time of project design.

# II. Project Description and Background Context

1. Development Context. With an area of nearly 8.6 million km2, Brazil is South America’s largest country and the fifth largest in the world., The country is characterized by five main climatic regions equatorial (North), tropical (most of the territory), semi-arid (Northeast), tropical of altitude (Southeast), and subtropical (South) and six main biomes Amazon rainforest, Atlantic forest, Savannah (*Cerrado*), semi-arid (*Caatinga*), freshwater wetlands (*Pantanal*) and grasslands (*Pampa*).
2. Socio-economic Context. The national population of some 209 million (2017) is mainly urban (86 %) but with an overall density of only 25/km2. Of the national population an estimated 26.5 % is classified as living at or below the national poverty line; this despite the strong period of economic growth and social progress between 2003 and 2014, where more than 29 million people left poverty and inequality declined significantly.[[1]](#footnote-1) It must be understood that the Brazilian population’s vulnerability to climate risk is a situation that depends not only on the expected climate change, but also on the adaptation conditions of families, which are closely related to their social vulnerability conditions.
3. Brazil’s economy is the second largest in the Americas (8th largest in the world). It is characterized by a mixed economy that relies on import substitution to achieve economic growth. The main sectors are services (67% of GDP), manufacturing (28.5 %) and agriculture (5.5%). The energy sector has grown significantly as successive Brazilian governments have supported programs to reduce dependence on imported petroleum focusing on renewable sources (mainly hydroelectric power) affording a low-carbon profile to the sector. Maintaining this profile in the future, considering the need for economic, growth poses a great challenge to Brazil.[[2]](#footnote-2)
4. Although historically agriculture and land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) sectors have accounted for the largest share of Brazil’s GHG emissions, the results of the Third National Communication (TNC) indicated a shift in the emissions profile away from this sector mainly due to actions aimed at controlling deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. While this was clearly a positive trend it also posed a new challenge to the Government of Brazil (GoB), since the emissions scenario at the time of the TNC also showed a relative increase in the energy sector emissions.
5. Institutional and Policy Factors. The legal framework governing the country’s policy on climate change is set out in Federal Law No. 12,187 of December 29, 2009 that provided the principles, objectives, guidelines and implementation mechanisms associated with the National Policy on Climate Change. The main instruments for implementing this Law are: (i) the National Plan on Climate Change which defined actions and measures aimed at mitigation and adaptation to climate change (December 2008); (ii) Federal Law No.12,144 of December 9, 2009 that established the Brazilian Climate Change Fund to financially support mitigation and adaptation actions using resources from the oil royalties; (iii) two action plans to prevent and control deforestation in the Amazon and *Cerrado* biomes respectively; and (iv) plans for mitigation and adaptation in agriculture, energy and charcoal.
6. National policy established voluntary mitigation actions projected to lead to a reduction of 36.1 % to 38.9% in GHG emissions of Brazil by 2020. Although voluntary at the international level, this reduction target provided for the elaboration of sectoral plans for mitigating and adapting to climate change. These sectoral plans are now in different stages of development and implementation.
7. In September 2016, Brazil deposited the instrument of ratification of the Paris Agreement, under which the country committed itself to adopt mitigation measures by means of a Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). The first Brazilian NDC aims to reduce GHG emissions by 37% below 2005 levels in 2025, with an indicative effort to achieve a 43% reduction below 2005 levels in 2030. In addition, in December 2017, Brazil ratified the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol.
8. A governance structure was established for the implementation of the country’s national CC policy with specific mandates and assignments that are complimentary to each other. The main institutional instruments, within the governmental scope, are: the Inter-ministerial Committee on Climate Change (CIM) and its Executive Board (GEx); and the Inter-ministerial Commission on Global Climate Change (CIMGC). At the civil society level, the Brazilian Forum on Climate Change (FBMC) and the Brazilian Research Network on Global Climate Change (Rede CLIMA)also assist in implementation. The Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTIC) is the technical focal point for climate change issues in Brazil and is the responsible public agency for preparing the National Communications to the UNFCCC; the MCTIC further holds the presidency of the Designated National Authority of the CDM and the National Designated Entities for the development and transfer of technologies in Brazil.
9. Brazil’s current mitigation actions in the global effort represent one of the largest undertakings by any single country to date, having reduced its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 41 per cent11 in 2012 in relation to 2005 levels. Brazil reduced deforestation rate in Amazon by 82 per cent between 2004 and 2014, and has undertaken mitigation actions in many areas, including energy and agriculture. The recent Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (iNDCs) presented by Brazil in the context of the Conference of Parties (COP 21), has indicated that the country further intends to commit to reduce GHG emissions by 37 per cent below 2005 levels in 2025, and by 43 per cent in 2030 (from UNDP, CPD. 2016).
10. Problems and Barriers the Project Sought to Address. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change UNFCCC establishes common obligations for all Parties taking into account the common but differentiated responsibilities of countries and their specific national and regional development priorities, objectives and circumstances. Non-Annex I countries such as Brazil are required to provide the Secretariat adequate information on the status of implementation of such obligations. This is mainly done through National Communications (NC) that are required to include an inventory of net anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) not included in the Montreal Protocol, and a general description of the steps taken or envisaged to implement the Convention in the respective country, based on the guidelines provided by the Conference of Parties (COP) (Decision 17/CP.8).
11. Additionally, at COP 17 (Durban, 2011) the UNFCCC adopted guidelines for the non-Annex 1 countries to prepare Biennial Update Reports (BUR ; Decision 2/CP.17, paragraphs 39-42 and Annex III decision 2/CP .17) for purposes of increasing transparency of mitigation actions and their effects on GHG emissions. At the same time, the modalities and guidelines for International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) were also approved. Countries were required to submit the first BUR by December of 2014, according to their capabilities and level of support received.
12. Brazil was the first signatory to the UNFCCC on June 4th, 1992. Congressional ratification of the Convention followed in February 28th, 1994 with the issuance of Decree No.1 and entered into force 90 days after its ratification.
13. To date the GoB has prepared and submitted three national communications to the UNFCCC all with the support of UNDP/GEF Enabling Activity (EA) projects in each case. The main features of each Communication are provided below.
14. INC. This initial NC focused mainly on the preparation of a detailed inventory of GHG emissions covering the inventory period 1990-1994 and included a general description of steps taken or envisaged to implement the Convention. Brazil faced several obstacles in preparing and submitting its INC associated with the need for new work approaches and methodologies, a lack of emission factors and activity data for several GHG and sectors and financial constraints requiring reductions in staff and contributing to further delays in completing the NC. Despite these constraints Brazil submitted the INC to the UNFCCC on December 10th, 2004, at COP-10. The INC project was viewed as critical to building capacity in the country (more than 150 institutions and 600 experts from different sectors and regions of Brazil were engaged in the Project).
15. SNC. The Second NC began in early 2006 and envisaged extending the coverage of the Inventory of GHG emissions and removals to the period 1990- 2000. It focused on sectors/gases that have a significant share of GHG emissions and/or present a large degree of uncertainty. It enlarged the scale and scope of activities undertaken, including vulnerability and adaptation (V&A) assessments, carried out studies on possible V&A measures and on the downscaling of global circulation models (using a regional model). Moreover, it enhanced the institutional capacity for implementing the Convention in Brazil. The SNC showed a considerable increase in the number of institutions and experts involved in the process and proved to be essential for the continuation of the country team approach.
16. TNC. Further support was requested from the GEF to support the preparation of the Third National Communication (TNC). This project started in November 2010 and envisaged extending the coverage of the annual Brazilian Inventory of GHG emissions and removals to the period 2000-2010. It focused on sectors/gases that have a significant share of GHG emissions and/or present a large degree of uncertainty. The TNC aimed to improve the available emission data by conducting targeted research and strengthening the technical capacity of institutions to cope with climate change mitigation and adaptation. The TNC also presented data from scenarios generated be a climate model (BESM) that supported the analysis of sectoral impacts and vulnerabilities. The TNC final document was to be submitted to the UNFCCC in December 2014 but was submitted until 2016. A comparative analysis of results achieved and evidence of the growing robustness of the Brazilian NCs over time is provided in Annex M (Table 1).
17. Despite the considerable capacity building supported by and achievements of the earlier EA projects as demonstrated through the three previous NCs, it was argued that much work remained to be done. Moreover, Brazil is a huge country with large regional disparities, which represents an enormous challenge in terms of data gathering particularly with respect to the GHG Inventory. As a consequence, government requested a new EA project to assist Brazil in the preparation of its 4NC; a project design to tackle the remaining barriers for data collection, processing, analysis and dissemination. Specifically, its focus was to address the following needs in order to:

- obtain more accurate information for activity data and emission factors, in particular for LULUCF, agriculture and energy sectors, in order to reduce uncertainties of emissions estimates in these sectors;

- obtain more precisely-focused vulnerability assessments in key sectors to generate more reliable information for the elaboration of adaptation strategies;

- extend coverage of the GHG inventory to the period 2010-2014 and refine the existing time-series data produced in previous NCs for key sectors;

- improve the performance and accuracy of downscaling methodologies for climate General Circulation Models (GCM) applied to Brazil, which would contribute to reducing uncertainties in V&A assessments for different sectors;

- prepare the 2nd and 3rd BURs to be delivered in 2016 and 2018, respectively;

- continue to build a more robust database (from the permanent data platform elaborated under TNC) in support of the national inventory to ensure regular updating, security, transparency, continuity and promote wider public access to data concerning GHG emissions;

- address information gaps identified in the earlier Communications including in the inventory for the LULUCF sector that would be further refined by the utilization of satellite images taken at shorter time intervals for the *Amazonia*, *Cerrado* and *Caatinga* biomes; and

- support additional scientific technical assistance (STA) to enhance the country’s ongoing R&D programme on climate and climate impact modelling thought instrumental for delivering the envisaged sectoral V&A assessments required under the 4NC.[[3]](#footnote-3)

1. Project Description, Strategy, Objectives and Outcomes. The Project would support extending coverage of the annual Brazilian Inventory of Anthropogenic GHGs to period 1990-2016, focusing on the sectors/gases that have a significant share of GHG emissions and/or present a large degree of data uncertainty. Furthermore, Brazil’s description of national circumstances (NatCir) would be updated, as well as support provided for steps to be taken (or envisaged) to implement the Convention. The Inventory would be further improved by calculating country specific emission factors for energy, agriculture and LULUCF. This proposed work would also allow for the extension and consolidation of existing partnerships and relevant government institutions and research centers, besides the expected improvement of current models and data platforms. Finally, the Project would continue to build institutional capacity for implementing the Convention in Brazil including undertaking activities related to climate change education and awareness.
2. The 4NC Project builds upon the results of the First, Second and Third National Communication and related human and institutional capacities in Brazil, while benefiting from recent knowledge and methodologies.
3. The 4NC and the BURs would serve as important tools for decision making, as well for monitoring emission reductions. The refined and updated inventory would also provide a more reliable basis for monitoring the sectoral mitigation plans; planning further mitigation actions; identifying trends in GHG emissions; and estimating reductions resulting from domestic actions.
4. The project goal is to enable the GoB to enhance available emission data, performing targeted research, and strengthening technical capacity and institutions to address both mitigation and adaptation. The projectobjective *is* to assist the GoB to perform the activities necessary to prepare the 4th and BURs to the COP in accordance with the UNFCCC.
5. The Project comprises six main components with related outcomes, outputs, activities and sub-activities (see Table 1, below).

**Table 1. Components and Outputs of Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component (outcome)** | **Outputs** |
| 1. National GHG Inventory is improved and updated | 1.1. Procedures for inventory development and management to enhance the current system evaluated and adjusted |
| 1.2. Best practices in the elaboration of inventories adopted |
| 1.3. National GHG Inventory updated to 2014 (1990-2014) in the energy, industry, agriculture, land use change and forestry, and waste sectors |
| 2. National Circumstances and Envisaged Steps for the Convention Implementation. (Period 2014 to 2017) | 2.1. Report on national and regional development priorities and institutional arrangements |
| 2.2. Report on needs, constraints, and gaps and other relevant information |
| 2.3. Report on measures for climate change mitigation |
| 3. Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Measures | 3.1. Documented climate scenarios based on the Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM) and downscaling with the Regional Earth System Model (RESM – former Eta- model |
| 3.2. Impact assessment of the atmospheric chemistry component of BESM; impact assessment of surface vegetation fires simulated by the fire module of BESM; impact assessment of projected large scale climatic fluctuations of rainfall on river runoff variations and its impacts on ocean carbon cycles and coastal erosion |
| 3.3. Regional and sectoral vulnerability analysis (using vulnerability indexes) and generation of maps, under various emission scenarios and time slices, in GIS format. |
| 3.4. Network of data collection devices for the assessment of the human perception of climate variability (extreme events) and change, to be used as a metric for adaptation policies. |
| 3.5. Adaptation measures for the key sectors identified. |
| 4. Public Awareness And Education Strategy | 4.1. Relevant documents and policy briefs published and disseminated |
| 4.2. Website of MCTIC updated with information on GHG inventories, legislation, scientific knowledge and other climate change issues |
| 4.3. Workshops and seminar organized and participation in public events in order to disseminate information on climate change issues, presenting main findings of the project |
| 5. Publication and Submission of the Fourth National Communication | 5.1. Publication of the 4NC hard copy and alternative media in Portuguese and English |
| 5.2. Reference Reports of the National Inventory published for the different sectors. |
| 6. Publication and Submission of Biennial Update Reports | 6.1. BURs for 2016 and 2018 published and submitted, including update of information regarding National Circumstances, National GHG Inventory, Mitigation actions, constraints and gaps, support received and domestic MRV |

1. Project Implementation Arrangements*.* The 4NC Enabling Activity Project would be implemented through a National Execution modality (NEX) through the Office of National Coordination on Global Climate Change (CGMC) at the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTIC), and is responsible for the technical implementation of the Project as a whole.
2. A Project Management Committee (CGP) or Tri-partite Committee (TPC), composed of MCTIC, the Brazilian Cooperative Agency (ABC) and the UNDP) would be created responsible for making the executive management decisions for the Project when requested by the Project Director, including the approval of the work plan and project reviews. The Project Coordinator (appointed by the project's Project Director) coordinates the Project Management Unit (PMU), which is responsible for the overall project coordination. Partnerships between key partners will be facilitated and new partnerships encouraged, especially in areas not sufficiently addressed by the TPC).
3. Project Timing and Milestones*.* The TNC was to be presented to the UNFCCC by December 2014, followed by the initiation of 4NC project preparation shortly after the official submission of the TNC. The first BUR would be presented in conjunction with the TNC. The second “stand-alone” BUR (BUR2) was to be presented in 2016 while the third BUR (BUR3) would be presented in conjunction with the 4NC, in 2018 per Decision 2/CP.17. In fact, delays experienced in obtaining GoB approval and submission of the TNC had a “knock-on” effect to the date of initiation of work of the 4NC which only began in August 2016 with a closing date of August 2020 for this four year project (see Table 2 below).[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Table 2. Key 4NC Project Formulation and Implementation Dates**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PIF Approval Date | Jun 20, 2013 |
| PPG | NA |
| CEO Endorsement submitted to GEF | Dec 2014 |
| Approved TNC submitted to UNFCC | Apr 2016 |
| CEO Endorsement of 4NCProject approved | May 11, 2016 |
| 1st meeting of TPC (PAC) | Jun 2016 |
| Project Document Signature Date (project start date): | Aug 11, 2016 |
| National TNC project evaluation | Sep 2016 |
| External TNC project evaluation | 12 2016 |
| Date of Inception Workshop (within 3 months from project start-up date) | (NA) |
| 1st Tripartite meeting | Jun 2017 |
| Expected Date of Mid-term Review | Aug 11, 2018 |
| Actual Date of Mid-term Review | April, 2019 |
| Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation | May 11, 2020 |
| Original Planned Closing Date | Aug 11, 2020 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date | NA |

1. Main Stakeholders. The main stakeholders identified in the PRODOC were a number of research institutions and universities that are part of the Brazilian Research Network on Global Climate Change (RedeCLIMA) that were expected to be involved in the preparation of the 4NC and BURs. Possible specific institutions identified at that time included research institutions (e.g., INPE, INPA,FIOCRUZ and EMBRAPA) and universities (e.g. UnB, UFC, UFPE, UNICAMP, COPPE/UFRJ, USP, UFRGS, UFSC). Other institutions thought possibly have to have a role were listed in an annex of the PRODOC. It was expected that the 4CN would address all national initiatives for climate change, including the National Plan for Adaptation (NPA) which would take into account active participation of civil society in drafting the documents. Moreover, MCTIC would support public consultations through making available all the documents of 4CN and BURs for consideration and submission of contributions from any interested entity, involving different partners in this process, such as stakeholders from the private sector and civil society organizations, including those representing indigenous people. Brazilian Forum on Climate Change.

# III. Findings

1. Project Strategy
2. Project Design. The NC process can be viewed as a programmatic approach based on the sequencing of the underlying NC projects to be prepared and submitted to the UNFCCC every 4 years (in theory). As a result, project design is largely informed by the previous NC and, while it is not a static design, changes in approach are largely evolutionary in nature. Moreover, in the case of Brazil, previous governments have viewed Climate Change as a national priority and agreed to support the NC process with additional but complementary activities supported through GEF’s System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) allocation for Brazil. This signifies that additional activities that are beyond but supplementary to the UNFCCC NC reporting requirements, can contribute to changes in previous project design. The outputs of key activities projected to be achieved in the 4NC that served to increase the robustness from the TNC include: (i) updated emissions to cover period 1990 – 2016, (ii) 2006 IPPC guidelines fully implemented, (iii) downscaling of Regional Earth System Model (RESM), (iv) impact assessments on surface fire, and climatic fluctuations, (v) regional and sector vulnerability analysis and (vi) adaptation measures for key sector identified (see Table 1 in Annex M for more detail).
3. Securing STAR resources, facilitated by GEF EAs/IAs on the behalf of national agencies however, is a highly competitive process and the initiation of the project cycle in the form of an approved project identification form (PIF) may be required far in advance from the underlying NC project design process. This in turn may affect a smooth integration between the two processes, in particular with respect to project design and ensuring that results and “lessons learned” derived from the previous NC are available and incorporated into the design of the next NC.
4. This appears to be the reason for the 36 month gap between obtaining PIF and PRODOC approvals, respectively (see Table 2, above). In a parallel but separate process, the TNC experienced a 15 month delay in receiving government approval prior to its submission to UNFCCC whose requirements call for a delay in giving approval of GEF support for the subsequent NC until the last NC is received. Once the TNC was approved and submitted the PRODOC for the 4NC appears to have been updated and quickly (re)submitted to GEF the latter approving the document in May 2016. This may explain why the PRODOC reviewed by the Mission appeared to contain a number of errors, gaps and contradictory information. This in fact appears to have been recognized in the PRODOC itself. A key assumption cited in the PRODOC was that a number of critical aspects associated with project design would be finalized at a project inception workshop (PIW) to be held within three months of project start-up. Participants would include the full project team, relevant GoB counterparts, co-financing partners, UNDP-CO, UNDP regional and/or HQ staff. The PIW would inform the team on the roles and responsibilities of the various partners, provide an overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and M&E requirements, provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project- related budgetary planning, budget reviews including arrangements for annual audit, and mandatory budget re-phasing etc. It would also include a review of the results framework (indicators, means of verification, and assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed. On the basis of this exercise, the project’s first Annual Workplan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators would be finalized in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project. The PIW never took place.
5. Despite these shortcomings project design was (and remains) highly relevant to both Brazil’s, and in a reflection of same, UNDP’s priorities. Project design fully supported Brazil’s institutional and policy framework, including its legal commitments to the UNFCCC. Similarly, activities supported under 4NC were compatible with UNDP’s assistance to Brazil under the Development Assistance Framework 2012 – 2015 taking into account the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and focused on the areas in which UNDP had a clear comparative advantage within its mandate. Other key elements that were reflected in project design included

- the high degree of participation (particularly Component 1) from range of participants / institutions characteristic of the NC process requires;

- at time of submission, the risks / assumptions appeared to be correct and justified in their ranking; and

- the need to actively engage relevant national ministries in the process

1. The PRODOC did not substantively address gender issues in its design. In part this was due to the difficulties in responding to the issue in “process” projects. Moreover, this was not a requirement during GEF 4. Nevertheless, the PMU with assistance from UNDP have made some efforts to remedy this issue (see below).
2. Results Framework/Logframe. The Mission found that the Results Framework/Logframe was deficit in providing a proper basis to assess progress of the Project. Specifically, there were no mid-term targets proposed which the Mission could use to assess progress toward achieving the stated project objective and outcomes. It is understood that this was not a GEF requirement for EA at the time (GEF 4). Moreover, in several cases the indicators themselves were not SMART.[[5]](#footnote-5) Exacerbating the situation further was the absence of use of process indicators for what is essentially a “process” project. While in some cases it is quite easy to assess progress if the products are discrete and already been achieved at the time of the MTR (e.g., BURs 2 and 3), more typically the verification/means of gauging success of most indicators required an assessment of the “status” of said indicator with no quantitative baseline or accompanying target values. There is a clear need to develop process indicators and targets to monitor progress of the project towards achieving outcomes and objectives. This situation forces one, for example in the PIR, to resort to the use of itemizing activities and subjectively estimating how far the Project has progressed towards achieving the project objective and outcomes. While clearly progress is being achieved there is no tool nor quantitative basis to “assess” if project will reach its targets successfully and if not propose options per the MTR TORs. This is discussed in greater detail below.
3. Progress Towards Results
4. Progress towards Project Objective. Nevertheless progress there is as demonstrated in the information provided in Table 3, below. There is much detail provided in the Table but some of the highlights are the following presented by outcome: (i) status of the national GHG inventories based on progress against specified requirements in on-going sector-based LOAs (LULUCF [58%], Energy [50%], and Waste and Agriculture [33 %]), respectively; (ii) contributions to the Status of Assessment National Circumstances (of the 20 products defined to support the NC Nat Cir chapter 9 have been submitted and validated [45%]); (iii) publication of the 4NC (not applicable at the time of the MTR); (iv) level of institutional capacity (increased) in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change a number of outputs have been achieved to date which include preparation of a communication plan, MCTIC publications, development of infographics (10), translation of IPPC reports into Portuguese for distribution to Lusophone countries; and (v) BUR 2 and BUR 3 have been prepared, approved and submitted and the outcome achieved.
5. Given that the PMU has staffed up, LOAs are now in place, most work is near or above 50 % completion at the time of the MTR the Mission believes that progress towards the project objective is satisfactory based on the results of three of the five outcomes. One outcome, the preparation of the 4NC itself will not occur until 2020 but given satisfactory progress on the main inputs to the NC this should not be an issue. For the remaining outcome, it is not clear how the reparation and distribution of knowledge products will lead to increasing level of institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change. This will be discussed further below.

**Table 3. Progress Towards Results Matrix (achievement of project objective against End-of-project Targets)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Status at Time of MTR** | **EOP Target (PRODOC)** |
| **Objective: To assist the Government of Brazil to perform the activities necessary to prepare the Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports in accordance with the UNFCCC.** | Status of national GHG inventories: | TNC GHG inventory available for period 1990- 1994 (INC), 1990- 2000 (SNC) and 1990-2010 (TNC) | Technical meetings: (i) methodological approach to inventory, (ii) w/ MCTIC staff (SIRENE improvements), (iii) w/partners in support of inventoryFinalize LOA w/ partnersSecure arrangements with public/private sectors to gain access to dataNew public access portal launched in SIRENEMinor adjustments/amendments required in two contracts (Agrosatilite and Finatec) Delivery: By sector (based on LOA): LULUCF (58%); Energy (50%); Waste and Agriculture (33 %). Extension of emission time series to 2016. | National GHG inventory for the sectors: (i) energy; (ii) industry; (iii) agriculture; (iv) LULUCF; and (v) waste for 2011- 2014 produced; and time-series 1990-2010 refined |
| Status of assessment National Circumstances | TNC includes assessment of National circumstances until 2013 | Established and staffed up PMUOrganized a number of meetings to facilitate RedeCLIMA support to the 4NC as well as secure assistance of other partner to provide inputs/support to the processHired consultants to assist with preparation of documentsDelivery: of 20 products defined to support Nat Cir chapter, 9 have been submitted and validated (45%) | Report on National Circumstances and description of steps taken or envisaged for the Convention implementation regarding the period 2014 to 2017; |
| Publication of Fourth National Communication | TNC published in December 2014 | Not Applicable (at the time of the MTR) | 4th National Communication fully prepared and published |
| Level of institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change | Fragmented initiatives on education, training and public awareness | meetings in support of preparation of a communications strategydefinition of a CC-based communication strategy MCTIC publication to facilitate increased public awareness of national emissionscontracting of specialized company to develop infographics to be made available on the MCTIC and SIRENE websites (10 developed to date)IPPC report on impacts/significance of CC-related increases in temperatures translated into Portuguese and made available to lusophone countries | At least one research group supporting education, training and public awareness initiatives |
| Biennial Update Report for reference year 2012 and 2014 | First BUR (submitted with TNC) | BUR 2 prepared and submitted to UNFCCC in March 2017BUR 3 prepared and submitted to UNFCCC in March 2019Outcome achieved | BUR (submitted on 2016) and BUR (2018 submitted with FNC) |

1. Progress Towards Outcomes. As one would expect given the progress towards achieving project objective described above, there is also substantial evidence of progress at the outcome level for all outcomes (see Table 4, below). As noted above, the difficulty is quantifying what point progress has reached at the time of the MTR with respect to EOP targets. It is clear that outcome 6 has been achieved (BUR2 and BUR3) and inputs are still being finalized before Outcome 5 can be initiated (4NC). Reports are being completed in anticipation for review and comment in April 2019 under Outcome 2 (National Circumstances) so this appears to be on the verge of completion. Progress towards achieving an improved and updated National GHG Inventory (Outcome 1) ranges from 30 to 58 percent based on delivery of sector-specific products through their respective LOAs. Under Outcome 3 (Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures) the scenarios using the BESM have been developed and provided to the international ESGF-INPE platform and are available for researchers contracted under this component to complete their work. Progress has also been documented for other non-model related activities under this outcome. However, the establishment of a network of low cost data collection devices for the assessment of the human perception of climate variability (extreme events) and change, to be used as a metric for adaptation policies may be dropped from the Project. Additional details with respect to the GHG Inventory component/outcome can be found in Annex M (Tables 3a – 3e).
2. Remaining barriers to Achieving the Project Objective. The one remaining barrier (as opposed to risks which are addressed below) to achieving the project objective is time. Once the delays associated with establishing the project team and putting in place the contracting of institutional service providers and consultants were overcome, the 4NC process seems to be advancing with a certain regularity. Nevertheless, a review of activities that need to be completed for 2019 to support the drafting and submission of the NC scheduled for 2020 appear ambitious. Moreover, as the TNC proved, the PMU cannot guarantee that the 4NC will be approved in a timely manner. However, the PMU believes that submission of an approved 4NC by December 2020 is possible. Finally, there is the issue of a project extension to support information dissemination activities following the submission of the 4NC (discussed below).

Table 4. Progress Towards Results Matrix (achievement of project outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Status at Time of MTR** | **EOP Target (PRODOC)** |
| **Outcome 1: National GHG inventory is improved and updated.** | Database of emission factors and activity data: | Pilot database (SIRENE) available under the SNC and TNC | SIRENE in the process of being improved that includes requirement assessments (Step 1) completed for Energy, Industrial Processes and Waste sectors and are under development for the LULUCF and Agriculture sectors. The new SIRENE portal was launched with a more dynamic, attractive and intuitive platform (see [http://www.sirene.MCTICc.gov.br](http://www.sirene.mctic.gov.br)) | Procedures for inventory development and management to enhance the current system evaluated and adjusted |
| QA/QC plan for GHG emission data per sector: | QA/QC pilot has been designed and implemented under SNC and TNC | Rede CLIMA has mobilized a network of experts responsible for the evaluation and analysis of methodological applications related to GHG emissions. Workshops conducted to evaluate the data quality and methodological aspects with government and sector specialists to discuss improvements for the next inventory | Best practices in the elaboration of inventories adopted |
| National GHG inventory for the sectors: (i) energy; (ii) industry; (iii) agriculture; (iv) LULUCF; and (v) waste; for 2011-2014 produced and time-series 1990-2010 refined | GHG inventory available for period 1990-1994 (INC), 1990-2000 (SNC) and 1990-2010 (TNC) | Sectoral working groups created and contracted, agreements reached on methodological approaches (e.g., use of the IPCC 2006 guideline), reporting period (1990 – 2016) and contracting a company to carry out land use mapping for the LULUCF sector. Estimated delivery by product (LOA) is LULUCF (58%), Energy (33%) and Waste and Agriculture (30%, respectively). A technical workshop is planned for April to discuss the progress achieved in each sector of the inventory, technical discussion on data integration between sectors and future perspectives (timing of completion of the next products, solution to challenges encountered and public consultation stage of the baseline reports). | GHG inventory available for the period 2011-2014, including refinement of time-series 1990-2010 |
| **Outcome 2: National circumstances (CN), envisaged steps for the Convention implementation, and other relevant information.** | Assessment of national circumstances in Brazil: | TNC (data until 2013) | Consultants hired and products developed and approved. In April, there will be a meeting to present the evaluations to the Rede CLIMA and to the Government (see <http://www.redeclima.ccst.inpe.br> | Report on national and regional development priorities and institutional arrangements. |
| Assessment of constraints and needs to implement the Convention in Brazil | TNC (data until 2013) | Collection of information on needs and gaps carried out to prepare BUR3 was used to update this 4CN and will be discussed with the government to obtain additional inputs in April. | Report on needs, constraints and gaps and other relevant information. |
| Identification of activities and CC measures to implement the Convention in Brazil | TNC (data until 2013) | See above. | Report on measures for climate change mitigation |
| **Outcome 3: Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures.** | Scenarios of “Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM)” | BESM developed and RESM / CPTEC model improved with higher resolution for a larger domain in the TNC | BESM scenarios generated since the TNC were submitted to the CMIP5 project and are available through the ESGF-INPE platform (see https://dm2.cptec.inpe.br/projects/esgf-inpe/). Project team is in discussions with INPE to assess if possible to incorporate BESM data into 4CN. | Documented climate scenarios based on the Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM) and downscaling with the RESM. |
| Climate change impact assessment for atmospheric chemistry, surface vegetation fires, and others | Limited CC impact assessment has been prepared under TNC | See above | Impact assessment of the atmospheric chemistry component of BESM; impact assessment of surface vegetation fires simulated by the fire module of BESM; impact assessment of projected large scale climatic fluctuations of rainfall on river runoff variations and its impacts on ocean carbon cycles and coastal erosion. |
| Mapping of vulnerability of key sectors and regions to climate change impacts | Improved data and methodologies under TNC | Following technical meetings in 2016/2017 it was agreed approach to sub-component would be based on “transversal” topics (e.g., Food Safety, Energy Security, Water Safety and Socio-environmental vulnerability) . These studies are in the final phase and will be delivered shortly and be used to discuss options in support of adaptation in a workshop in later April / early May, 2019 | Regional and sectoral vulnerability analysis (using vulnerability indexes) and generation of maps, under various emission scenarios and time slices, in GIS format |
| Assessment of human perception on climate change | Independent studies on human perception on climate change | In process of defining a strategy to access the results of this study.  | Network of low cost data collection devices for the assessment of the human perception of climate variability (extreme events) and change, to be used as a metric for adaptation policies. |
| Identification of key sectors and regions with climate change impacts | Preliminary results of studies on climate change vulnerability | Impact and vulnerability studies are in process of being completed for the subcomponent and assessing the use of biomes as an approach to regional impact analysis. | Adaptation measures for the key sectors identified. |
| **Outcome 4: Public Awareness and Education Strategy in Place** | Assessment of policies and programs related to climate change | Revised National Plan of Climate Change and regional workshops realised for TNC dissemination | MCTIC publications to increase public awareness of national emissions and Policy of Climate Change (PNMC) completed for years 2016 and 2017 and currently in preparation for 2019 (see http://www.mctic.gov.br/mctic/opencms/busca.html). | Relevant documents and programs/policy briefs published and disseminated |
| Updated webpage from MCTIC with information on 4NC | The dissemination of TNC and the inventory results available on the MCTIC webpage | New SIRENE web site was launched in December. 2018 with a new structure and ease of access to information by the general public (http://sirene.mctic.gov.br).  | Web site of the MCTIC updated with information on GHG Inventories, legislation, scientific knowledge and other climate change issues. |
| Dissemination of results found in the preparation of National Communication | Workshops undertaken to present the results of TNC  | Participation of representatives of 4NC project management and technical team in workshops / events to share experiences and promote knowledge dissemination and capacity building (e.g., Government of Pernambuco, Climate Observatory NGO, GIZ/ Ministry of Cities, MMA/REDD+ among others). | Workshops, seminars and meetings with subnational governments organized and participation in public events in order to disseminate information on climate change issues, presenting main findings of the project |
| **Outcome 5: Publication and submission of the Fourth NC** | Publication of Fourth National Communication |  (A) Previous NCs | Hiring of English translator consultant, definition of 4NC's preliminary index and sharing of proposed index with government  | Publication of the 4NC in hard copy and alternative media in Portuguese and English, presented to the GoB; |
| Publication of Reference Reports of the key sectors of the NationalGHG emissions Inventory | (Publication of reference reports ofTCN | Scope and structure of Reference Reports defined and shared with the partners through letters of agreement. | Reference Reports of the National Inventory published for the different sectors. |
| **Outcome 6: Preparation and submission of Biennial Update Reports (BUR) in 2016 and 2018** | Publication of Second BUR | First BUR submitted with TNC | BUR2 was prepared (2016) and published and submitted to UNFCCC in 2017 (see <https://unfccc.int>). | BUR for 2016 published and submitted, including updates of information. |
| Publication of Third BUR | Previous BUR | BUR 3 was published and submitted to UNFCCC in 2018 (see <https://unfccc.int>).  |  BUR for 2018 published and submitted, including updates of information.  |

1. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
2. Management Arrangements. Management arrangements as they exist at the time of the MTR are depicted in Figure 1, below. Following vertically from top to bottom, this consists of the Tri-partite Committee (TPC) composed of representatives from CGCL, the National Director and National Coordinator, UNDP and the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC). This is the highest decision-making body in the Project. Below the TPC there is the project management unit (PMU) consisting of the Technical Coordinator and component supervisors supported by assistants and a translator. Below the PMU are a number of institutions and consultants supported through Rede CLIMA that are responsible for a range of inputs into the NC process.
3. The Tri-partite Committee (TPC), sometimes referred to as the Project Board in the PRODOC, an entity common to most internationally-financed projects in Brazil, was identified to be established in the PRODOC. However in the PRODOC it was not clear exactly what its role but it is assumed it was to be the ultimate decision-making authority when issues are encountered that could not be resolved at the PMU level. Following approval of the Project the TPC was established but has only met once since the initiation of implementation; this despite the fact that the PRODOC called for it to meet on a semi-annual basis. Since its primary function appears to be to resolve issues referred to it by the PMU it can be argued that the shortfall in meetings as called for in the PRODOC is an indirect indicator of the smooth implementation of the 4NC Project.
4. The PMU appears to function well (some individuals from TNC were able to be brought over to 4NC bringing a wealth of experience). Many of the partners and consultants and ministerial counterparts were highly complementary with respect to its professional competence and dedication to the NC process. Issues raised during the Mission with respect to delays associated with signing the LOAs and receiving payment following reaching LOA benchmarks appeared to be due to meeting administrative requirements of the GoB and UNDP and not attributable to PMU performance. The PMU also appeared open and responsive to suggestions from UNDP leading to improvements in implementation particularly with respect to the need for more realistic annual budgets, development of a communication plan and the need to strengthen its gender strategy and implement a gender analysis (see below).
5. A number of key partners identified in the PRODOC, many of which have collaborated with MCTIC in the TNC, were identified to be supporting the 4NC. In addition to the Brazilian Research Network on Global Climate Change (RedeCLIMA), these include UFRJ (Energy), UnB and UFPE (LULUCF), IFAL and Embrapa (Agriculture and Waste) under the GHG Inventory Component. Other partner institutions include IPEA and IBGE (Component 2) and ANA, INPE, as well other universities (Component 3). The institutional arrangements particularly for Component 1 appear overly-complicated at first sight but these have evolved from previous NCs and seem to function well (based on a productive marriage of data providers, data demanders and the final product users with coordination tasks and quality control interfaces).
6. The client was satisfied with the support the Project had received from UNDP. The one point raised was the possible need in the future for UNDP to support new PMU staff unfamiliar with GEF/UNDP reporting requirements, budget formats, contracts and similar administrative requirements through training workshop(s) (as suggested in the PRODOC ). These would have been useful to some of the new partners at the initiation of the 4NC process (similar to UNDP-supported workshop of the use of frameworks at the request of MCTIC in Rio in early 2019).



1. Work Planning. Project design called for an approved and submitted NC in four years following the initiation of project activities despite the fact that all previous NCs were delayed, some of them significantly as in the case of the TNC (24 months). The activities and budget appeared not to reflect likely delays associated with project start-up but rather were more or less evenly distributed across the 4 year period.[[6]](#footnote-6) In fact, the delay in PY 1 was associated primarily with legal reviews of draft Letters of Agreement among potential partners (even some partners that participated in TNC) and were not envisioned in project design. Meeting the respective administrative requirements of GoB and UNDP may have also been a contributing factor. It appears that once these LOAs were agreed to the activities have largely been implemented according to plan.
2. There exists a clear AWP process that follows UNDP requirements and provides flexibility to adjust budget/activities at mid-semester of the project year.
3. The Mission found no evidence that Results Framework/Logframe was used as a management tool. This may in part be due to the difficulties described above in its application. In fact, a review of the PIR shows the need to qualify (descriptions of many activities) and where possible quantify (e.g., number of meetings) to demonstrate progress in implementation. Similarly, project progress presented in the UNDP/UNEP Survey of Status Tool required to be submitted to GEF for EAs appears at best to be percentage-based estimates with little quantitative rigor to justify them.
4. The quality of project supervision provided by UNDP appeared satisfactory. UNDP responded to requests for assistance from the PMU when needed and in a timely fashion (e.g., supporting workshops and a consultant on use of Letters of Agreement and gender, respectively). The UNDP RTA responsible for CC visits Brazil annually and participated with CO in review of the 4NC Project (among others) in anticipation of the PIR. The Mission observed that there appeared to be a positive an efficient level of communications between UNDP CO and PMU.
5. Execution after some initial delays appear to be satisfactory. These delays were primarily due for the need to get Letters of Agreement in place between UNDP and a range of contractors responsible for different inputs into the NC process. As noted above, progress has clearly been achieved towards achieving both project outcomes and objectives though it has been difficult to quantify DUE to the issue of the weak Logframe and lack of use of SMART, process indicators with the obvious exception of the BUR2 and BUR3 which were delivered on time. The Letters of Agreement appear logical in detailing a sequential list of activities in support of the end-product (s) with number of days allocated to each step on the critical path. It would seem that as an instrument this could easily be transferred to a process indicator (s) for use in the logframe to track progress towards achieving outcomes.

1. It was recognized that MCTIC and UNDP have attempted to increase consideration of gender in project implementation (e.g., through hiring practices in the PMU and supporting a consultant to evaluate selected UNDP projects, including the 4NC, for purposes of identifying opportunities to main-stream gender into project activitie)s. Nevertheless, it was agreed that for a “process” project such as the NC this remains a challenge.
2. Financial management, disbursement and audit all seemed to be in compliance at the time of the MTR (see relevant sections below for more detail).
3. Finance and Co-finance. At the time of the MTR (31st March, 2019) figures show a cumulative disbursement of 2,324,926 USD representing 30.9 % of the total grant approved amount as stated in the PRODOC (see Figure 2 and Table 5, below)

**Table 5. Financial Disbursement and Delivery at time of MTR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Results (%)** | **USD**  |
| Cumulative disbursement as of 31 March 2019. | - | 2,324,926 |
| Cumulative delivery (against approved PRODOC) | 30.88 | - |
| Cumulative delivery against expected delivery as of this year (General Ledger) | 40.72 | - |

1. Under delivery appeared due primarily to “administrative constraints” contributing to the delays in project’s first year attributed to the need for legal review in support of “due diligence” of contractual documents among existing (with change of senior staff) and/or new institutions involved in the 4NC. Basically, this involved the renegotiation of many of the agreements from previous NCs. This factor was exacerbated by UNDP approach to budget allocation in PRODOCs that call for the equal division of project budgets across life of project. It was recognized that for evaluation purposes this can result in structural under-disbursement in the early years of these projects.
2. In 2018 the allocated budget appeared to be in excess of what was disbursed; a result due to an unexpected delay in the contractor receiving products from a sub-contractor required to complete contractual commitments for that year. It should also be mentioned that the Project has benefited from the depreciation of the Brazilan Real (BRL) against the US Dollar, the latter the currency denomination of the GEF grant. At the time of the MTR this has resulted in approximately an increase of BRL 4,735,426 savings to the Project.
3. Adequate financial management controls appear to be in place and working and only minor budget revisions were requested of and approved by UNDP at the time of the MTR. These adjustments are built into the AWP process at if needed normally occur at the onset of the second half of the project year.
4. Under GEF policy there is no requirement for co-finance for Enabling Activities (EA). While there is undoubtedly sources of co-financing in support of the 4th NC these are not being monitored and documented at the time of the MTR. Nevertheless, this may be something the PMU and UNDP may want to consider to include at the time of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) for purposes of better understanding what and where are the main sources and amounts of co-financing; information that is always useful to report as an indicator of government and public support for the NC process.
5. Audit. It was noted in the audits that MCTIC, the executing agency of the Project, is not a party to the legal agreements entered into with the contractors, rather these are signed directly between UNDP and the contracted entities. In the context of the agreement, UNDP is responsible for monitoring and analysis of account rendering, formalized through the financial reports, and MCTIC accepted the technical evaluation of the products. Within the agreement, the MCTIC is responsible only for the products and services contracted.
6. At the time of the MTR two audits of the Project have been completed for the years 2017 and 2018, respectively. The findings of the 2017 audit indicated that no significant inconsistencies were identified in part due to the low representativeness of the products analysed in relation to the total value of the Project. The conclusion was that adequate internal controls were in place for the implementation of the Project activities, in their most relevant aspects. Two minor exceptions were identified consisting of the need to: (i) reconcile one cost item (personnel) between budget reports and the actual inputs leading to product delivery associated with a contract between UNDP and the Eliseu Alves Foundation (FEA) and (ii) clarification on the legality of project personnel hired by UNDP to work in MCTIC offices.
7. Similarly, the findings of the 2018 audit did not identify any significant nonconformities in the accounts and stated that adequate internal controls are maintained for the implementation of the Project activities, in their most relevant aspects. The audit noted that their results demonstrated that disbursements are supported by adequate documentation and have been carried out in accordance with the PRODOC and met the applicable rules and regulations.
8. Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems. As noted above, the Project’s Results Framework/Logframe did not appear to be practical tool for use in monitoring project activities possibly due to the absence of annual and MTR targets to use to assess progress (at the time of project preparation this was not a GEF requirement). The main tool seems to have been the AWP and review of progress at the midpoint and end of each project year. It should be noted that the weaknesses of the logframe were identified at the time of the PRODOC and were to be addressed in the inception workshop that unfortunately never took place.
9. The PMU does however apply the UNDP/UNEP Survey of Status tool for NCs/BURs annually for the years 2016 – 2018 but this appears to be more a reporting tool rather than in support of M&E. Typically information is requested mid-year in proximity to PIR preparation
10. UNDP provides a three-tier supervision, oversight and quality assurance role (funded by the GEF agency fee) involving UNDP staff in Country Offices and at regional and HQ levels. The independent quality assurance role supports the Project Board and PMU by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed.
11. Finally, there is the preparation of the GEF-required Project Implementation Report (PIR) of which one has been completed to date. It is noted that in the PIR completed in 2018 a number of project level issues were “flagged” and recommendations made. Specifically, the UNDP RTA noted that: (i) the absence of an inception workshop (and was a requirement of GEF-finance projects), (ii) the need for more realistic annual budgets, (iii) the need for a communication plan and (iv) the Project must strengthen its gender strategy and implement a gender analysis to seek for opportunities to mainstream gender in the activities which are being carried out. This latter point was mainly related to outcome 3 (Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation measures) where there are opportunities to approach gender based adaptation bringing women and girls to the core of measures to reduce climate vulnerability in Brazil.
12. Stakeholder Engagement. By its very nature stakeholder consultation is built into the 4NC project approach. In part, this is due to a national law that requires transparency in public-finance projects. Within the Project itself the LOAs that form the contracts between UNDP and partner institutions to deliver a series of products in support of the NC, in particular under the National Inventory, call for public consultation and inclusion is mainstreamed into the component/sub-component development process. Moreover, once the sub-sector documents are consolidated there is a second round of public consultation. Another tool that was first used as a pilot is the SIRENE platform that now provides access to GHG emission data under the inventory component. Finally, there has been efforts to broaden and diversify inter-institutional collaboration (e,g., reaching out to consult with FUNAI, Brazil’s National Indian Foundation) and recent discussions with the Ministry of Education to provide 4NC and CC-related inputs into a new environmental curriculum. The PMU has also reached out to State and municipal governments offering to share 4NC process related information relevant to their respective sub-national efforts (e.g., Recife). Having said that there remains other opportunities to continue to broaden stakeholder engagement particular and the State, municipal and even local/family levels to get the message across.
13. Reporting. No issue was identified with respect to the Project meeting GEF/UNDP reporting requirements (e.g., the annual PIR and the UNDP/UNEP Survey of Status tool for NCs/BURs). Similarly at the time of the MTR UNDP was meeting its project assurance requirements. In other cases of meeting reporting requirements, for example in the case of the TPC, there were few minutes simply because there was only one meeting.
14. The Mission felt that access to regular reporting documents could have been improved at least during the course of the evaluation. This may be due simply to the large number of meetings (and meeting minutes) that PMU staff have to participate in the many partners and government counterparts but at least as a minimum there the minutes of regular PMU meetings should be easily accessible. This seems to support the RTAs recommendation at the time of the PIR that an aggregation of outputs and other documentation should be presented in the next PIR, in order to improve quality and transparency of reporting.
15. Communication. There has been a significant effort to get 4NC-related information out to the public for review and comment based on cumulative experience derived from past NC efforts. This occurs through different mechanisms including SIRENE (providing access to information on GHG Inventory), updating of the MCTIC web-page (see http://www.mctic.gov.br/mctic/opencms/ciencia/SEPED/clima/index.html for more general project-related information and information on CC issues in general) and MCTIC publications (some 50 + publications related to Climate Change can be found on the MCTIC webpage including documents related to NC/BUR, RedeCLIMA, and SIRENE (see http:/ / [www.mctic.gov.br](http://www.mctic.gov.br) / mctic / opencms / busca.html). Moreover, public consultation is built into the framework contracts at the component / sub-component levels of many of the activities supported by the NC obviating the need go back to the public when the NC is eventually consolidated and submitted for government review. At the time of the first PIR, the RTA recommended a wider compilation of the project’s communication activities. The PMU responded by preparing a communication plan that has identified a number of activities including some that are presently being rolled out through a contract with a company that is in now preparing infographics posted on MCTIC’s website. The PMU noted that for the 4NC, a communication strategy and plan would have been more effective if prepared and incorporated into project design at the onset of the Project and should be considered in the preparation of the 5NC. Public awareness and communication activities are expected to be ramped up significantly following the submission of the approved 4NC to the UNFCCC at the end of 2020 through widespread public dissemination, regional workshops, publishing of sister publications and a final workshop. This will require an additional 12 month extension from the initial completion date called for in the PRODOC.
16. Sustainability
17. At the time of the MTR the context has changed and some of the risks identified in the PRODOC (really extending back to 2014) no longer appear relevant. This certainly appears to be the case in finding and recruiting technically qualified technicians to support the Project. Similarly, public support seems to remain high, at least as demonstrated by the number of visitations to the MCTIC website, one of most visited public websites in Brazil.
18. Financial Risks to Sustainability. Financial risk to the project outcome was ranked as low in the PRODOC and is expected to remain so for the foreseeable future (see Table 6, below). In part this is due to the financial commitment from GEF to support Brazil and other non-Annex 1 countries to meet their reporting commitments to the UNFCCC coupled with the lack of need to match GEF resources with co-financing support.
19. Factors that could change the rating of this risk include the possibility of Brazil graduating from the non-Annex 1 group of countries and no longer qualifying for unrestricted GEF support and changes in government priorities that might affect Brazil’s ability to “top-up” its NC budget with Brazil’s STAR allocation of GEF resources.
20. Socio-economic Risks to Sustainability. Being an Enabling Activity, beneficiaries within target groups are not directly addressed. The Government of Brazil, including the Executing Entity Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTIC), and the institutions involved in the preparation of the 4NC and the BUR however will benefit directly from the Project through the proposed TA and STA activities.
21. Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability. This risk was initially ranked as low at the time of project preparation. However, at the time of the MTR this has been raised to medium in part due to the need for additional caution associated with any change of government that could either directly or influence progress towards achieving a project objective. Moreover, while support remains strong within MCTIC and several of its national collaborators (e.g., the Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Food, Mines and Energy and External Relations) in other ministries there appears to be an increase level of uncertainty on the future status of inter-institutional relationships built up from previous NCs. At the time of the MTR UNDP commitment to the Project remains strong as indicated in the Country Programme Document (CPD) for the period 2017 – 2021. The CPD identified as one of its national priorities the sustainable management of natural resources for present and future generations. Specifically, the indicative country programme output would be “policies strengthened for the adoption, implementation, and monitoring of mitigation and adaptation measures to climate change, mainstreaming and integrating national plans and international agreements as measured by number of mitigation or adaptation initiatives implemented.”
22. Environmental Risks to Sustainability. No direct environmental benefits are usually associated with Enabling Activity projects that typically support national processes leading to meeting country reporting requirements required of the global environmental conventions. The 4NC Project will generate indirect local and global environmental benefits through the studies and information that will provide the basis for future efforts to reduce GHG emissions as well as to adapt and to increment resilience to climate change impacts. The enhanced inventory of GHG sources and sinks will provide input to devise more efficient and effective policies and new legislation at the Federal and state levels.

**Table 6. Assessment of Risks to Sustainability of Project Outcomes (identified in PRODOC)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PRODOC** | **MTR** |
| Financial Risks (L) | (L) |
| Socio-political Risks (L) | (L) |
| Institutional Framework and Governance Risks- limited political support for CC issues (L) | (M) |
| Environmental risks (NA) | (NA) |
| Other- difficulty in hiring people (L) | (NA) |

1. Innovations. As the NC process has continued to evolve contributing to the existing approach adopted in the 4NC it has resulted in refinements to earlier data sets as well as increases in overall robustness of the Communications themselves as evidence supports in Annex M (Table 1). Whether the gradual evolution of the methodological approach to the NC process can be characterized as innovative is debatable. Nevertheless, one of the unexpected products of the 4NC at the time of the MTR was the resort to open, competitive bidding for services that had heretofore been provided by a partner in earlier NCs. While this is not an uncommon practice in Brazil it is the first time that the Ministry has used it in a NC. In this example, the results were a high-quality product delivered at substantially reduced cost. It is cautioned however, that this should be considered as a new tool to use when warranted and not undermine strategically important and productive institutional relationships built up over several NCs.

# IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Conclusions
2. Despite an initial delay in project start-up reflected in lags in disbursement, the 4NC Project appears to be progressing satisfactory at the time of MTR. Delays in implementation appeared to be more due to the need to review draft Letters of Agreement (*cartas de acordo*) among the legal units of some of the project partners (either because they were new partners to the process and/or had a change of staff) reflecting due diligence regardless of whether these were new or a continuation of previous agreements. As a result the disbursement curve shows a gap in the first year though this is also due to UNDP’s structural approach to project disbursement over LOP, rather than a delay in the implementation of project activities. A review of PIR 1 and the partial PIR 2 shows progress though somewhat difficult to evaluate due to lack of targets and indicators included in the PRODOC for use at the time of the MTR per GEF policy at the time (GEF 4). In discussions with the PMU significant budget revisions appear not to be needed at this time and/or can be addressed through the continuation of minor budget revisions typical of those realized during the implementation of the first half of the project. However, it would be prudent to review the budget available for equipment as the Project will be purchasing hardware for the INPE supercomputer. Finally, a review of the main outputs of a recent PMU Strategic Workshop held in February 2019 appears sound and projects the submission of an approved 4NC to UNFCCC on December 2020 assuming there are no delays in securing GoB approval, some 4 months later than initially projected in the PRODOC. It should be noted that securing GOB approval by the end of 2020 may be ovely optimistic given experiences with previous NCs.
3. An analysis of risks from the time of the PRODOC indicated they are either no longer relevant (e.g., finding and contracting high quality individuals for the PMU) or continue to be categorized as low (e.g., financial and public support of the 4NC process). It is the Mission’s view however that the Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability, initially ranked as low at the time of project preparation, has increased due to the need for additional caution associated with any change of government that could either directly or indirectly influence progress towards achieving a project objective. Fortunately support appears to remain strong within MCTIC and several of its national collaborators (e.g., the Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Food, Mines and Energy and External Relations). Nevertheless, in at least one case it is unclear to what degree future collaboration will occur with MCTIC. For this reason the risk was upgraded from “low” to “medium.”
4. The NC process is really a program linked by a sequence of NC projects in which each current project is linked to the previous one (sequentially programmatic) dependent on the approval and submission of the previous NC by the non-Annex 1 country. In the case of Brazil, in addition to the EA budget allocation to support the NC process, GoB has sought additional resources through its GEF STAR allocation for activities complementary to the NC process and in support of the country’s CC programme. Given the size and significance of Brazil in terms of global CC this appears completely justified and certainty within GEF’s policies as STAR allocation is designed to allow countries to prioritize what are the global issues to justify GEF support. The issue however is the STAR allocation process is separate from the EA allocation process, the former being highly competitive requiring the submission of project concept (PIF) early to GEF in parallel to the still uncompleted NC process due to the need to “lock-in” a project design and budget that has not benefited fully from the on-going NC process. This is not efficient and can affect the smooth transition between NCs (e.g., through staff disruption, barriers to fully take advantage of lessons-learned from the previous NC into the design to the next NC and risk to maintaining continuity with partners). As a follow-up recommendation the NC 4 should assess new GEF cancellation policies on the future submission of NC proposals.
5. No NC in Brazil has yet to be submitted and approved within the timeframe stated in the EA project design. In the TNC this took 15 months. While in practice, PMU/MCTIC represents the Brazilian government in fact it cannot guarantee that the document can be approved and delivered on a timely basis. Delays, where they occur, may be due to lack of consensus among two or more ministries and the need for their resolution. Mitigating these differences is one of the key roles of MRE in the NC process. The task of the PMU is to reduce the risk of lack of consensus among counterpart ministries collaborating in the process before it reaches the end of the process. MCTIC is fully aware of the importance of continued outreach and engagement with other ministries during the NC process.
6. Over the previous three NCs a series of inter-institutional relationships, facilitated by RedeCLIMA and individual collegial relationships have built up that has proven critical to the NC process. Other key factors include:

- accumulated (and retained) experience derived from earlier NCs;

- putting in place a solid PMU team (many bringing experience from earlier NCs) that based on the Mission’s discussions with partner institutions, is highly respected by their counterparts;

- commitments from a range of individuals/partners to the ”cause” (as evidence by working as volunteers or taking on supplementary duties); and

- support from UNDP

Taken as a whole all the above factors appear to have combined to contribute to overcoming the shortcomings of the PRODOC and associated Results Framework/Logframe.

1. Many of the issues associated with PRODOC and Results Framework/Logframe could have been resolved with an Inception workshop. This was recognized in the revised 2016 version of the earlier PRODOC in making a number of recommendations to be addressed in a proposed IW following approval. Nevertheless, the workshop never took place (though there was a meeting of partner institutions following project approval, but UNDP was not represented, and it did not address many of the weaknesses of the PRODOC and Results Framework).
2. Recommendations
3. The MTR is the moment in project implementation to review activities, indicators and targets and budget and propose any revisions, if needed (with the understanding that any changes to Outcomes is much more difficult to justify and rarely done). The Mission has already made its views on the PRODOC and Results Framework clear. Given that PMU is at the midpoint of project implementation and progress seems to be proceeding satisfactorily with no major issues found it is not recommended to revise the Logframe (e.g., replacing existing indicators with SMART indicators and estimating new, quantifiable targets) at this time. However in looking ahead to the Terminal Evaluation (TE) there are several issues that should be addressed at this time. These are:

- project extension. The existing PMU strategy for the remaining half of the Project calls for submission of an approved NC in December 2020, 4 months later than is called for in the PRODOC for this 4 year project. Moreover, the PMU is currently proposing to follow the submission of the NC with a series of outreach and communication and information dissemination activities over the course of 2021 in support of the 4NC; a proposal to which the Mission agrees (see below). This would add an additional 12 months totaling 16 months in all. The Mission believes that a no-cost extension is warranted and there appears to be grant resources to cover any additional costs due to cost savings associated with the depreciation of the BRL against the USD;

- elimination of activity. Under Component/Outcome 3, the PRODOC calls for the establishment of a network of low cost data collection devices for the assessment of the human perception of climate variability (extreme events) and change, to be used as a metric for adaptation policies. The PMU indicated that this has become an “orphan” activity as the activity proponent is no longer involved in the Project. If this is a case this should be dropped (or modified) and the indicator/target eliminated (or revised);

- revision of indicator (or revision of means of monitoring/reporting). Under Component/Outcome 4 it is not clear how the preparation and distribution of knowledge products as reported in the PIR 1 and partial PIR 2 will lead to increasing level of institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change (the respective Results Framework/Logframe indicator). Either the indicator should be changed or provide a different means of monitoring and reporting progress against it.

It is further recommended that these changes and more generally, the main results and recommendations resulting from the PMU strategic planning workshop held in February 2019 should be put into a proposal including budget and calendar to cover the remainder period of project implementation (including the extension) to review and discus with UNDP.

1. Delays to obtaining final government approval of the TNC and its subsequent submission to the UNFCCC affected the continuity of process between that effort and the initiation of the 4NC. This inhibited the incorporation of different approaches, “lessons learned,” new activities identification and analysis of budget allocations in the NC 4 PIF/PRODOC, at least formerly. While there is no guarantee that the 4NC will be approved and submitted without incurring delays it in the Mission’s view that this appears to be a low risk. The PMU/UNDP should avail of the opportunity to bring the lessons learned derived from the 4NC into the project design of the 5NC formerly and work for a more robust and clearer PRODOC and a Logframe that can be used as a useful M&E and reporting tool. The recommended “no cost” extension above would provide an ideal opportunity to do this in parallel to the other proposed activities following the submission of the 4NC.
2. If the aforementioned “breathing-room” is secured to enable greater flexibility to inform the 5NC process by the results and experiences from the 4NC factors to consider incorporating into the 5NC (and PRODOC and Results Framework), based on the Mission’s findings informed from a number of interviews and resulting suggestions. Many of these have already been recognized and initiatives taken by the PMU. These include: (i) greater inter-ministerial outreach; (ii) broadening circle of traditional partner institutions (e.g., FUNAI); (iii) increasing public awareness and communication (e.g., incorporating CC inputs into MOE environmental initiative in the school curricula); (iv) incorporating State and municipal governments into the process if only through offering experiences/lessons learned from NC (e.g., Pernambuco State); (v) putting greater emphasis on broadening and diversifying the message of the NC to reach “the people;” (vi) developing a communication strategy and plan to be incorporated into project design at the onset of the Project and should be considered in the preparation of the 5NC; and identifying possible implementing partners in project design to reduce delays in preparation of LoAs.

1. At present the preparation of the PIRs is largely a subjective exercise at least in estimating degree of progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes. While clearly progress is being made there are no tools to measure in a quantitative sense. This puts pressure on the PMU and, if this was a problematic project, could contribute to differences in its evaluation. The NC project is largely about process. Simple process indicators should be developed and included in the 5NC results framework to facilitate tracking and evaluating project progress. A good place to begin would be to review existing Letters of Agreement used in the 4NC, particularly under the GHG Component, as a basis for developing quantitative process indicators. LOAs appear to be logical in detailing a sequential list of activities in support of the end-product (s) with number of days allocated to each step on the critical path. These should be easy to convert to one or more indicators and targets per component/sub-component.
2. Inception workshops by themselves are rarely “silver bullets” ensuring smooth implementation of a project, in particular if the project is poorly designed. They nevertheless can be used to build on uncertainties and/or weaknesses of a PRODOC (e.g., reviewing institutional roles and responsibilities), clarify lines of communication and decision-making processes, reporting requirements and engage project partners further by bringing them up to date and explain what to expect during the implementation phase. For the 5NC it is recommended that an inception workshop, scheduled for the first trimester following project initiation, be built into project design with accompanying indicator and budget.
3. UNDP has shown considerable support to the NC process over the 4 NCs to date. For example, in the current 4NC process a workshop has been supported to introduce the use of Letters of Agreement to contract service providers. Similarly, consultants have been hired in the past to facilitate mainstreaming gender into project activities. In the coming 5NC, dependent on staff changeover in the PMU and broadening and inclusion of new partners, UNDP may want to consider supporting additional workshops early during the implementation of the project in particular in explaining administrative, budgeting and reporting requirements.
4. The PMU meets regularly on a monthly basis supplemented by extra meetings in support of AWP preparation and on an *ad hoc* basis as issues arise. In February 2019 the PMU supported an off-site, strategic planning workshop to assess project progress, map out the status of specific activities against overall project outcomes, both for the current year and to the end of the project. The product reviewed by the Mission was high quality and showed that the PMU knew where it was going and how to get there. It was the Mission’s understanding that this was the first time that the PMU took this approach. The Mission recommends that the PMU consider the increased use of these strategic workshops perhaps on an annual basis starting during the PRODOC design process of 5NC and followed in anticipation of AWP preparation and reflected in proposed activities and procurement.
5. The Tripartite Committee (also referred to as Project Board in the PRODOC) was supposed to meet on a semi-annual basis in the PRODOC. In fact. it has only met once at the time of the MTR. Its main purpose is to resolve issues that cannot be resolved at the PMU level. When projects are being implemented smoothly there is no need to have meetings (for the sake of having meetings). The Mission recommends that the TPC should meet on a “when and as needed” basis.
6. Co-financing is not a requirement for EA grants in support of NC for non-Annex 1 countries. As a result the PMU has not monitored and documented sources, types and amounts of same. This may be something the PMU and UNDP may want to consider to have on hand at the time of the Terminal Evaluation (TE); always useful to report as an indicator of government and public support for the NC process.
7. Brazil’s cumulative and evolutionary experience over 4 NCs has led to the development of relative sophisticated and effective institutional arrangements and processes, particularly in the preparation of the GHG Inventory. This approach appears to be both highly valuable and likely to be unique. A forum should be sought to facilitate the dissemination of both the process and results, particularly in describing its evolution over time to a wider community both nationally and globally. The PMU is already considering supporting a side event in the next COP; a proposal supported by the Mission. Given the importance of the NC process in support of the UNFCCC there should be resources available to support a broader effort (e.g., an international workshop attended by other countries to share experiences and compare lessons learned). It is suggested that this should be further investigated perhaps by starting with the UNFCCC Secretariat and GEFSEC facilitated by UNDP.
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## **Annex A. UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference**

**Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to** [**UNDP Procurement Website**](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (PIMS 5187) implemented through the Brazilian Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovations and Communications, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on the 11th August 2016 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* ([*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance\_Midterm%20Review%20\_EN\_2014.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)).

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The project was designed to: assist Brazil to prepare the Fourth National Communication (4NC) and Biennial Update Reports (BUR) required to meet obligations under the UNFCCC. The objective is to extend coverage of the annual Brazilian Inventory of Anthropogenic GHGs to period 1990-2016, focusing on the sectors/gases that have a significant share of GHG emissions and/or present a large degree of data uncertainty. Furthermore, Brazil’s description of national circumstances will be updated, as well as the steps to be taken or envisaged to implement the Convention. Finally, the project will continue to build institutional capacity for implementing the Convention in Brazil including undertaking activities related to climate change education and awareness.

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[7]](#footnote-7) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[8]](#footnote-8) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: representatives from the executing agency and from the project´s Steering Committee, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts in the subject area, project stakeholders and academia. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct one field mission to Brasília, Brazil.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[9]](#footnote-9)** | **Baseline Level[[10]](#footnote-10)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[11]](#footnote-11)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[12]](#footnote-12)** | **Achievement Rating[[13]](#footnote-13)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the Fourth National Communication

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc.  |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *30* working daysover a time period of *12* of weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS**  | **COMPLETION DATE** |
| Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission) | *10 days*  | *February 04th, 2019* |
| MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | *5 days*  | *February 18th, 2019* |
| Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission | *0 day* | *February 22nd, 2019* |
| Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission) | *10 days*  | *March 15th, 2019* |
| Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)  | *5 days*  | *April 30th, 2019* |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP´s Brazil Country Office

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Brazil for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **CONSULTANT PROFILE**

A team of one independent consultant will conduct the MTR. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in Brazil;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years;
* Fluency in English; Proficiency in Portuguese is an asset;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in a relevant technical area.
1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[15]](#footnote-15)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[16]](#footnote-16) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)[[17]](#footnote-17));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=29916). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be sent to the following email ONLY: ***ic.procurement.br@undp.org*** This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by ***January 20th, 2019,*** indicating the following reference “Consultant for BRA/16/G31 Midterm Review”.Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for this process. The application should contain a current and complete CV in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact, as well as a price offer (in US Dollars) indicating the total cost of the assignment.

The CV and the proposed price must be submitted in separate files. Noncompliance with this provision will cause the application to be disregarded.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

Mandatory criteria:

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
* Fluency in English with excellent writing skills.

Qualifying criteria:

* Post-Graduate in related areas of the TOR;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system
* Experience of working on GEF evaluations, especially with Climate Change/Energy;
* Experience working in Latin America.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The final criteria for this selection process will be **technical capacity** and **price**.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual **consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:**

**1. CLASSIFICATION OF TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION (CV)**

The maximum score in TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION is 100 points.

Analysis of the CV regarding compliance with the mandatory requirements specified in these Terms of Reference. Candidates who do not meet the minimum mandatory criteria described herein will be disqualified at this stage.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **SCORE** | **WEIGHT** | **SUBTOTAL** |
| **Post-Graduate in related areas of the TOR** |
| Doctorate: 05 points; Master: 03 points; Specialization: 02 points | 0 to 5 | 2 | 10 |
| **Experience** |
| Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system  | 0 to 5 | 6 | 30 |
| 05 years or more: 05 points; Less than 05 years: 03 points; Less than 02 years: 01 point   |
| Experience of working on GEF evaluations, especially with Climate Change/Energy | 0 to 5 | 6 | 30 |
| 01 point per evaluation report  |
| Experience working in Latin America |   |   |   |
| 04 years or more: 05 points; Less than 04 years: 03 points; Less than 2 years: 01 point   | 0 to 5 | 6 | 30 |
| **Total** |  |  | **100** |

**2. CLASSIFICATION OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS (PRICE) – FINAL**

Only the financial proposals (price) of candidates who attain **a final Score of 70 points or higher in the TECHNICAL CLASSIFICATION** will be taken into consideration.

The Final Score—FS—of the process will be reached by the sum of the **final Technical Score—TS multiplied by a factor of 0.70**, and the **Price Proposal score—PS—multiplied by a factor 0.30**, i.e.:

FS = TS x 0.70 + PS x 0.30

The **PS** score will be calculated according to the following formula:

**PS = 100 x LPP / Ppe**

Where:

PS = score of the price proposal

LPP = lowest price proposal

Ppe = price proposal under evaluation

The lowest price proposal will score one hundred (100).

**The proposal achieving the highest final score will be selected.**

Annex B. Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?**  |
| - what are current government policies in support of CC | status and commitments of existing policy framework | national policies | review |
| - what are the legal government commitments to the UNFCCC | commitments entered into through the convention | UNFCCC convention | review  |
| -how does UNDP support GoB priorities in CC | degree existing UNDP development framework support Brazil’s CC priorities | UNDP staffCDF | interviewreview |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
| were the objectives/outcomes realistic | - overall subjective observations- progress described at time of MTR | project staff; project partnersPIR | interviews review |
| what evidence exists to demonstrate progress | overall subjective observationsprogress against LOAs | project staff/partnersLOAs | Interviewsreviews |
| were there any unexpected results | - observations-identification/description | project staffPIR | interviewsreview |
| were risks/assumptions correct | - overall subjective observations- impediments to progress described at time of MTR | project staff; project partnersPIR | interviews review |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** |
| - has project been implemented smoothly- how could it have been done better | - delays and sources in project implementation- changes in staff- meetings of TPC | project staff | interviews  |
| project partners | interviews |
| what progress has been described/quantified | descriptions available from PIR 1 | PIR | data analysis |
| what/when activities supported over 1st half of project  | number, types and schedule of activities and respective budgets | AWP | data analysis |
| what changes from PRODOC were required | reallocation of budget | budget amendments | data analysis |
| what was nature and periodicity of meetings supported under the project  | events that trigger ad hoc meetings not scheduled as part of regular schedule | minutes of meetings  | reading |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
| likelihood continued support will be forthcoming | on-going and future declared collaborative activities with MCTIC | project staff | interviews  |
| project partners | interviews |
| collaborative ministries | interviews |
| likelihood public will continue to support NC process | visitation rates of relevant webpages | websites | data analysis |
| likelihood enabling policies will stay in place | type and nature of legal commitments | national policies | analysis |
| likelihood of future financing | past financing and stated policy intentions for future support for EAs | financing agency policies | analysis |

Annex C. Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for Data Collection

Project Strategy

* were the project objective/outcomes realistic?
* were project objectives were/are responsive to Brazil’s needs?
* Were components realistic ref. project objectives, capacity of EA, funding, timeframe etc.?
* to what degree were lessons learned from the TNC was used in present design?
* are their concerns over existing/future government commitment to the NC process?
* risk assessment and proposed mitigation measures?
* delays in project startup and the inception workshop? and
* why not more use of SMART indicators?

Progress Towards Results

* how best to complete a quantitative assessment of progress towards achieving project outcomes and objectives given existing Logframe? and
* given achievement of progress to date will project objective be achieved, and if so, within the timeframe stated in the PRODOC (extension needed)?

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

* what did UNDP do to ensure quality at entry, and did it support implementation through providing adequate supervision and follow-up?
* what could government have done to improve performance in first half of project?
* how could have efficiency in project implementation been increased?
* how were gender aspects addressed in implementation phase?
* were there any un-intended outcomes / impacts?
* what were the main factors affecting project progress?
* describe how the M&E system was used to support project implementation? and
* how has the project addressed environmental and social safeguards and stakeholder engagement?

Sustainability

* what is the likelihood that some changes may occur that are detrimental to the ultimate achievement of the operation’s development outcome (please describe)?

 Other Issues to be discussed:

* sustainability ref. what happens after 4NC submitted?
* is there a need for reallocation of funds for different CC related investments at time of MTR?
* what was the role of externalities in affecting project progress towards objective (e.g., economic recession, change in government?; and
* other?

Annex D: MTR Ratings

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

## **Annex E. Mission Itinerary**

The following field visits were completed over the period 31 March – 5 April, 2019.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Place** |
| Sunday 31.03.19 | Arrive in Brasilia (morning) |
| Monday 1.4.19 | Meetings in Brasilia |
| Tuesday 2.4.19 | Meetings in BrasiliaTravel to Campinas, SP (air)Overnight in Campinas |
| Wednesday3.04.19(morning) | Meetings in Campinas, SPTravel to Sao Jose dos Campos, SP (land) |
| Wednesday 3.04.19 (afternoon) | 1. Meetings in SJ dos Campos, SP
2. Return to Brasilia (air)
 |
| Thursday 4.04.19 | Meetings in Brasilia |
| Friday 5.04.19 | Meetings in BrasiliaMission departs Brasilia (night) |

Annex F. List of Persons Interviewed

The following individuals were consulted, and field visits completed over the period 18 March – … May 2019.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Pre-mission** |
| **Date** | **Place/Mode** | **List of Participants** |
| Monday18.03.19 |  |  |
| 1500 – 1700 | Skype | Marcio Rojas da Cruz, National Project Director and General Climate Coordinator (MCTIC); Lidiane Melo, National Project Coordinator (MCTIC)**;** Danielly Godiva, Project Manager (MCTIC/UNDP);Rosenely Diegues, CO Focal Point (UNDP).  |
| Sunday 31.03.19 | **Arrive Brasilia** |
|  | **Mission** |
| Monday 01.04.19 | **Brasilia**  |
| 0800-11:00 | UNDP UN House – Sergio Vieira de Mello Complex | Rosenely Diegues, CO Focal Point (UNDP); Andrea Ribeiro Bosi, Programme Associate (UNDP) |
| 1400 - 1700 | MCTICMinistries Esplanade Block E | Marcio Rojas da Cruz, National Project Director and General Climate Coordinator (MCTIC); Lidiane Melo, National Project Coordinator (MCTIC)**;** Danielly Godiva, Project Manager (MCTIC/UNDP). |
| Tuesday 02.04.19 | **Brasilia** |
| 09:00 – 10:30 | MCTICMinistries Esplanade Block E | Márcio Rojas Da Cruz, National Project Director and General Climate Coordinator (MCTIC) |
| 11:00 – 12:30 | MCTICMinistries Esplanade Block E | Diogo Santos, Project Supervisor, V&A specialist (MCTIC/UNDP) |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | MCTICMinistries Esplanade Block E | Renata Grisoli, Technical Analyst GHG National Inventory (MCTIC/UNDP) |
| 16:00 - 1730 | SkypeEmail: bernardo@agrosatelite.com.br | Bernardo Rudorff, Executive Director, *Agrosatélite Geotecnologia Aplicada*. Land use mapping for the GHG National InventoryDaniel Alves de Aguiar |
| **Travel to Campinas, SP** |
| Wednesday 03.04.19 | **Campinas, SP** |
| 09:00 – 10:30 | Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation, (EMBRAPA) National Center for Agricultural Technology and Informatica UNICAMP, Barão Geraldo | Adriana Pires, Research Coordinator for Residual Solid Sector (GHG National Inventory)Priscila Grutzmacher, Waste Consultant |
|  | **Travel to São José dos Campos** |
| 16:30 – 17:30 | National Monitoring Center for Natural Disaster Alerts (CEMADEN)Dr Altino Bondensan St. 500São José dos Campos/SP | José MarengoScience-Technical Coordinator Vulnerability and Adaptation |
| 18-30 - 1900 | Telephone | Jean Ometto, Vice-Coordinator, Rede CLIMAINPE |
| **Return to Brasilia** |
| Thursday 04.04.19 | **Brasilia** |
| 08:00 – 10:00 | MCTICMinistries Esplanade Block E  | Lidiane Melo, National Project Coordinator (MCTIC)**;** Danielly Godiva, Project Manager (MCTIC) |
| 11:00 – 12:30 | Ministry of External Relations (MMA) Ministries Esplanade Block H | Paulo ChiarelliBUR Coordination and Elaboration Focal Point  |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Ministry of EconomyMinistries Esplanade Block P | Karen CoppeRede CLIMA Public Policy Specialist |
| 15:30 - 1630 | Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Coordination General for Climate Change)Ministries Esplanade Block D | Kátia MarzallGovernment representative for elaboration of the BUR |
| 17:00 - 1800 | EMBRAPA HeadquartersBiological Station | Gustavo MozzerGovernment Representative for the elaboration of the BUR  |
| 1800 - 1900 | Skype | Eduardo Assad, Science Technician for Agronomic Sector (GHG National Inventory and Vulnerability and Adaptation)EMBRAPA |
| Friday05.04.18 |  |  |
| 09:00 – 10:00 | National Industry Confederation (CNI), Executive Directorate of Environment and Sustainability (GEMAS)  | Marcos Cantarino, private sector representative that uses the results of the national inventory and GHG emissions |
| 10:30 – 10:30 | MMEMinistries Esplanade Block U | Luis Fernando Badanhan, Government representative responsible for following BUR development |
| 14:00 – 17:00 |  MCTICMinistries Esplanade Block E | Márcio Rojas Da Cruz, National Project Director and General Climate Coordinator (MCTIC);Lidiane Melo, National Project Coordinator (MCTIC); Andréa Nascimento de Araújo, Substitute General Climate Coordinator (MCTIC); Danielly Godiva, Project Manager (MCTIC); Rosenely Diegues, CO Focal Point (UNDP). |
| Friday05/04/19 | **Depart Brasilia** |

Annex G. List of Documents Reviewed/Consulted

UNDP documents.

UNDP, 2018. Project Implementation Review (PIR). Brazil 4NC.

UNDP, 2018. Country Programme: Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC).

UNDP, 2017. Minutes of the Tripartite Meeting (UN House, Brasília / DF 08.06.2017).

UNDP, 2017. Annual Report.

UNDP: 2016. Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Project Document (19.12.2014 – from GEF project website).

UNDP, 2016. Country Programme Document for Brazil (2017-2021).

UNDP, 2016. Minutes of the *Comite de Aprecia ao de Projetos* (UNDP, Brasilia/DF 06.05.2016.

Brazilian documents.

MCTIC, et. al., 2019. Brazil’s 3rd Biennial Update Report to the United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change.

MCTIC, et. al., 2017. Brazil’s 2nd Biennial Update Report to the United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change.

MCTIC, et. al., 2016. Third National Communication of Brazil to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – Volume I/ I – III.

MCTIC, et. al., 2014. Brazil’s 1st Biennial Update Report to the United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change.

MME/EPE, 2018. Brazil’s Energy Balance.

MTC, 2019. Audit Report for 2018.

MTC, 2018. Audit Report for 2017.

FRB, undated. Intended Nationally Determined Contribution towards achieving the objective of the UNFCCC.

GEF documents.

GEF Request for CEO Endorsement/Approval Template (19.12.2014)

GEF Project Identification Form (PIF) (5/12/2013)

STAP Scientific and Technical Screening of the Project Identification Form (8/5/2018)

GEF Secretariat Review for Full/Medium-Sized Projects (undated)

UNFCCC documents

UNFCCC (2003). Reporting on Climate Change: User manual for the guidelines on national communications from non-Annex I Parties, Bonn, Germany.

IPPC documents

IPCC (2006). *Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*: *Volumes 1 – 8)*.

IPCC (2003). *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, land-Use Change and Forestry*. Penman, J., Gytarsky, M., Hiraishi, T., Kruger, D., Pipatti, R., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., Tanabe, K. and Wagner, F. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/IGES, Hayama, Japan.

IPCC (2000). *Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. Penman, J., Kruger, D., Galbally, I., Hiraishi, T., Nyenzi, B., Enmanuel, S., Buendia, L., Hoppaus, R., Martinsen, T., Meijer, J., Miwa, K. and Tanabe, K. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/OECD/IEA/IGES, Hayama, Japan.

IPCC (1997). *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Volumes 1, 2 and 3*. Houghton, J.T., Meira Filho, L.G., Lim, B., Tréanton, K., Mamaty, I., Bonduki, Y., Griggs, D.J. and Callander, B.A. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/OECD/IEA, Paris, France.

Other documents.

Camarinha, P., 2018. Ppt. presented at Workshop on national adaptation goals/indicators and their relationship with the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, Tokyo, Japan, 24-25, July, 2018). MMA.

Rodrigues Mendes, M. H., undated. Brazil's Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs). Ppt presentation. MMA.

Selected internet addresses.

<http://www.mma.gov.br/>

<http://www.ibge.gov.br>

[http://www.MCTICc.gov.br/](http://www.mctic.gov.br/)

<http://www.inpe.br/>

<http://www.redeclima.ccst.inpe.br>

[http://www.sirene.MCTICc.gov.br](http://www.sirene.mctic.gov.br)

<https://unfccc.int>

<http://www.br.undp.org/>

[http://www.MCTICc.gov.br/MCTICc/opencms/ciencia/SEPED/clima/cimgc/Comissao\_Interministerial\_de\_Mudanca\_Global\_do\_Clima\_\_CIMGC.html](http://www.mctic.gov.br/mctic/opencms/ciencia/SEPED/clima/cimgc/Comissao_Interministerial_de_Mudanca_Global_do_Clima__CIMGC.html)

[http://sirene.MCTICc.gov.br/portal/opencms/](http://sirene.mctic.gov.br/portal/opencms/)

<http://redeclima.ccst.inpe.br/>

<http://www.ccst.inpe.br/projetos/inct/>

<https://www.ipcc/>

## **Annex H. Co-financing (NA)**

**Annex I: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_Random \_DuBois\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *\_\_*Luzern, Switzerland*\_\_\_\_\_*Luzern*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_*20 March 20*19\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(Date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex J: MTR Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex K: Audit Trail Template

To the comments received on (*7 June, 2019*) from the Midterm Review of Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (UNDP Project ID-*5187 #)*

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report** | **MTR team****response and actions taken** |
| LI | 1 | ExSummary (Progress towards Outcomes) | The network is not going to be established, however, the Project is going to develop a survey to assess the human perception of climate variability and change at the country. The MCTIC engaged with the CGEE (Center for Management and Strategic Studies) a discussion on how to conduct this action one month later the MTR. By july of 2020 there will be deliverables around this issue. | Agreed and addressed in the text. |
| RD | 2 | ExSummary (MTR Ratings Table) | During the PIR exercises over the years we have reviewed the risks related to the project implementation. Therefore, I am afraid this affirmation is not quite right – or maybe I do not get it. Maybe we could discuss further the issue of sustainability of EA for CC for developing countries under UNFCCC. I respect the evaluator’s opinion that EA are not sustainable given the rating, but then can the project change that scenario? What is up to the project to change? What is our role as project? Those questions should guide the risk to sustainability assessment. If you consider that such projects would be financed by GEF and that is a parameter for sustainability within the GEF project cycle, given we already have an endorsement, could it not be considered sustainable? Given the reality, non-annex 1 countries are entitled to NC resources and will submit EAs to the GEF, under what parameters are we considering this initiative unsustainable? I gather below that it relates from the recent political risks, that shall be reflected in the 2019 PIR. I think U is too harsh on the project at this point in time, given all the support that is still maintained for the project and given we already have an endorsement for the 5NC. Could you kindly explain the reasons for such a rating? I do not get it, sorry. | Agreed. This was an error and overlooked by the evaluator and changed to ML. Having said that, the evaluator remembers an initial discussion with the reviewer and raised the issue of financial sustainability and government assuming ownership of the NC process in the absence of GEF funding. However as long as the NC process is supported by international treaty and GEF continues to support non-annex 1 countries for purposes of the evaluation this was viewed as a source of “sustainable” finance for the foreseeable future and the issue of sustainablility of GEF funding for NCs outside of the scope of the MTR Nevertheless, the reviewer raises valid questions and given the possibility of Brazil becoming an Annex 1 country sometime in the future these should be considered in future NC processes. |
| EK | 3 | 36 | This doesn’t say much of what really happened during implementation so far related to stakeholder participation. Please elaborate on who are and was stakeholders during implementation. | Not agreed. This section is under project description and background context and was meant to identify the main stakeholders at time of PRODOC preparation. |
| LD | 4 | New 39 | Check spelling | Agreed. Changed to UNDP-GEF per 4NC PRODOC. |
| EK | 5 | Table 4 | This table doesn´t capture all the requested information, such as the first PIR rating, the achievement rating and its justification and the use of the traffic light symbology to easily identify the indicators with problems. Please see the table presented in the TORS (page 29 of the TOR annex in this same document) or annex 8 of the MTR guidance for more information | The Table that the reviewer requests is Table 2 (Progress towards Results Matrix) which can be found in Annex M and cited in para 9 above. For purposes of the MTR Table 4 was found to be more useful in the attempt to quantify progress (in the absence of MTR targets) since project initiation and included cumulative progress from both the PIR 1 and an update pre-PIR 2 that the consultant ask the team to fill out in anticipation of the MTR. The highly descriptive and voluminous nature of the PIR narrative was viewed by the evaluator as too lengthy for the main text of the MTR and needed to be summarized down to the essentials  |
| LD | 6 | Table 4 | Please also add some evidences and source of verifications available to improve transparency. | Done |
| LD | 7 | Table 4 | Please provide the website address | Done |
| DG | 8 | New 52 | The end of TNC project was delayed more than 15 months, around 2 yrs. The period of 15 months was the duration of the government validation of the document. | Agreed. Changed to 24 months. |
| EK | 9 | Table 5 | Please update this table at the end of the MTR exercise. | Not agreed. Contact with the national coordinator indicated this information not presently available. |
| LD | 10 | New 61 | Please also refer to currency exchange element which appears to be an issue for the whole GEF portfolio. | Done |
| RD | 11 | New 67 | The Logframe is used in the PIR. Thus, I do not understand the affirmation that the PRODOC is not used made earlier. In what other way was it supposed to be used? Maybe I am not understanding the point made by the evaluator. We might have slipped some points of the PRODOC (not having all PB meeting or IW), but overall, in my judgement, the PRODOC is the guiding principle we do follow. For UNDP, such statement is very strong. The PRODOC is an important guiding material for any project and should be the main guiding force for its implementation. Deviations require substantive revisions (adaptative management), at least in terms of goals and results, not at the activities level to which we do have flexibility. | The evaluator understands the point raised by the reviewer. Nevertheless, as a monitoring tool to asses progress and success as implementation progresses the absence of annual and MTR targets exacerbated in some cases by lack of use of SMART indicators, limits its usefulness as a tool. It effectively is a table that presents objective and outcome indicators, baseline and EOP targets. The PIR provides for the most part detailed descriptive narratives and while it clearly demonstrates that progress is being made, in the absence of annual/MTR targets it is very difficult to make a quantifiably-based evaluation. The text has been clarified and notes that at the time of the PRODOC this was not a GEF requirement (i.e., annual/MTR targets). |
| EK | 12 | New 67 | I would revise the S rating provided to implementation and adaptive management based on this and wonder what other sections of the prodoc were not used also | Disagree. The criteria for implementation and adaptive management are based on a subjective determination of progress “leading to efficient and effective project implementation” with only a few components requiring remedial action. Moreover, the Logframe was in compliance with GEF requirements at the time of the PRODOC though there was nothing that would have prevented UNDP to increase its rigour and utility. The logframe’s weaknesses were in fact recognized by UNDP and were to be addressed in the Inception Workshop that never took place. Finally, AWPs and PIRs were applied as monitoring tools but, since they were monitoring the same technical parameters as the underlying logframe, suffered from the same weaknesses.  |
| LD | 13 | New 67 | Also consider Inception workshop status | Done |
| LD | 14 | New 71 | Unclear, review writing | Done and addressed |
| LD | 15 | New 74 | Please provide evidence and web addresses. | Done |
| RD | 16 | Section D | As mentioned in the table, I do not understand the rating given in sustainability. Kindly consider the particularities of the project (EA under UNFCCC) vis-à-vis national scenario for this analysis. U seems to low, even reading the points below. Most of the issues are outside the project’s control and if I add the two LL and one M, I do not understand the U. Sorry. Kindly explain/reconsider.  | Agreed and addressed in Executive Summary table above. |
| EK | 17 | New 75 | Is a full analysis for update/definition of new risks a MTR recommendation? If not, please include | Not agreed. Risks identified at time of PRODOC are either no longer relevant or remain low with exception of institutional/governance risks which are fully appreciated by the NC4 team and mitigative measures being taken.  |
| RD | 18 | New 77 | Is this likely to occur in the next 04 years? We already got the next endorsement letter, though. | Agreed and modified accordingly. |
| RD | 19 | New 79 | Has this elevated so much to decrease the overall rating to U? I do not think so. The governance risk is still controlled | Agreed and modified per response in comment 2 above. |
| LD | 20 | New 81 | Are there any other innovative aspects other then using competitive bidding process? | This was one of the “standard” questions posed by the evaluator and this was main response.  |
| LD | 21 | New 82 | I would suggest though to check the budget allowed for equipment as the project intends to purchase hardware for the super computer of INPE. | Agreed and reflected in text. |
| RD | 22 | New 82 | We might need more time, given history of prior NCs and political momentum | Noted and addressed. |
| LD | 23 | New 82 | I actually like the idea of extending the project for 4 months only but apparently the MCTIC team sees the need for more time to guarantee GoB approval for submission. I don’t see this reflected here. It is important to consider the past historical path of approval and defining a final date, including plan of activities for project extension backed up by MTR. This is key to guarantee a smooth process of submission of the 5NC in the GEF7 cycle.  | Noted and addressed. |
| LR | 24 | New 82 | We would like to reinforce that the estimated period (4 months) probably couldn’t be enough to have the 4CN validated by the Brazilian government, and the final version of the report submited to the UNFCCC, taking into consideration the political context and the fact that some institutional actors changed, and the priorities under the agenda too. The MCTIC strongly support the period of extension of 18 months. | Noted and addressed also in new para 88 below. |
| RD | 25 | New 82 | At ATLAS and PIRs we have redefined some risks as relevant/ critical over the years. It is true, though, that the governance risk that is now pointed out by the evaluator was not there last year and shall be marked in 2019 PIR. | Noted |
| LD | 26 | New 84 | New cancellation policies of the GEF will require a completely new approach to submit new NC proposals to the board.  | Agreed and reflected in the text. |
| LD | 27 | New 85 | Which would be alternative scenarios, that include communication strategy, political articulation or other strategies to mitigate this risks? Would be nice to have some recommendations on this. | Tough question. At the practical level it seems MCTIC is doing what it can to promote the political articulation needed to reduce risk of inter-institutional barriers to the NC process (namely promoting increased dialogue and understanding with its counterpart institutions in Brasilia and always keeping MRE advised of its efforts for outreach. Other thoughts: (i) co-jointly preparing a series of policy documents highlighting the relevance of CC issues to each of the participating sectors; (ii) co-participating in a series of policy workshops led by an appropriate “neutral” party (MoE?) to examine how Federal CC policies can be better reflected in sectoral policies; (iii) promote (engineer) senior policy maker retreats to make mainline agency policy makers more aware of the relevance of CC issues to their respective sector well-being. Alternative scenarios launch a public awareness campaign to support NC4 objectives which in turn might bring some pressure on other mainline agencies and/or working increasingly with some of the States to achieve the same end result. This is an important enough question that it might warrant a consultancy to flesh out the best way forward not only for NC4 but for NC5.  |
| LD | 28 | New 88 | This explains the point I raised before. Given that we have an endorsed 5CN what is the final target for submission then? December 2020 or mid 2021? Communication activities should be done in parallel, is hard to justify 1 year extension only for communication activities. Extensions always have costs!! Even if there is no request for more grant resources. Planning is key to guarantee efficient implementation.  | Agreed |
| LR | 29 | New 88 | We would like to rise our comment made before. The MCTIC strongly support the period of extension of 18 months. At the moment we can’t estimate the period of delay on the approval of the final version of the Report (4CN) | Agreed an addressed above. |
| LD | 30 | New 88 | Please propose the new indicator. | The PRODOC states that project-supported policy briefs and documents would be published and disseminated with the aim of strengthening GOB institutional capacity. Possible indicators could be: reflecting CC-policies in their respective sectoral policies, evidence of sectoral workshops supporting increased public awareness/training of staff leading to mainstreaming elements of CC policies/document recommendations and/or sectoral participation in MCTIC document/policy brief launches etc.  |
| LD | 31 | New 90 | Defining possible implementing parties upfront in project design to reduce delays with LoAs | Agreed and reflected accordingly. |
| LD | 32 | New 94 | On a practical level: This planning exercise should be reflected in the activities and procurement plan. | Agreed |
| EK | 33 | Annex K | Please fill in with the comments made by the project team, CO and regional office. | Done |

Annex L: Relevant midterm tracking tools (NA)

Annex M: Supplementary Data Tables

**Table 1. Matrix of Key Milestones Demonstrating Increased Robustness in Brazil’s NCs over Time**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Input** | **National Communication** |
| **INC** | **SNC** | **TNC** | **4NC (projected)** |
| GHGInventory | Emissions period covered | 1990 – 1994 | 1990 – 2000 (2005) | 1990 – 2010 | 1990 – 2014 (2016) |
| Sectors covered | – all sectors following considering IPCC 1996 guidelines. | - focused on specific sectors/gases that are major contributors to GHG and/or high uncertainty, particularly in the LULUCF sector, where it was applied Tier 3 approach, covering 100% of the national territory.  | - focused on specific sectors/gases that are major contributors to GHG and/or high uncertainty, particularly in the LULUCF sector, where it was applied Tier 3 approach, covering 100% of the national territory. | – all sectors considering IPCC 2006 guidelines. |
| Best practices applied (specific practices or percentage of total as specified in 2006 IPPC document) | Key source analysis is not used | LULUCF sector start using 2006 GLs.Key source analysis is not used | Energy sector start using 2006 GLs EFs.Key source analysis is not used | 2006 GLs fully implemented |
| V&A | - described Brazilian research and monitoring initiatives related to CC- Analysed CC effects in marine and land ecosystems | - supported with studies- downscaling of global circulation models- presented CC scenarios from Global Climate Models and improvements achieved from the regional Eta model- described the status of development of the Brazilian Global Climate System model - MBSCG- Analysed CC effects in marine and land ecosystems | - presented CC scenarios from BESM- presented CC scenarios from Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM) and other Global Climate models (GCM) as well as from GCMs nested on the regional model Eta (Eta-MIROC5 and Eta-HadGEM2ES)- Assessed CC impacts and vulnerabilities on strategic sectors of Brazil | - documented CC scenarios (BESM)- downscaling of RESM- impact assessments on surface fire, and climatic fluctuations- regional and sector vulnerability analysis- human perception assessments- adaptation measures for key sector identified- description of the state of art on CC modelling in Brazil and analysis of CC scenarios- description of CC evidences in Brazil- Assessments of CC impacts and vulnerabilities on strategic sectors of Brazil, from an integrated approach: water, energy, food and socioecological securities.- identification and evaluation of adaptation initiatives (planned and under implementation) |
| National Circumstances | Information provided up to 2000 | Information updated to 2009 | Information updated to 2013 | 2014 - 2017 |
| Other relevant information | – |  | Information about mitigation actions included. | Information about adaptation plan and mitigation sectoral plans will be included. |
| Relevant institutional arrangements | the arrangement for the elaboration of INC was presented | the arrangement for the elaboration of SNC was presented | the arrangement for the elaboration of the TNC was presented, which included the activities of the Rede CLIMA, as well as the arrangement of the governance of the national policy on climate change in Brazil.  | the arrangement for the elaboration of 4NC (considering the articulation with the Rede CLIMA and other partner institutions) will be presented, indicating the improvements made in relation to what was done in the past to ensure the improvement of the NC (for example, creation of a mapping validation committee, and committee formation with government representatives to make the process more participatory).  |
| Challenges faced in the preparation of NC |  |  | Approval process within government | Formalization and articulation of institutional partnerships |
| Capacity building | 150 institutions/600 experts engaged in project | the numbers didn’t change significantly |
| Preparation of BUR | – | – | BUR 1 | BUR 2 & 3  |
| Key policy documents |  | Contribution to the development of the National Policy on Climate Change | Contribution to the development of the National Adaptation Plan |  Contribution to review the National Adaptation Plan, to monitor the progress of the mitigation actions and to support data with other government initiatives, or other bodies (eg FREL / REDD, sub-national GHG emission inventories, etc.) |
| Public awareness | – | – | Launch of SIRENE, with the public availability of all NC and BUR publication and national inventory results. Regional workshops to share the main results. | - updated MCTIC website- public workshops  |

Table 2. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment** | **Achievement Rating** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective: To assist the Government of Brazil to perform the activities necessary to prepare the Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports in accordance with the UNFCCC.** | Status of national GHG inventories: | TNC GHG inventory available for period 1990- 1994 (INC), 1990- 2000 (SNC) and 1990-2010 (TNC) | Not set or applicable (NA) | NA | National GHG inventory for the sectors: (i) energy;(ii) industry; (iii) agriculture; (iv) LULUCF; and (v) waste for 2011- 2014 produced; and time-series 1990-2010 refined |  | NA | NA |
| Status of assessment National Circumstances | TNC includes assessment of National circumstances until 2013 | NA | NA | Report on National Circumstances and description of steps taken or envisaged for the Convention implementation regarding the period 2014 to 2017 |  | NA | NA |
| Publication of Fourth National Communication | TNC published in December 2014 | NA | NA | 4th National Communication fully prepared and published |  | NA | NA |
| Level of institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change | Fragmented initiatives on education, training and public awareness | NA | NA | At least one research group supporting education, training and public awareness initiatives |  | NA | NA |
| Biennial Update Report for reference year 2012 and 2014 | First BUR (submitted with TNC) | NA | NA | BUR (submitted on 2016) and BUR (2018 submitted with FNC) |  | NA | NA |
| **Outcome 1: National GHG inventory is improved and updated.** | Database of emission factors and activity data: | Pilot database available under the SNC and TNC | NA | NA | Procedures for inventory development and management to enhance the current system evaluated and adjusted; |  | NA | NA |
| QA/QC plan for GHG emission data per sector: | QA/QC pilot has been designed and implemented under SNC and TNC | NA | NA | Best practices in the elaboration of inventories adopted |  | NA | NA |
| National GHG inventory for the sectors: (i) energy; (ii) industry; (iii) agriculture; (iv) LULUCF; and (v) waste; for 2011-2014 produced and time-series 1990-2010 refined | GHG inventory available for period 1990-1994 (INC), 1990-2000 (SNC) and 1990-2010 (TNC) | NA | NA | GHG inventory available for the period 2011-2014, including refinement of time-series 1990- 2010 |  | NA | NA |
| **Outcome 2: National circumstances, envisaged steps for the Convention implementation, and other relevant information.** | Assessment of national circumstances in Brazil: | TNC (data until 2013) | NA | NA | Report on national and regional development priorities and institutional arrangements. |  | NA | NA |
| Assessment of constraints and needs to implement the Convention in Brazil | TNC (data until 2013) | NA | NA | Report on needs, constraints and gaps and other relevant information |  | NA | NA |
| Identification of activities and CC measures to implement the Convention in Brazil | TNC (data until 2013) | NA | NA | Report on measures for climate change mitigation |  | NA | NA |
| **Outcome 3: Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures.** | Scenarios of “Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM)” | BESM developed and RESM/CPTEC model improved with higher resolution for a larger domain in the TNC | NA | NA | Documented climate scenarios based on the Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM) and downscaling with the RESM |  | NA | NA |
| Climate change impact assessment for atmospheric chemistry, surface vegetation fires, and others | Limited CC impact assessment has been prepared under TNC | NA | NA | Impact assessment of the atmospheric chemistry component of BESM; impact assessment of surface vegetation fires simulated by the fire module of BESM; impact assessment of projected large scale climatic fluctuations of rainfall on river runoff variations and its impacts on ocean carbon cycles and coastal erosion |  | NA | NA |
| Mapping of vulnerability of key sectors and regions to climate change impacts | Improved data and methodologies under TNC | NA | NA | Regional and generation of maps, under various emission scenarios and time slices, in GIS format. |  | NA | NA |
| Assessment of human perception on climate change | Independent studies on human perception on climate change | NA | NA | Network of low-cost data collection devices for the assessment of the human perception of climate variability (extreme events) and change, to be used as a metric for adaptationpolicies |  | NA | NA |
| Identification of key sectors and regions with climate change impacts | Preliminary results of studies on climate change vulnerability | NA | NA | Adaptation measures for the key sectors identified |  | NA | NA |
| **Outcome 4: Public Awareness and Education Strategy in Place** | Assessment of policies and programs related to climate change | Revised National Plan of Climate Change and regional workshops realised for TNC dissemination | NA | NA | Relevant documents and program/policy briefs published and disseminated |  | NA | NA |
| Updated webpage from MCTIC with information on 4NC | The dissemination of TNC and the inventory results available on the MCTIC webpage | NA | NA | Web site of the MCTIC updated with information on GHG inventories, legislation, scientific knowledge and other climate change issues |  | NA | NA |
| Dissemination of results found in the preparation of National Communication | Workshop-undertaken to present the results of TNC | NA | NA | Workshops, seminars and meetings with subnational governments organized and participation in public events in order to disseminate information on climate change issues, presenting main findings of the project. |  | NA | NA |
| **Outcome 5: Publication and submission of the Fourth NC** | Publication of Fourth National Communication |  (A) Previous NCs | NA | NA | Publication of the 4NC in hard copy and alternative media in Portuguese and English, presented to the GoB; |  | NA | NA |
| Publication of Reference Reports of the key sectors of the NationalGHG emissions Inventory | (Publication of reference reports ofTCN | NA | NA | Reference reports of the national inventory published for the different sectors |  | NA | NA |
| **Outcome 6: Preparation and submission of Biennial Update Reports (BUR) in 2016 and 2018** | Publication of Second BUR | First BUR submitted with TNC | NA | NA | BURs for 2016 published and submitted, including updates ofinformation. |  | NA | NA |
| Publication of Third BUR | Previous BUR |  | NA | BUR for 2018 and submitted including updates of information |  | NA | NA |

**Table 3a. Checklist of Sectoral Data-provider Progress participating in 4NC (Energy Sector)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Achieved** | **In-progress** | **Not started** | **Modified** | **Narrative Text** |
| - improve information on the national energy balance (BEN); |  |  |  |  | Some technical meetings were held with the team from the Ministry of Mines and Energy and the Energy Research Company (EPE), responsible for the dissemination and elaboration of BEN, to address the needs of the project and the improvements of these data. |
| - improve database with updated Useful Energy Balance (BEU), whose latest edition is 2005 (2004 base year); |  |  |  |  |  |
| - establishment of a common database to the energy sector and industrial processes sector; |  |  |  |  | The inventory team has been discussing with some partners and with UFRJ on the best alignment of data and analysis for these two sectors. |
| - contribute to the establishment of a national database for the current fleet of Road Transportation Sector |  |  |  |  | All these activities are in the definition phase. Other experts have to be involved to ensure that the best available data are used. Especially for road transport, efforts are being made to apply other variables in the calculation, which will represent an important improvement for the sector's inventory. The next UFRJ / Coppe product will present some of this information. The project analyst for this sector is following the discussions. |
| * - improve and extend the bottom-up approach for GHG emissions estimation;
 |  |  |  |  |
| * - improve knowledge of Brazilian specific energy transformation sectors;
 |  |  |  |  |
| * - improve knowledge of Brazilian emissions factors, especially for the non-CO2 gases emissions;
 |  |  |  |  |
| * - improve data and emissions estimation for the transportation sector using the IPCC Tier 2 Approach
 |  |  |  |  |
| * - improve methodology and obtain and extend data for estimating fugitive emissions.
 |  |  |  |  | For this subsector, there is the challenge of accessing data from the Brazilian Coal Association. A meeting was held with the representative, but the data has not yet been shared with the project. In any case, it is possible to apply Tier 1 of the IPCC to estimate emissions. In the inventory workshop in the next week, it will be discussed. |
| **New Activities (not specified in PRODOC)** |
| * – improve methodology for aviation.
 |  |  |  |  | Technical meetings were held with the National Civil Aviation Agency, which shared the data and estimates of emissions prepared in Tier 3, already validated by the Rede CLIMA team. |

**Table 3b. Checklist of Sectoral Data-provider Progress participating in 4NC (Industrial Sector)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Achieved** | **In-progress** | **Not started** | **Modified** | **Narrative Text** |
| - improve the assessment for the cement production sector implementing a Tier 3 methodology; |  |  |  |  | For some industrial sectors, public data made available by IBGE or IBAMA are being used. For cement and steel, the associations were contacted for access to the data. |
| - improve activity data and assessment for lime production, limestone and dolomite use sectors, covering existing gaps in the inventory; |  |  |  |  |
| - improve activity data and assessment of iron and steel industry and aluminium sectors implementing Tier 3 methodologies; |  |  |  |  |
| - improve activity data and assessment of chemical industry sector; |  |  |  |  |
| * - improve activity data and assessment of the production and consumption of HFCs, PFCs and SF6 sector.
 |  |  |  |  | A consultant was hired to carry out the survey of this information that is widely dispersed in the country and does not have adequate information management. We also held meetings with ANEEL to obtain support in the contact with companies responsible for SF6 emissions. |

**Table 3c. Checklist of Sectoral Data-provider Progress participating in 4NC (Agricultural Sector)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Achieved** | **In-progress** | **Not started** | **Modified** | **Narrative Text** |
| - improving the quality of activity data; |  |  |  |  | There was a meeting with IBGE to obtain data at the level of disaggregation necessary to improve this inventory. The updated and improved data is being used. |
| - develop methodologies with higher Tiers for some categories, for example, for enteric fermentation, direct emissions from soil and methane emissions from rice; and |  |  |  |  | In fact, emission estimates will be presented according to Tier 2 methodology. New parameters and regionalized emission factors are being used for calculations, |
| - develop country-specific emission factors proceeding with the studies initiated in the TNC. |  |  |  |  | Studies on regionalized emission factors, mainly for enteric fermentation, are underway. |

**Table 3d. Checklist of Sectoral Data-provider Progress participating in 4NC (LULUCF Sector)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Achieved** | **In-progress** | **Not started** | **Modified** | **Narrative Text** |
| - define primary land use categories and selected subcategories using high-resolution satellite data, at least, in 2010 and 2014, for the entire national territory |  |  |  |  | Project team is considering to use data from 2016 (rather than 2014). The land use transition mapping is performed for all 6 biomes. The biomes Pampa and Caatinga have already been completed, the Amazon biome will be completed in April. |
| - map the changes in land use from 2010 and 2014 using geo-referenced technology; |  |  |  |  |
| - identify individual cells by: (a) soil map, (b) native vegetation, (c) land use in year 2010 and 2014, (d) municipality; (e) biomass content; (f) climate |  |  |  |  |  |
| - estimate changes in carbon stock for each cell (all biomes and land use categories/ subcategories) identified in above activity for each of the five carbon pools, using in addition: a) carbon stock map for the main forest physiognomies in Amazonia, b) main literature concerning biomass stocks for the other biomes; c) reference soil carbon stock map |  |  |  |  | The Rede CLIMA partners are working on updating this information for each of the biomes and their phytophysiognomies. |
| - update inventory 1990-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - estimate non-CO2 emissions from fire, fertilizer application in forests, and liming;  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - extend studies on methane emissions from water reservoirs |  |  |  |  | There is no obligation at this time to apply the emissions methodology from water reservoirs. In addition, it is under review by the IPCC. Therefore, it was decided not to present such emissions. |
| - improvement in the estimates of the quantity of timber and charcoal production (especially for CH4 emissions) |  |  |  |  |  |
| - enhance estimates of forest degradation |  |  |  |  | For this inventory, it is possible to map areas of high impact through degradation, which represents a considerable improvement over the past inventory in which it was not possible to map these areas. |
| - enhance the understanding to the dynamics of land use, not only deforestation; and |  |  |  |  |  |
| - review the data base for vegetation physiognomy; |  |  |  |  |  |
| **New Activities (not specified in PRODOC)** |
| * HWP (harvested wood products)
 |  |  |  |  | For this inventory, emissions per HWP will be estimated. |

**Table 3e. Checklist of Sectoral Data-provider Progress participating in 4NC (Waste Sector)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Achieved** | **In-progress** | **Not started** | **Modified** | **Narrative Text** |
| - improve data and extend estimates for solid waste disposal sector with regional evaluation of waste generation rates, waste composition and disposal practices |  |  |  |  | The entire sector is being improved based on the IPCC 2006, considering new data and other subcategories. |
| - improve data and extend estimates for industrial waste water handling sector by type of industry |  |  |  |  |
| - improve the estimate of GHG emissions from waste incineration sector |  |  |  |  |

1. Based on headcount ratio. Source: *Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia Estatística* (IBGE). *Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios Contínua* (PNAD-C). Summary of Social Indicators 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In 2017, renewables accounted for 43.2% of the Brazilian energy mix, a significantly higher share than the world (13.8%) and the OECD (10%) averages. Biofuels and sugarcane biomass supplied 40.3% of total energy. Renewables supplied 80.4% of electric energy. Hydraulic sources generated 59.4% of total electricity, natural gas 10.5% and wind 6.8% (MME/EPE, 2018). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This effort was initiated in the TNC, which has generated unprecedented results for sectoral V&A analysis, although there are still aspects to be improved in the 4CN. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. By convention Project implementation began with the UNDP signing date of the PRODOC. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Specific, measurable, accepted, relevant and time-bound. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. More realistic project budgets for well-designed projects typically show a “bell-curve” reflecting the need to put people/contract/institutions in place in the first year to support efficient disbursement in the middle and later years of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-%282009%29.pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)