

## ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

<p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD:</b> Public sector and civil society institutions capacities for policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, focusing in particular on the most vulnerable groups, strengthened.</p>
<p><b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> Strengthening of public policy institutional arrangements with focus on specialized studies and systems.</p>
<p><b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:</b> 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Enabling Activities (CCM-6):</b> CC Enabling Activity</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> Fourth National Communication (FNC) and Biennial Update Reports (BUR)</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> Completed and submitted Fourth National Communication (FNC) and Biennial Update Reports (BUR)</p>

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
<p><b>Project objective:</b>  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.</p>	(A) Status of national GHG inventories;	(A) TNC GHG inventory available for period 1990-1994 (INC), 1990-2000 (SNC) and 1990-2010 (TNC)	National GHG inventory for the sectors: (i) energy; (ii) industry; (iii) agriculture; (iv) LULUCF; and (v) waste for 2011-2016 produced; and time-series 1990-2010 refined	Project evaluation and official reports to the UNFCCC	<p><b>Risks:</b> No major risks have been identified in the implementation of this project since the Government of Brazil is strongly committed to its obligations under the international agreements on Climate Change and in particular to the reporting under the UNFCCC.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil.</p>
	(B) Status of assessment National Circumstances	(B) TNC includes assessment of National circumstances until 2013	(B) Report on National Circumstances and description of steps taken or envisaged for the Convention implementation regarding the period 2014 to 2019;		
	(C) Publication of Fourth National Communication;	(C) TNC published in April 2016	(C) 4 <sup>th</sup> National Communication fully prepared and published		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
	(D) Level of institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change.	(D) Fragmented initiatives on education, training and public awareness	(D) At least one research group supporting education, training and public awareness initiatives		
	(E) Biennial Update Report for reference year 2012 and 2014	(E) First BUR	(E) BURs (submitted on 2016 and 2018)		
<b>Outcome 1: National GHG inventory is improved and updated.</b>	(A) Database of emission factors and activity data;	(A) Pilot database available under the SNC and TNC	(A) Procedures for inventory development and management to enhance the current system evaluated and adjusted;	Status of the preparation of the inventory report	<p><b>Risks:</b> (1) Coordination with stakeholders may cause delay since a large number of actors from different economic sectors of the society are involved. (2) Difficulty in hiring qualified people.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> (1) 4NC will benefit from experience gained with INC, SNC and TNC; (2) Project can draw on a pool of experts, including Rede CLIMA researchers; (3) The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil.</p>
	(B) QA/QC plan for GHG emission data per sector;	(B) QA/QC pilot has been designed and implemented under SNC and TNC	(B) Best practices in the elaboration of inventories adopted.		
	(C) 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.	(C) GHG inventory available for period 1990-1994 (INC), 1990-2000 (SNC) and 1990-2010 (TNC)	(C) GHG inventory available for the period 2011-2014, including refinement of time-series 1990-2010.		
<b>Outcome 2: National circumstances, envisaged steps for the Convention implementation, and other relevant information.</b>	(A) Assessment of national circumstances in Brazil;	(A) TNC (data until 2013)	(A) Report on national and regional development priorities and institutional arrangements.	Status of the report preparation	<p><b>Risks: (1)</b> Limited political support to Climate Change issues; (2) Difficulty in hiring qualified people.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> (1) 4NC will benefit from experience gained with INC, SNC and TNC; (2) Project can draw on a pool of experts, including Rede CLIMA researchers; (3) The</p>

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
					Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil.
	B) Assessment of constraints and needs to implement the Convention in Brazil;	(B) TNC (data until 2013)	(B) Report on needs, constraints and gaps and other relevant information.		
	(C) Identification of activities and CC measures to implement the Convention in Brazil;	(C) TNC (data until 2013)	(C) Report on measures for climate change mitigation.		
<b>Outcome 3: Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures</b>	(A) Scenarios of “Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM)”;	(A) BESM developed and RESM/CPTEC model improved with higher resolution for a larger domain in the TNC	(A) Documented climate scenarios based on the Brazilian Earth System Model (BESM) and downscaling with the RESM.	Status of the development of the scenarios and the vulnerability and adaptation report.	<b>Risks:</b> Several minor risks have been identified: (1) complex coordination with stakeholders may cause project delays; (2) access to supercomputers; (3) delay to generate regional climate change scenarios; (4) quality of satellite images available for analysis; (5) delays in the preparations of reports.

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
	(B) Climate change impact assessment for atmospheric chemistry, surface vegetation fires, and others;	(B) Limited CC impact assessment has been prepared under TNC	(B) 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.		<b>Assumptions:</b> The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil.
	(C) Mapping of vulnerability of key sectors and regions to climate change impacts.	(C) Improved data and methodologies under TNC	(C) Regional and sectoral vulnerability analysis (using vulnerability indexes) and generation of maps, under various emission scenarios and time slices, in GIS format.		
	(D) Assessment of human perception on climate change	(D) Independent studies on human perception on climate change	(D) 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.		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
	(E) Identification of key sectors and regions with climate change impacts.	(E) Preliminary results of studies on climate change vulnerability	(E) Adaptation measures for the key sectors identified.		
<b>Outcome 4: Public Awareness and Education Strategy in Place</b>	(A) Assessment of policies and programs related to climate change;	(A) Revised National Plan of Climate Change and regional workshops realised for TNC dissemination	(A) Relevant documents and programs/policy briefs published and disseminated.	Project reports (4NC, evaluation report)	<p><b>Risks:</b> Several minor risks have been identified: (1) no interest of people to access the information; (2) difficulty to involve the general public.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> (1) The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil; (2) is increasing people's interest for matters related to climate change.</p>
	(B) Updated webpage from MCTI with information on 4NC;	(B) The dissemination of TNC and the inventory results available on the MCTI webpage	(B) Web site of the MCTI updated with information on GHG Inventories, legislation, scientific knowledge and other climate change issues.		
	(C) Dissemination of results found in the preparation of National Communication	(C) Workshop's undertaken to present the results of TNC	(C) 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.		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
<b>Outcome 5: Publication and submission of the Fourth NC.</b>	(A) Publication of Fourth National Communication;	(A) Previous NCs	(A) Publication of the 4NC in hard copy and alternative media in Portuguese and English, presented to the GoB;	Project reports (4NC, evaluation report)	<p><b>Risks:</b> No specific risks have been identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> (1) The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil; (2) project stakeholders correctly understand UNDP/GEF M&amp;E principles.</p>
	(B) Publication of Reference Reports of the key sectors of the National GHG emissions Inventory.	(B) Publication of reference reports of TCN	(B) Reference Reports of the National Inventory published for the different sectors.		
<b>Outcome 6: Preparation and submission of Biennial Update Reports (BUR) in 2016 and 2018</b>	(A) Publication of Second BUR.	(A) First BUR submitted	(A) BUR for 2016 published and submitted, including updates of information.	Project reports (BUR-2016 and BUR-2018)	<p><b>Risks:</b> (1) Delay in compilation of GHG inventory for period 1990-2012 and 1990-2014 by 2016 and 2018, respectively due to limited time.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> (1) Brazilian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC</p>
	(B) Publication of Third BUR.	(B) Previous BUR	(B) BUR for 2018 published and submitted, including updates of information.		

**ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

## ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- i. Title page
    - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
    - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
    - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
    - Region and countries included in the project
    - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
    - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
    - TE Team members
  - ii. Acknowledgements
  - iii. Table of Contents
  - iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
    - Project Information Table
    - Project Description (brief)
    - Evaluation Ratings Table
    - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
    - Recommendations summary table
  2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
    - Purpose and objective of the TE
    - Scope
    - Methodology
    - Data Collection & Analysis
    - Ethics
    - Limitations to the evaluation
    - Structure of the TE report
  3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
    - Project start and duration, including milestones
    - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
    - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
    - Immediate and development objectives of the project
    - Expected results
    - Main stakeholders: summary list
    - Theory of Change
  4. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating<sup>1</sup>)

### 4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

### 4.1 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

### 4.2 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness (\*)
- Efficiency (\*)
- Overall Outcome (\*)

---

<sup>1</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.



- Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Gender equality and women's empowerment
  - Cross-cutting Issues
  - GEF Additionality
  - Catalytic/Replication Effect
  - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations
  - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
  - TE itinerary, including summary of virtual visits
  - List of persons interviewed
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results
  - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
  - TE Rating scales
  - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
  - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
  - Signed TE Report Clearance form
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

## ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

*This is a generic list, the evaluator can add questions as necessary.*

Evaluative Questions	Criteria	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?</b>				
• Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators</li> <li>• The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	Desk review
Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically?		The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• National development strategies (Vision 2030, Medium Term Socio-Economic Framework) Draft Energy Policy,</li> <li>• PIF</li> </ul>	Desk review
Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified?		The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• PIF</li> </ul>	Desk review
Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>UNDP CPD, MSDF, SP</li> </ul>	Desk review
Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement.</li> </ul> <p>Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder Consultation Reports</li> </ul>	
Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area		A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review</li> <li>Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>
Have relevant lessons learned from previous		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review</li> </ul>

projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project?	all aspects of the Project Document	PIF	Stakeholder Interviews
Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?	The SES checklist was completed appropriately, and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>SES Annex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?	The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Monitoring Reports</li> <li>Beneficiary testimony</li> <li>Site visit/field reports</li> </ul> Pilot Data Analysis/Reports Project Document (table 8), PIR, tracking tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul> Site visits
Is the installed solar PV capacity adequate to enable the realization of the intended cumulative reduction in emissions?	The installed PV capacity is sufficient to achieve the desired emission reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Monitoring Reports</li> <li>Beneficiary testimony</li> <li>Site visit/field reports</li> </ul> Pilot Data Analysis/Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document (table 8), PIR, tracking tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Site visits</li> </ul>
Has the project achieved any direct Emissions Reductions based on the energy interventions.	The project has achieved emission reductions and monitoring is ongoing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Monitoring Reports</li> <li>Beneficiary testimony</li> <li>Site visit/field reports</li> </ul> Pilot Data Analysis/Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document (table 8), PIR, tracking tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Site visits</li> </ul>
Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making?	Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul> Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
How well were risks (including those identified in the Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clearly defined risk identification, categorization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>M&amp;E Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?	and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS)		Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?	The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government	Steering Committee Meeting Minutes	Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft legislation</li> <li>Policy Documents</li> </ul> Action/Implementation Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul> Stakeholder consultation
Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?	The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul> Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul> Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A gender mainstreaming plan was completed</li> <li>The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant.</li> <li>Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective</li> </ul> The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender Mainstreaming Plan</li> <li>Project Document</li> </ul> Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul> Stakeholder consultation
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities</li> <li>Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation</li> <li>Any changes to the project's planned activities were</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Work Plans</li> <li>Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> </ul> Revised Project Results Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review</li> </ul> Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

	<p>approved by the Steering Committee</p> <p>Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required</p>		
To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements.</li> </ul> <p>Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VFM, RFI, Market Surveys</li> <li>Procurement Evaluation Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review</li> <li>Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates</li> <li>Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified</li> </ul> <p>Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Work Plans</li> <li>Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality.</li> </ul> <p>Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s)</li> <li>UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents)</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel</li> </ul>
Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP</li> <li>An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds</li> </ul> <p>The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HACT Assessment(s)</li> <li>Capacity Assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review</li> </ul>
Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The M&amp;E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded</li> <li>The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&amp;E tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>AWPs</li> <li>FACE forms</li> <li>Quarterly Narrative Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality)</li> </ul> <p>Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels</p>	Site visit reports	
Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks</li> <li>Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice</li> </ul> <p>Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procurement/Recruitment reports</li> <li>FACE forms</li> <li>CDRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings.</li> </ul> <p>Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Audit Reports</li> </ul>	Desk Review
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>Risk Log</li> </ul>	Desk Review
Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>Risk Log</li> </ul>	Desk Review
Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy</li> </ul> <p>MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>Risk Log</li> <li>MOU(s)</li> </ul>	Desk Review
Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>Risk Log</li> </ul>	Desk Review

Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions	The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly/ Semi-annual Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Monitoring Reports</li> <li>Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review</li> <li>Stakeholder Consultation</li> </ul>
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring &amp; Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

## ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

### 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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

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 \_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

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



**ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales**

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

**Terminal Evaluation Report for Project BRA/16/G31 – Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) – (PIMS 5187.**

**Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**

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

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

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

**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**

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

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

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

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

**To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of BRA/16/G31 – Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) – (PIMS 5187).**

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovations				
UNDP Brazil				
UNDP Regional Hub LAC				