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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		108	
GEF Agency project ID		44729	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Phaseout of Ozone Depleting Substances	
Country/Countries		Belarus	
Region		Europe and Central Asia (ECA)	
Focal area		Ozone Depleting Substances	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		NA	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not specified	
Private sector involvement		Atlant; Beltorgprogress; Belvar; Minsk Computer; Kamerton; and Tsvetotron	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 14, 1997	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 11, 1997	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		August 29, 2000	
Actual date of project completion		December 29, 2000	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.21	.21
	Co-financing	.03	.03
GEF Project Grant		6.69	6.79
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	8.8	7.99
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		6.9	7
Total Co-financing		9.1	8.02
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		16	15.02
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 22, 2001	
Author of TE		Karin Shepardson (Team Leader)	
Original GEF TER preparer (2002)		Antonio Del Mónaco	
Original GEF TER reviewer (2002)		Ramesh Ramankutty	
Revised TER completion date		May 31, 2016	
Revised TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
Revised TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not explicitly state the Global Development Objectives of the project. The main objective of the project was to "assist Belarus with the rapid phase out of ODS [Ozone Depleting Services] consumption in a manner consistent with international efforts and within internationally agreed timeframes" (PD pg. 2). At the time of the project design, the dominant consumers of ODS in Belarus were the refrigeration sector (80%), the solvent sector (13%), and the fire protection sector (2%). It was recognized that ODS can lead to environmental degradation such as decreased plant productivity and the deterioration of the marine food chain (PD pgs. 1-2). It was also recognized that the project would contribute to global efforts to reduce damage to health and to the environment from increasing exposure to ultraviolet radiation (PD pg. 10).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not explicitly state the Development Objectives of the project. The Project Document does note that the project would provide "assistance to high consumption enterprises in Belarus [which] would enable them to make the transition to non-ODS materials before supplies diminish." Additionally, the project would provide needed "technical assistance and institutional strengthening to an Ozone Office established on July 1, 1996 in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP)" (PD pg. 2) .

The Project Document outlines the following enterprise-specific technology conversion investment sub-projects and technical assistance sub-components:

Technology Conversion Investment:

- Refrigeration Manufacturing
- Refrigeration Servicing
- Solvents

Technical Assistance and Training:

- Fire Protection Technology Transfer

- Institutional Strengthening

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

There were no revisions to the project's objectives or components during implementation. The TE does note that project savings were used to expand the impact of the refrigeration-servicing sub-project and to expand the technical assistance component to publish training and public awareness materials related to the sub-projects (pg. 3).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE does not provide a rating for project relevance,[1] while this TER provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project was designed under GEF-1, and therefore, the GEF Operational Programs were not yet applicable. The project's objectives were consistent with the Ozone Depleting Substances focal area, as conceived under GEF-1. The *Revised Draft GEF Operational Strategy (1995)* states that the GEF will "support activities to phase out ozone-depleting substances that are committed under the Montreal Protocol, with special emphasis on short-term commitments and enabling activities" (pg. 77). Belarus ratified the Montreal Protocol in 1988, in addition to the London Amendment in 1990, which added methyl chloroform (TCA) and carbon tetrachloride (CTC) as regulated ozone depleting substances (ODS). Additionally, the project's objectives were consistent with Belarus' formal ODS Phaseout Country Program and the National Phaseout Strategy, which called for the complete phaseout of ODS consumption by the end of 1997, based on receiving international financial assistance in mid-1995. As the project's effectiveness date was August 1997, the following phaseout dates were proposed: refrigeration manufacturing - July 1999; refrigeration servicing - December 1999; solvents - December 1998; and fire protection - December 1999. These phaseout dates met the London Amendment deadline of January 2000 (PD pgs. 1-3).

[1] The TE, or Implementation Completion Report, does not include individual ratings for project relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

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

This TER provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness. The project fully achieved its objective of reducing the consumption of Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) in the refrigeration manufacturing, refrigeration servicing, and solvent sectors. The project fully met its targets of reducing ODS consumption by 600 tons in the refrigeration sector and by 90 tons in the solvent sector. The expected results under the technical assistance and training component were not clearly articulated at the design stage, however the relevant activities were implemented.

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

Component 1: Technology Conversion Investment

- Refrigeration Manufacturing: Under this sub-project, it was expected that Atlant, a household refrigerator manufacturing enterprise, would fully convert to non-ODS materials. Specifically, it was expected that Atlant's refrigeration line would convert from CFC-11 to cyclopentane. Overall, it was estimated that 282 tons/year of ODS used in manufacturing and 62 tons/year from servicing requirements would be phased out. By project end, all ODS substances used at Atlant were fully phased out and targets were met (TE pg. 28). Additionally, 3,105kgs of CFC-12 were recovered and re-used by Atlant's service network and no new CFC-12 was purchased (TE pgs. 6-7).

- Refrigeration Servicing: Under this sub-project, it was expected that a Refrigeration Recovery, Recycling and Reclamation Scheme (3R) and training program would be established for Beltorgprogress, an industrial refrigeration servicing enterprise. The TE notes that by its completion date the project was on target to exceed the 20% recovery rate. Additionally, the total number of refrigeration technicians trained exceeded the expected number by more than 10% (TE pgs. 7-8).

- Solvents: Under this sub-project, it was expected that three enterprises (Belvar, Minsk Computer and Kamerton) would replace the CFC-113 solvent used for cleaning of electronic components with "no-clean" high purity water and acid-alkaline techniques. Additionally, it was expected that Minsk Computer and Tsvetotron would replace trichloroethane (TCA) with an alkaline process for circuit board manufacturing. Despite some delays and challenges in implementation, the phaseout of ODS consumption was achieved in all enterprises (TE pgs. 8-12).

Component 2: Technical Assistance and Training

- Fire Protection Technology Transfer: Under this sub-component, it was expected that stakeholders would be introduced to alternatives to halon-based fire protection systems. The TE notes that a workshop was held, and stakeholders concluded that Belarus needed a system to

collect, recycle, and recover halon equipment. However, the cost of developing such a system was outside the project's scope (pg. 12).

- Institutional Strengthening: The expected programmatic results under this sub-component were not clearly articulated in the Project Document. The project was supposed to provide resources to support the operations of the Ozone Office within the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP). The Project Document also indicated that the project would provide support for "longer-term regulatory functions" (pg. 4). In general terms, the implementation of this sub-component appears successful. The TE notes that by the end of the project the Ozone Office's capacity for undertaking awareness raising and outreach activities was strengthened, which supported its legislative and regulatory efforts (pg. 12).

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

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project efficiency. The original GEF TER notes that all of the sub-projects were below the cost-effectiveness thresholds set under the Montreal Protocol, except for the Belvar and Kamerton sub-projects. The original GEF TER notes that this was allowable under the GEF Operational Strategy as the Belvar and Kamerton sub-projects completed ODS phaseout in their sector (line 49). The TE does note that the Belvar and Minsk Computer sub-projects experienced delays during implementation due to the poor financial performance of the enterprises (pg. 15). The Kamerton sub-project also experienced delays as it was the first solvent investment to be completed under the project, and the learning curve was steep for the enterprise and the project's executing agency. As a result of these implementation delays, the use of Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) was longer than expected (TE pg. 11). However, the enterprises ultimately achieved all phaseout objectives by the end of the project. The project was extended four months in order to complete the final audit of project accounts (TE pg. 4).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Likely** for project sustainability, and this TER concurs. The financial, sociopolitical, and institutional conditions were in place to ensure long-term sustainability of project outcomes. The continued use of halon in fire protection systems undermined the phaseout of Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) in Belarus, however stakeholders were committed to addressing this issue.

Financial Resources

This TER provides a rating of **Likely** for the sustainability of financial resources. The TE notes that international efforts to phaseout and control ODS supplies resulted in an increase in ODS supply prices. For example, the local price of CFC-12 rose from $2 to $4/kg. Recycled refrigerants were the cheapest

alternative for servicing existing CFC-12 refrigeration systems (TE pg. 8). As the TE notes, the economic pricing signals will serve as a compliance tool in the long-term (pg. 16).

Sociopolitical

This TER provides a rating of **Likely** for sociopolitical sustainability. The TE does not cite any risks that could undermine the longevity of project outcomes. The TE notes that country ownership over the project was high throughout implementation, as evidenced by its continuous support for the Ozone Office established within the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP) (pg. 17). Additionally, the refrigeration servicing training course developed under the project was well received by participating technicians. The training course was transferred to the vocational school in Minsk, which should ensure continued support for the long-term objectives of the project (TE pg. 17).

Institutional Framework and Governance

This TER provides a rating of **Likely** for sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance. The Ozone Office was successfully installed in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP) and had the capacity and political support to sustain project outcomes. Additionally, legislation was passed during the project to control and restrict the use of ODS, including financial penalties (TE pg. 16).

Environmental

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for environmental sustainability. The main risk to environmental sustainability was the continued use of halon in fire protection systems. The fire protection sector represented 2% of the ODS market in Belarus. The TE notes that halon continued to be vented from installations subjected to the mandatory five-year refilling requirement (pg. 6). By project end, stakeholders had recognized the need for converting halon-based fire protection systems, however national funds had not yet been allocated to establish a halon recycling system (TE pg. 12).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Including project preparation funds, $7.99 million in co-financing was disbursed, compared to the expected $8.8 million. Co-financing was provided entirely by the enterprises targeted through the ODS phaseout sub-projects. The TE notes that some of the enterprises struggled to raise co-financing, which contributed to implementation delays. Minsk Computer eventually sought help from government agencies to meet their counterpart financing commitments (TE pg. 15). Other enterprises only contributed a portion of what was agreed at appraisal (Beltoprogress- 10.7%; Belvar- 60%; and Tsvetotron- 35.6%). Atlant and Kamerton exceeded expected co-financing by 9.9% and 8.3% respectively (TE pg. 30). The TE does note that some variations in co-financing occurred due to the devaluation of

local currency over the project implementation period (TE pg. 16). Despite the lower than expected co-financing, the project achieved its objectives.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Certain sub-projects (i.e. Belvar and Minsk Computer) experienced delays in implementation due to poor financial performance (TE pg. 15). The Kamerton sub-project also experienced delays as it was the first solvent investment to be completed under the project, and the learning curve was steep for the enterprise and the Ozone Office. As a result of these implementation delays, the use of ODS was longer than expected (TE pg. 11). However, the enterprises ultimately achieved all phaseout objectives by the end of the project. The project was extended four months in order to complete the final audit of project accounts (TE pg. 4).

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE indicates that country ownership over the project was strong throughout implementation. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP) demonstrated strong support for the Ozone Office's mandate and functions, which allowed the project to achieve its objectives in an efficient manner (TE pg. 21-22). Additionally, the government passed legislation to control and restrict the use of ODS, including financial penalties, which supported sustainability (TE pg. 16).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E design at entry, while this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory**. The Project Document includes a framework which outlines indicators of change at both the output and outcome level. The indicators are of mixed quality. Some indicators are activities, such as "training for fire protection sector" or "retrofitting/substitution of technologies that consume ODS." At the outcome level however, the project did set specific targets for reducing ODS consumption in various sectors from the 1994 levels. It is unclear why a target for Halon consumption was set, as the project did not specifically target the fire protection sector (see PD, Annex I, pg. 7). Additionally, indicators were not set for key results, such as the institutional strengthening of the Ozone Office.

A general M&E Plan is included, which outlines key M&E activities and responsible parties. The Ozone Office was responsible for monitoring project performance and submitting semi-annual progress reports to the World Bank that included updates on the project's indicators. The Institute of Ecology, under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP), was responsible for monitoring ODS phaseout and consumption levels (PD, Annex I, pg. 6). It does not appear that a dedicated budget for M&E was provided.

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

This TER is unable to assess the quality of M&E implementation. The TE provides extensive information on the financial monitoring system established under the project, however no information is provided on the M&E system. The TE does note that the project's targets were met (i.e. reduction of refrigerator consumption by 600 tons; reduction of solvent consumption by 90 tons; training of 100 refrigerator service technicians; etc.), however there is no information on how performance was tracked throughout the life of the project.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for World Bank performance, or quality of project implementation, and this TER concurs. The project design was relevant and appropriate for the country context. Expected results and indicators of change could have been more clearly articulated under the fire protection technology transfer and institutional strengthening components. In general, the supervision and technical assistance provided by the World Bank was strong. The World Bank closely monitored the financial viability of the participating enterprises throughout implementation. When it became evident that two enterprises, Belvar and Minsk Computer, were not financially viable, the World Bank worked closely with the enterprises to get them back on track (pg. 15). The TE does note that the World Bank processing of procurement packages and letters of credit was slow at project start-up. However, the TE indicates that these two areas improved substantially as the project progressed. Overall, the World Bank fulfilled their responsibilities satisfactorily.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for Borrower performance, which this TER adjusts to **Satisfactory** for quality of project execution. The executing agency for the project was the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP). The Ozone Office was established under the MNREP using the GEF project preparation funds, and acted the defacto project implementation unit (PIU). The Ozone Office had a strong relationship with both the World Bank and senior officials within the MNREP, who were called in to resolve any implementation issues that arose (TE pg. 21). The TE does note that the Ozone Office's capacity for procurement and financial management was initially weak, as these were not typical Ministry functions (pg. 21). The MNREP's legal structure did not allow for the hiring of local consultants to manage these core functions. However, the TE notes that these issues were resolved and consultants were hired a year after the project became effective (pg. 16). The TE also notes that the project implementation capacity of the Ozone Office increased substantially over time, and eventually Ozone Office staff in Belarus trained Ozone Office staff in Ukraine (pg. 21).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

> By project end, 100% of the ODS used at participating enterprises were phased out (TE pg. 5). The project fully met its targets of reducing ODS consumption by 600 tons in the refrigeration sector and by 90 tons in the solvent sector (pg. 28). Additionally, the enterprises decommissioned and destroyed the old equipment (TE pg. 11).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

> The TE notes secondary benefits that emerged as a result of the project, including improved health and safety of workers at the enterprises. Specifically, the TE notes that the reduction of CFC-11 vapors and the construction of a new door design improved conditions at Atlant (pg. 7).

Staff at Belvar, Minsk Computer, and Kamerton, were no longer exposed to CRC-113 and TCA vapors (TE pgs. 7-11).

Additionally, the TE notes that field service technicians benefited financially from recovering refrigerant through the new Recovery, Recycling, and Reclamation Scheme (3R) at Beltorgprogress. On average, their wages increased by $10-15 per week (pg. 8).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE notes that the institutional capacity of the Ozone Office to implement ODS phaseout increased significantly by project end (TE pg. 14). Additionally, the procurement and environmental safety capacities of the enterprises increased. For example, many of the enterprises achieved ISO 9001 rating (i.e. quality control standards) and requested independent audits for ISO 14001 certification (i.e. environmental management standards (TE pgs. 14-15).

Additionally, the project trained more than 100 technicians in ODS recovery and reclaim from refrigerators (TE pg. 28). The training course developed under the project was transferred to the vocational school in Minsk, where new technicians continue to be trained (TE pg. 17).

b) Governance

By project end, the Ozone Office had drafted several pieces of legislation, including: (1) Ozone Layer Protection Law, (2) a system of licensing the activities related to ODS production, storage, industrial consumption, recycling and disposal, and (3) a ban on import and export of especially hazardous ODs in accordance with the London Amendment to the Montreal Protocol (TE pg. 14). The TE notes that GEF project funds did not directly support these legislative and regulatory issues (pg. 15).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been

mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE notes that the Belarus Ozone Office staff trained other offices in the region in ODS phaseout, most notably in Ukraine and Russia (TE pg. 21). The TE notes that the information exchanges between offices were particularly useful on policy issues such as the introduction of ODS import/export regulations (TE pg. 23).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following lessons learned (TE pgs. 22-24):

- Team continuity on the Bank, the government, and the enterprise project teams helped to maintain a good working relationship and to build a common understanding of the project objectives. It also helped to establish a dialogue about future cooperation on environment issues. Several project enterprises are currently participating in an IDF [Institutional Development Fund] Grant program to help build capacity for environmental certification (ISO 14000).

- The financial viability of beneficiary enterprises is difficult to predict, even with criteria aimed to assess whether or not a company would be in business in a relatively short five-year time horizon. However a good monitoring system such as the one established under the project helped maintain a dialogue about the importance of enterprise viability to an investor throughout the project. The details collected through the monitoring system provided the basis for regular, frank exchanges on the challenges that businesses were facing in the Belarus economy.

- The experience with combining the ODS [Ozone Depleting Substances] phaseout investments with legislative controls to discourage the use of ODS (a consumption tax) proved to be effective and resulted in a cooperative relationship between the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection and the participating enterprises.

- Implementation of the project from a unit within the Ministry and reliance on civil servant staff helped to ensure that the ODS Phaseout agenda would continue to be supported after the project ended (contributed to the project's sustainability). It also helped to ensure good complementarity/collaboration between the investments and the legislative/environmental

enforcement side. The Ozone Office did not suffer from being seen as separate or any more privileged than other civil servant staff in the Ministry, and were paid their normal salaries to perform project related duties.

- Establishment of procurement and financial management capacity at the start of the project is critical for starting off implementation quickly. However, it proved difficult in this project because of restrictions placed on civil servant staff. This was the one key drawback of the project implementation arrangements and it was difficult to anticipate in advance the length of time it would take to resolve these issues.

- Good procurement support on the supervision missions helped the project recover from a slow start in this area. Full integration of the procurement specialist into the project supervision team (including enterprise site visits) helped the client build and develop their own capacity, and established a good working relationship between the Bank and the Ozone Office that helped resolve issues at later stages.

- The project had a clear and detailed procurement plan- unlike earlier projects in Belarus where implementation problems stemmed from a lack of clarity (or too much flexibility) in this area. The project made only small deviations from the original procurement plan.

- Knowledge of and predictability of the ODS market helped to build support for the refrigeration servicing initiatives, and helped the regulators decide on which enforcement methods would be most appropriate at any given point in time.

- The information transfer between this project and two other FSU [Former Soviet Union] projects (Ukraine and Russia) was excellent and helped provide a more cohesive regional program. The information transfer between the Belarus Project and the Central European ODS Phaseout projects was also excellent due to their participation in information exchange workshops. The Belarus project in a sense helped provide a bridge of information back to the other two FSU ODS Phaseout projects managed by the Bank, who could not for various reasons attend. Information exchanges were particularly useful on policy issues like the introduction of ODS import/export regulations.

- It was important for the Bank team to include staff working on similar projects in the region to help exchange knowledge and gain information about the local ODS market. It also helped to address very technical issues like refrigeration servicing specifications by creating a critical mass of knowledge.

- Both the domestic and commercial refrigeration servicing schemes benefited by utilizing well organized existing structures for the basis of the project design. Atlant was by far the dominant player for the home refrigeration servicing sector in Belarus and therefore could reach a large

number of customers quickly and efficiently through their existing business operations. Similarly, Beltorgprogress was also a servicing organization with existing networks throughout the country which were "readymade" for introduction of a refrigeration recovery, recycling, and servicing program. Similar programs in other countries have struggled and lacked an existing centralized organization that could help roll out the program to reach a large number of consumers.

- Task delegation to a more junior level staff person helped provide the project with more dedicated supervision time that was important near the end to ensure that the project was completed on time. This helped both to contain supervision costs, and to provide the project with more individualized attention.

- Time spent training of resident mission staff (deputy team leader) through targeted courses and through time spent with the project team in headquarters to learn the Washington based side of supervision, was very valuable not only in helping with the later half of project supervision, but also in building long term capacity in the resident mission.

- Despite an unfavorable macro-economic environment - a project of this nature is well worth pursuing, and helped to maintain the Bank's dialogue in the country during a period of no-lending. Because of this unique situation, the project had the full support and attention of the Bank management as necessary. Global environment issues are an area where international cooperation is needed irregardless of a country's economic framework. The project was well implemented, and helped to establish a good World Bank project implementation track record in a country where poor performance in this area had affected the country dialogue.

- Many other secondary benefits came from project investments in addition to the ODS phaseout benefits that were targeted including improvements in worker health and safety; local environmental improvements; and awareness raising of best practices for environmental control. Each enterprise was asked to prepare their own assessment of the project which details these secondary benefits in more depth. Most enterprises reported product quality improvements from the investments.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not provide recommendations.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report's assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts is systematic and largely complete. More information could have been provided on the fire protection technology transfer and institutional strengthening components of the project. However, the design of these components was weak, which likely affected their assessment.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and the evidence is convincing. Overall, the ratings are well-substantiated.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report satisfactorily addresses all aspects of sustainability (financial, sociopolitical, institutional, governance, and environmental).	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned were comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented in the report. However, recommendations were not provided.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs (total and by component) and actual co-financing used.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The project does not address M&E design or implementation.	**HU**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

Original GEF TER (GEF Secretariat, 2002)

ICR Review (World Bank OEDST (2001)