

COLOR LEGEND	
green	satisfactory
yellow	neutral or no information
red	unsatisfactory
orange	follow-up required

1. RELEVANCE			
Key questions	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
1.1 Was the project relevant to UNFCCC and other international convention objectives?		PIF / GEF Project Brief	Yes
1.2 Was the project relevant for the GEF CCM focal area?			Yes
1.3 Is the project relevant to Brazil's environment and sustainable development objectives?	Did the project fit within stated sector development priorities?	PIF / GEF Project Brief; Update based on interviews and general policy appraisal	Yes
	Had the outputs been developed with involvement from government officials and have they been adopted into national strategies, policies and legal codes?	Interviews with Government officials; Official publications; Government Agency publications	Yes
	How did the project support the environment and development objectives of the Brazil?	PIF / GEF Project Brief; Update based on interviews and general policy appraisal	Supportive
	What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?	Minutes of PPG phase activities	Stakeholders seem not well identified and involved
	Did the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?	Interviews with Government officials	Context was simplified and project design was heavily exposed to external factors.
1.4 Did the project address the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	How did the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?	TE Analysis	The Project addressed public and private stakeholders.
	Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?	TE Analysis; Minutes of project activities revealing explicit focus on stakeholders	Stakeholders werer involved during implementation
	Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	Minutes of PPG phase activities	Stakeholders were not well involved at design stage but this was remedied during implementation. ESCOs and FIs

			were not ready to benefit from the EEGM.
1.5 Was the project internally coherent in its design?	Were there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?	MTR; TE Analysis	A logical framework is in place but the theory of change is weak and suffers from some invalid assumptions.
	Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	Interviews with key stakeholders; TE Analysis	There project length and low expenditure rate indicate a mismatch.
1.6 How was the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	How did GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that were necessary but are not covered by other donors?	PIF / GEF Project Brief	The Project addressed almost exclusively the subject (EE and EEGM) in a period of turmoil, which is a great merit.
	Was there coordination and complementarity between donors?		Hardly. There is further no evidence of institutional coordination between the UNDP and IDB to push forward the specific subject of this intervention.
1.7 Did the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for similar projects in the future?	Did the experience of the project provide relevant lessons for future projects targeted at similar objectives?	TE Analysis	Yes. The TE includes a compilation of identified lessons.
1.8 Was there evidence of uptake of project activities and/or results by government stakeholders, demonstrating country ownership?	Have relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) actively been involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation? ¹	Minutes of PPG phase activities; minutes of technical committee and Project Board	The Project has increased interest in EE by at high policy level in Brazil.
	Has the recipient government maintained financial commitment to the project?	Evidence of government co-finance	Yes. Programs related to EE were updated and funding windows renewed.
	Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?	PIF / GEF Project Brief; Minutes of technical committee	Inter-ministerial coordination was rather poor. A strategic Project Steering Committee did not materialize. GEF Focal point did not intervene. Contacts at operational level was very good however.
1.9 Has the project contributed to improvement of key development indicators such as the SDGs?	Is it possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/ job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution,	Impact study; interviews with key stakeholders; Proceedings of Final Seminar; TE Analysis	Yes

¹ Note: The Terminal Evaluation should include a section covering the extent of stakeholder interaction. This includes planned interactions, as set out in the Project Document, and then actual involvement during the course of the project.

	regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability)?		
	Were the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP)?	UNDP Project Document; interviews with UNDP key staff	The Project document does not refer to Agency (UNDP and/ IDB) programme documents. However, the objectives are aligned with SDGs.
1.10 Has gender been taken into account during project design and implementation?	Have gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc)?	GEF Project Brief; Evidence of gender in project results and discussions; Interviews with Project Coordinator(s) and UNDP key staff	Not at design stage. A proactive policy was followed to ensure inclusiveness, including gender.

2A. EFFECTIVENESS			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
2.1 Were the project strategy and components clear and adequate for achieving the stated objective?	Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?	MTR; Substantive Revision; GEF Council and STAP comments during design; TE Analysis	The objectives were clear but not feasible.
	Were the project assumptions and risks well articulated in the PIF and project document?	MTR; Substantive Revision; GEF Council and STAP comments during design; TE Analysis;	Some critical assumptions were not validated although they were know at design stage.
	Were the stated assumptions and risks, logical and robust, and have they helped to determine activities and planned outputs?	Interviews with Project Coordinator and UNDP key staff	No.
	Were external factors (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) considered in project design and implementation?		No. The project anticipated a favorable investment climate in Brazil, but conditions changed completely. The project design was not robust.
	Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?		The capacities were adequate but ownership of the Project by national stakeholders was initially low. The project design seemed not to be aligned with local priorities.
	Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?	GEF Project Brief	As of 2009, there was little expertise in UNDP and IDB with setting up a guarantee mechanism. However, no provisions were made to mitigate risks

			and the project design suffered from optimistic forward reasoning.
	Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?	Inception Report; BTOR by UNDP CO staff and RTA	No
	Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?	Inception Report; Project self-assessments; project audit reports; MTR; BTOR by UNDP CO staff and RTA	In principle yes. However since local ownership was not properly negotiated, project management could not take off.
2.2 Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	To what extent did the project achieve the expected outcomes set forth in the Results Framework?	GEF Project Brief Strategic Results Framework (SRF); Revised Project Document SRF	Some outcomes were successful and others not. The GHG reduction target was not attained and efficiency of GEF resources (US\$ 13.5M) was poor.
2.3 How were project risks tracked, and how were risk mitigation measures managed?	How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?	Project Document; PB minutes; ATLAS Risk Matrix updates	Poorly.
	What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?		No
	Where there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?		No.
2.4 What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?	Project Terminal Report; Impact Study; PIRs; Interviews with key stakeholders;	Useful lessons have been learned concerning complexity of project design, choice of indicators, ambition level, robustness, and validation of assumptions.
	What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?	MTR; TE Analysis; Interviews with stakeholders	Proper structuring of output-outcome-impact levels. Avoidance of complex connections GEF-MIF-EEGM. Realistic targets. Entry point at correct level of implementation partner and not just political.

2b. FINANCIAL EFFECTIVENESS			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

2.5 Did the project include strong financial controls allowing the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables?	How do actual expenditures compare to the original budget? ²	ATLAS Combined Delivery Reports; ATLAS Annual Work Plans	Technical assistance expenditures kept within original budget. GEF funds in EEGM were largely unspent and not needed.
	How do annual expenditures compare to the original budget and anticipated project delivery rate?	Project Document; ATLAS Combined Delivery Reports; PB minutes TE Analysis	Expenditures lagged behind. GEF funds in EEGM were largely unspent and not needed.
	How do expenditures per project outcome, and per budget category, compare to what was originally planned?		See Annex.
	Have financial audits been conducted and how have their findings been used for financial management of the project? ³	Financial audits; Project QPR and APR; PB minutes TE Analysis	Audits were conducted and responded.
	To what extent did financial planning of GEF budget and co-funding comply with the incremental cost principle?		Technical assistance: yes. EEGM: no.
2.6 How well were project components supported by external funders integrated into the overall project?	Does the project document identify potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing?	PIF / GEF Project Brief	No. There was about US\$95M of investment expected to be mobilized based on the provided guarantees. This was already tagged as speculative at GEF Review. Nor this investment, nor the IDB collateral (US\$15M) were eventually disbursed.
	Was there sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources?		No.
	What was the effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of materialization of co-financing?	Project Financial Records; PB minutes; TE Analysis	The lack of materialization impeded the Project to deliver on energy savings and GHG reductions.
2.7 How cost-effective was the project in achieving the environmental benefits set forth?	Did the project meet or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned?	TE Analysis	No.
	Has there been a benchmarking of the project to compare costs and benefit levels of similar projects in similar contexts?	GEF Project Brief; TE Analysis	No. The unused GEF RAF funds allocated to Brazil have an opportunity cost.

² Note: Project cost and funding data should be presented, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures should be assessed and explained.

³ Note: Observations from financial audits as available should be considered. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

3. EFFICIENCY			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
3.1 Was project support provided in an efficient way?	Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	Project audit reports;	Yes
	What mechanisms were applied to ensure good value-for-money to deliver the envisaged project outputs and activities (especially those by delivered by external suppliers)?	TOR for contracted goods and services; TOR for work done internally; minutes of selection processes; awarded contract sums	Standard selection mechanism and due diligence.
	How was results-based management used during project implementation?	PB minutes; Interviews with Project Coordinator and UNDP key staff	Adequately.
	Were the project logical framework and work plans, and any changes made to them, used as management tools during implementation?		Yes. Also a Substantive Revision was produced.
	Was project implementation and project management as cost-effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?	Combined Delivery Report; project audits; TE Analysis	More or less. The project took various years to start but then delivered expeditely.
	Did the leveraging of funds (co- financing) happen as planned?	Project financial records; project financial audits	No, but this is due to the conceptual issues related to the type of cofinance.
	Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?	Project financial audits; TE Analysis	Yes, with some aspects to can be improved.
3.2 Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? ⁴	Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the mid-term review? Or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications.	MTR and management response; Inception Report; PB minutes	Changes were made.
	If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes?	Substantive Revision and its SRF; TE Analysis	The outcomes were refocused and the Project was split into 3, separately managed initiatives. The changes improved the approach followed and achored ownership within MMA.

⁴ Note: GEF foresees the following reasons for applying adaptive management: (a) original objectives were not sufficiently articulated; (b) exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed; (c) project was restructured because original objectives were overambitious; (d) project was restructured because of a lack of progress; (e) other (to be specified).

	Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?	PB minutes; Tripartite meeting minutes; Project communication files	The changes were approved by the Brazilian Cooperation Agency. MMA and UNDP. A steering committee was not in place.
3.3 Was reporting accurate and timely?	Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?	List of QPR, APR/PIR; Project Board briefings	PIRs were delivered as scheduled.
3.4 How efficient were partnership arrangements for the project?	To what extent were partnerships and linkages between institutions and organizations encouraged and supported?	Project terminal document; Final Seminar proceedings; Interviews with stakeholders	Highly.
	What type of partnerships and linkages were facilitated, and can these be considered sustainable?		Yes.
	What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?	MTR; minutes of technical committee and Project Board meetings	High.
	Which methods were successful or not and why?	TE Analysis	See TE report.
3.5 Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?	GEF Project Brief; Inception Report; TE Analysis; Interviews with key stakeholders	Little international expertise was drawn into the project. The TE did not conceive this as a problem.
	Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?		Local capacity to implement project activities was adequate and used.
	Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?		There were important voids in inter-institutional collaboration which affected the Project.
3.5 What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?	TE Analysis	See TE report
	How could the project have carried out implementation more efficiently (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnership arrangements etc.)?	TE Analysis; Interviews with key stakeholders	With the benefit of hindsight, yes.
	What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?		Closer supervision by the GEF agencies and the GEF OFF.

4A. UNDP IMPLEMENTATION QUALITY			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
4.1 How was the overall implementation quality by UNDP?	Was there an appropriate focus on results?	APR/PIRs; Project Board meeting minutes;	More or less. The project PIF dates back from 2006, when there was less awareness about RBM, which affected

		Interviews with key stakeholders and UNDP staff;	the rigor in project design, and the ambition level.
	How adequate was UNDP's support to the Implementing Partner and project team in terms of quality and timeliness?	BTOR by RTA and other UNDP officers	Good, considering the legal limitations to install a full-fledged PMU within the Government and the constrained CO resources to mitigate this situation.
	Did UNDP have adequate staff capacity and resources for effectively supporting project implementation over time? If not, what was the reason for this?		The TE lacks information for a proper assessment. In 2010-2013, CO invested substantially to start the Project (without project expenditures). Then, expenditure soared (2015-2017). Towards the end, Project was closed down and little staff available to support implementing partner to finalize. UNDP CO staffing capacity is constrained.
	Did UNDP have the effective capacity to provide project implementation support under cost-recovery?		Yes. According to the CDR, some posts indicate cost recovery.
	How accurate was annual reporting, which balance was struck between candor and realism?	APR/PIRs	Fair. The Evaluator would prefer a much more concise PIR in line with SMART indicators. Reporting was hampered by the lack of a defined baseline.
	How was the quality of risk management?	ATLAS Risk Matrix updates	The outcomes under the revised Prodoc after SR were adequately monitored.
	How responsive were the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any)?	PB meeting minutes and other internal UNDP notes	The technical committee shows a good understanding of opportunities and issues. However, a strategic discussion between IDB, UNDP and Govt on the EEGM did not take place.
How were salient issues regarding project duration and delivery rate addressed?		Hardly. Nor UNDP nor MMA seemed worried to keep annual project delivery rates on track. Given the delayed start of the Project, this was neither possible. See comment on RBM.	

4B. IDB /IDB INVEST IMPLEMENTATION QUALITY			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
	Was there an appropriate focus on results?		No. The information provided does not show an effort to trigger the committed

4.1 How was the overall implementation quality by IDB?		APR/PIRs; Project Board meeting minutes; Interviews with key stakeholders and UNDP staff; BTOR by RTA and other UNDP officers	GHG reductions and private investment during the Project's timeframe. No adaptive management has been applied to reprogram activities or budget to deliver on the key indicators.
	How adequate was IDB's support to the Implementing Partner and project team in terms of quality and timeliness?		A support relation between IDB and MMA seemed not in place. IDB provided guidance to Atla, which was subcontracted by IDB.
	Did IDB have adequate staff capacity and resources for effectively supporting project implementation over time? If not, what was the reason for this?		IDB did not provide specific information to evaluate this question. The institutional channeling of the GEF project towards IDB Invest is unclear. Questions in this direction were not answered. The IDB GEF focal person has not been involved in PIR reviewing and TE.
	Did IDB have the effective capacity to provide project implementation support under cost-recovery?		Yes, this capacity was subcontracted to Atla.
	How accurate was annual reporting, which balance was struck between candor and realism?	APR/PIRs	Reporting was adequate at operational level but did not address progress towards the attainment of outcomes and impacts. No action was taken based on the PIRs to correct this situation.
	How was the quality of risk management?	ATLAS Risk Matrix updates	Poor. The EEGM was already high-risk from the start (weak ESCO market, withdrawal of BNDES). Strategic monitoring did not take place.
	How responsive were the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any)?	PB meeting minutes and other internal UNDP notes	Not responsive at a strategic level. Operationally, Atla implemented a large number of promotional activities and engaged with FIs and projects. A strategic discussion between IDB, UNDP and Govt on the EEGM did not take place.
	How were salient issues regarding project duration and delivery rate addressed?		Although demand for the EEGM was low, no effort was made to redirect the GEF resources to attain the Project targets.

5. IMPLEMENTING PARTNER IMPLEMENTATION (MMA) QUALITY			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
5.1 How was the overall implementation quality and role of the National Implementing Partner?	How adequate was IP project implementation in terms of results and timeliness?	TE Analysis (Project delivery rate assessment)	After the Substantive Revision, project implementation was expedite.. The Evaluator perceives that knowledge of UNDP and GEF procedures could have been better.
	Did the IP made available the required staff capacity for effective and timely implementation of project activities? If not, what was the reason?	Interviews with key Government staff; MTR	Yes. MMA staff was made available to implement the Project.
	How accurate was annual reporting, which balance was struck between candor and realism?	APR/PIRs	Fair. The Evaluator would prefer a much more concise PIR in line with SMART indicators. Reporting was hampered by the lack of a defined baseline.
	How was the quality of risk management?	ATLAS Risk Matrix updates	The outcomes under the revised Prodoc after SR were adequaly monitored.
	How accurate were management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement?	Annual Work Plans, APR/PIRs; PB Meeting minutes	Formal constraints impede a full-fledged National Implementation Modality within BR Govt. Extensive back-up from UNDP and the appointment of a Project Technical Advisor are needed to circumvent this problem, putting substantial management tasks in hands of UNDP (but not political choices, which rest with MMA). The tandem UNDP-MMA performed well but with higher transaction costs than supposed under a NIM.
	How were salient issues regarding project delivery rates, attainment of results and external factors identified and put forward?	PB meeting minutes and other internal UNDP notes	Hardly. Nor UNDP nor MMA seemed worried to keep annual project delivery rates on track. Given the delayed start of the Project, this was neither possible. See comment on RBM.
	How successful was the IP to create and/or consolidate government ownership?	Interviews with key Government staff; Evidence of institutional continuation and/or support from Government	Highly. MMA managed to get key public sector actors on board (ANEEL, EPA, MME, MPDG)

6. M&E PLAN DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
6.1 Was the M&E plan well conceived and budgeted? ⁵	Was the M&E plan sufficiently articulated to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?	GEF Project Brief SRF; Substantive Revision SRF; MTR	No. A formal M&E plan is mentioned in the Prodoc was not elaborated. Clear procedures regarding IDB and UNDP's role in M&E were not established, as evidenced by the TE exercise. No baseline was established.
	Were the monitoring indicators from the project document sufficient and effective for measuring progress and performance?	TE Analysis into quality of indicators, targets and means of verification	Yes.
	Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?	GEF Project Brief / Prodoc; Listing of M&E activities carried out (such as field visits); Final impact report (as indicated in GEF Project Brief)	No information available to assess this question.
6.2 To what extent were follow-up actions taken in response to monitoring reports?	To what extent were follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, taken in response to monitoring reports (APR/PIRs, and MTR)? ⁶	Inception Report; UNDP management response to MTR; project internal communications; minutes of interaction with stakeholders	The actions agreed were implemented.
	Were the APR/PIR self-evaluation ratings consistent with the MTR and TE findings?	APR/PIRs	Not assessed by TE at this stage
	How were the findings of self-evaluations and discrepancies with MTR/TE identified by the project steering committee and addressed?	Minutes of Project Board meetings; Interview with UNDP RTA and/or project assistant	The PIRs and MTR were not reviewed by a PSC (as this was not in place) nor by the GEF OFF

7. SUSTAINABILITY			
KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	SOURCES AND/OR METHODOLOGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
7.1 What financial risks may affect sustainability of project outcomes?	Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?	Project terminal report; Impact report Interviews with key stakeholders and Project coordinator;	The TE has not identified specific financial risks. Most TA has resulted in policy, programs which require a proper hand-over.

⁵ Note: An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and adequate funding for M&E activities.

⁶ Note: Terminal Evaluations for full size projects should also consider whether changes were made to project implementation as a result of the MTR recommendations.

	What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends?	TE Analysis	Baseline financing for EE remains available under public funding programs (ANEEL) with improved eligibility for RE and EE services. IDB Invest has communicated it will not continue the EEGM as market demand is insufficient.
7.2 What socio-economic risks may affect sustainability of project outcomes?	Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?	Project terminal report; Impact report Interviews with key stakeholders and Project coordinator;	No information is available to assess this question.
	What is the likelihood that stakeholder ownership be insufficient for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?	TE Analysis	Substantial. The products of the Project need to be transferred to a local entity, otherwise, sustainability of some TA results may be at risk.
	Is there awareness among the key stakeholders that continued project benefits are in their interest?		Yes
7.3 What institutional framework and governance risks may affect sustainability of project outcomes?	Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	Project terminal report; Impact report Interviews with key stakeholders and Project coordinator;	The TE did not identify such risks
	Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical knowhow, in place?	TE Analysis	Fairly well. Most investment schemes (e.g. ANEEL) are transparent. However, monitoring of effective performance of investments (energy savings) does not received due attention yet and a system to this purpose (MRV) is not implemented so far.
7.4 What environmental risks may affect sustainability of project outcomes?	Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Project terminal report; Impact report Interviews with key stakeholders and Project coordinator; TE Analysis	The TE did not identify such risks.
7.5 Has sustainability adequately been addressed during project design and implementation?	Did the project design include the development and implementation of a sustainability strategy?	GEF Project Brief; MTR; interviews with key stakeholders; TE Analysis	No. The lack of an exit strategy was questioned at GEF review before CEO Endorsement.
	Were financial instruments and mechanisms foreseen and implemented to ensure ongoing benefits post-project?		Yes, this is part of the project design
	Did the project design consider the establishment of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector, and were these achieved?		The Project was overambitious regarding its Public Building Initiative. Positive results were obtained, although of a somewhat different nature.

	Did the project design and implement business models and delivery mechanisms to ensure post-project delivery of benefits?	Yes. The Project proposed several business models as alternatives to the conventional ESCO, and to access the public buildings sector.
	Did the project design and successfully implement policy and regulatory frameworks supportive of the project objectives?	Yes. The Project was successful in analyzing and adapting secondary legislation to promote EE within the Federal Government
	Did the project manage to create appropriate institutional capacity, including a mechanism for sustaining this? (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.).	Institutional capacity is unlikely created. This is mainly due to the impediment for fully integrating a Project into the host entity (MMA). Individual skills and capacities of public officers certainly increased.
	Did the project identify and mobilize project champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote project outcomes)?	Fairly. Champions include MMA, ANEEL, some municipalities and ESCOs (SOMAR). But project ownership still largely rests with the participating national energy professionals, consultants and academic specialists, rather than the market (private sector businesses, public building operators, and national FIs). Follow-up on this is highly recommended.
	Are stakeholders aligned in terms of what actions are needed to enhance sustainability of project outcomes?	The TE has no information available to respond. A (subjective) impression during the Final Seminar is, that the results are still scattered and ownership is not defined. As a recommendation, MMA and MME should join efforts with UNDP and IDB to identify follow-up actions.