

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1135	
GEF Agency project ID		1295	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Renewable Energy for Electricity Generation-Renewable Electrification of the Galapagos Islands	
Country/Countries		Ecuador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP6 (Promoting the Adoption of Renewable Energy by Removing Barriers and Reducing Implementation Costs) SP3 (Power Sector Policy Frameworks supportive of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency)	
Executing agencies involved		Department for Alternative Energy, Ministry of Energy and Mines	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		Jan 17 2006	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 1 2006 (Note: initial start date)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		July 31 2009	
Actual date of project completion		April 30 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.81	0.81
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.24	3.24
Co-financing	IA own	1.00	0.77
	Government	5.40	35.48
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	20.04	33.24
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		4.05	4.05
Total Co-financing		26.44	69.49
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		30.49	73.54
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Jan 29 2015	
Author of TE		Humbergto Rodriguez	
TER completion date		3/2/2016	
TER prepared by		Mia Lu	
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	MS	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	L	N/R	L
M&E Design	N/R	S	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/R	S	N/R	S
Quality of Implementation	N/R	S	N/R	S
Quality of Execution	N/R	MS	N/R	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD) the Global Environmental Objective is “to address the issue of reducing greenhouse gas emissions through the removal of institutional, economic, technical and financial barriers to nation-wide development of renewable energy for isolated systems as well as main grid connected.” (PD, pg31). The project’s goal is to address a key issue in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in Galapagos by substituting photovoltaic and wind energy for fossil fuel (mainly diesel) utilized in electricity generation. This is proposed to be achieved through support to the Government to develop the regulatory, institutional and financial instruments necessary to demonstrate the technical, economic, and financial viability of establishing joint ventures or facilitating independent power producers to generate electricity utilizing renewable energy to supply mini-grids or feed into large grids (PD, pg19).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project, as originally stated in the Project Document, is to promote the utilization of renewable energy (photovoltaic and Wind) for electricity generation, thereby reducing Galapagos’ dependency on diesel shipped from continental Ecuador. This will enable Galapagos to benefit from a clean, modern and reliable source of energy for electricity generation with decreased power-related operation and maintenance costs, while, at the same time, reducing energy-related CO2 emissions associated with the burning of diesel. A secondary objective is to substantially decrease the volume of diesel annually shipped to the islands, thereby reducing the environmental threat from an oil-spill that can cause great damage to the rich mix of species found in and around the islands (PD, pg19).

The following outcomes were expected by the end of the project:

- To support national partners in implementing repowering of electricity generation on each of the islands.
- To support repowering-through strengthening the institutional, technical and operational capability of EEPG.
- To facilitate repowering on Floreana and San Cristobal with PV / wind / diesel hybrid electricity generating systems.
- To facilitate repowering on Isabela and Santa Cruz with PV / wind / diesel hybrid electricity generating systems.
- To build capacity for replication of project experiences/best practices and dissemination of lessons learned throughout Ecuador and in other countries in the region.

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

During the execution of the project there were modifications made to the objectives, outputs and indicators on three occasions, in response to changes that occurred in the Ecuadorian electricity sector as a result of the constitutional reform of 2008 and project conditions. These changes were approved in July 2010, January 2011 & November 2012 respectively. (TE p.3-5)

As a result of the Inception Workshop November 2007, the project modified its objective to include Biofuels as a source of renewable energy, additional to photovoltaic and wind power, given the possibility of producing them in the continent and transporting them to the Galapagos. The project also modified a number of outputs and outcomes. Outputs and outcomes were again modified in 2011 & 2012. (TE p.3-5)

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 rates relevance as 'Relevant', and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as Satisfactory. As stated in the PD, the project was designed to remove barriers to the renewable electrification of the Galapagos Archipelago. In so doing, it would achieve the stated objectives of GEF Operational Program #6: Promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs, and falls under GEF Strategic Priority 3 (SP 3); Power Sector Policy Frameworks supportive of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (PD, pg13). Therefore, the project is consistent with the focal area of climate change mitigation. The project and outcomes of the project are also in line with the initiatives of the Government of Ecuador to ensure reliable and sustained supply of electricity in the Islands (TE, pg3-3).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. Several of the expected outcomes were achieved satisfactorily, but not all of them. The project has also shown

that renewable energy generation is possible in the islands. The total operating renewable capacity as of June 2014 of 4,156kw represents 63% of the expected 6.6 mw goal at the end of the project. If projects expected to come into operation during 2015 and 2016 are included, which are supported by this umbrella project, total renewable power from mid-2016 onwards is 10,494 kw representing 175% of the final goal of the project (TE, pg3-31).

Project achievements are detailed below under the five objectives, as defined in the PD and TE:

1. To support national partners in implementing repowering of electricity generation on each of the islands - When the project was conceived, it was expected that potential national partners would get involved in the repowering of generation systems on the islands. The project has supported the Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy (MEER) and the Galapagos Provincial Electric Company (EEPG) in different aspects of repowering, but at the end of the project partners identified in the repowering are international agencies KOICA, JICS and GIZ, the group e7, the German government through KfW, but *no national companies*. The mechanism envisaged for implementation of the projects was the signing of PPA with the private sector; this mechanism was found unsuitable as an implementation mechanism as a result of changes in government policy of Ecuador (TE, pg3-34). Therefore, it is considered that for Outcome 1 (national partners supporting the repowering of electrical systems on each of the islands) most of its major relevant objectives have been achieved, but with some significant deficiencies and therefore compliance is considered *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)* (TE, pg3-39).
2. To support repowering-through strengthening the institutional, technical and operational capability of EEPG - The evaluator knows of the participation of Elecgalapagos officials and attendants from other institutions in all of these events, however it does not have a register of participants. It is also known that the technical information of the courses and workshops was provided to the participants but this material has not been uploaded to the website of the project and made publicly available, providing access to information. When it comes to technical strengthening of an institution involved with renewable energy, this strengthening is also a result of staff getting involved in the development of projects and then in the training on the operation of the plants offered by project contractors. Since a number of renewable energy projects are not operational, there has been no opportunity for the training of EEPG. It is then considered that the advance of Outcome 2, strengthening the capacity of the EEPG for implementing power generation projects based on renewable energies and for the planning, management, operation and maintenance of these systems is *not sufficient*, and therefore the result of this task is *Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)* (TE, pg3-44).
3. To facilitate repowering on Floreana and San Cristobal with PV / wind / diesel hybrid electricity generating systems the initial Logical Framework was modified in outcome 3 to include biofuels as alternative of renewable energy for Floreana Island. Level of achievement of the Outcome 3 is considered *Satisfactory (S)* because the San Cristobal wind farm was developed with the participation of a foreign agent under the scheme of private generation, with satisfactory results and for having introduced in Floreana generation with biofuels. This wind / PV / diesel system has an operating capacity of 7,423 kW, of which 2,400 kW are wind power (32.3%) and a small PV capacity of 13 kW (0.2%). It is noteworthy that this hybrid system represents the largest operating wind capacity in the islands, and makes the greatest contribution to reducing fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emission. Despite this, the penetration has not reached the figure of 50% indicated in the initial Logical Framework of the overall project. From 2014 it is necessary to include the contribution of the repowered photovoltaic system that will increase the penetration of renewables (TE, pg3-46).

4. To facilitate repowering on Isabela and Santa Cruz with PV / wind / diesel hybrid electricity generating systems - The hybrid generation systems project for Santa Cruz Island is within the "Zero Fossil Fuel on the Galapagos' strategy and initially considered using wind energy and thermal (diesel) energy. The project has evolved since the initial release of PRODOC and subsequently included photovoltaics, battery banks and a seawater desalination plant with cogeneration. The development of the wind farm was successful. Wind capacity added was 6.4 and 32 MW respectively in two islands reaching integration with other components of energy generation and storage for high penetration of renewable energy in Santa Cruz / Baltra. Initial planning considered the development of wind farm in the first stage of approximately 2-3 MW. Currently the project has a delay of several years, mainly due to the design and construction of the sub-transmission line, which is in the process of commissioning, like wind turbines installed since June 2013. This process is expected to conclude in the first months of 2015. In total, the penetration of renewable generation in relation to diesel generation in 2013 will reach 33.5%.
5. To build capacity for replication of project experiences/best practices and dissemination of lessons learned throughout Ecuador and in other countries in the region - ERGAL has been a reference point for the development for other renewable energy projects, having participated in the SE4A (Sustainable Energy for All) program. Coordination with MEER for participation in a Regional Seminar with presentation and discussion of results / lessons learned is still pending. As to "Initiatives in power generation based on renewable energy at national level, benefiting from the experience of the project", it is not known how many or which projects in Ecuador, besides the two mentioned above, have benefited from the project.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

This TER rates efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory. The cost / effectiveness in project formulation also considered unit costs for the development of PV and wind projects but without taking into consideration the logistical circumstances and severe environmental rules and regulations that developers would face. Moreover, given the nature of the project, the value that conservation of the flora and fauna of the Galapagos represents for humanity, the costs aspect of project was not more widely taken into account in the formulation of the project. (TE 3-15) The TE notes that the project's projected unit cost of reduced emissions for the GEF over the next 20 years is estimated to be between US\$ 66/tCO₂ and \$18.75/tCO₂. The lower bound of this range is below the unit cost estimated in the project document. (TE 3-15) The project successfully leveraged more than twice the expected co-financing, showing that the project was efficient in mobilizing resources. The financial availability was in line with the needs of the project, i.e. the provision of resources for payments was timely "following the due process payment requests" (TE, pg3-16).

Regarding timing, the project was extended twice as long as expected. The extension reflected and was due to the complexity of the project, while it was affected by the less forward-looking initial plan of the project.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
---------------------------	-----------------------

The following risk factors were assessed by the TER and based on this assessment sustainability of project outcomes was assessed to be likely.

1. Financial resources - The PD states that the project aims to transform EEG in the long run to a more financially responsible utility company. The project sought to achieve financial sustainability considering that investment costs would be borne by the central government and other stakeholders, so that the revenue generated by the sale of renewable energy would help achieve financial sustainability. As regards the financial sources used, 48.2% were from the committed sources of the Government of Ecuador, while 45.2% were from realized from other donors. Financial sources allocation was not perfect in each sub-project within the umbrella project, but it doesn't hurt the overall sustainability of the financial condition. Therefore, the financial resources sustainability is *Likely (L)*.
2. Institutional framework and governance - A factor that favors the sustainability of the project is the commitment of the Government of Ecuador to continue the policy of Zero Fossil Fuels on the Galapagos and renewable energy generation for the archipelago, efforts under the responsibility of MEER and other institutions. The institutional framework and governance is *Likely (L)*.
3. Environmental and sociopolitical - Renewable generation has been welcomed by the population and development has been done in compliance with current environmental regulations, so that socioeconomic and environmental sustainability are both *Likely (L)*.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing.

The project was largely co-financed by the Government of Ecuador and other donors, with 93% of the project's budget coming from co-financing. Therefore co-financing affected the overall attainment and efficiency of the project. The final co-financing levels were higher than expected, especially from the Government of Ecuador, which contributed more than planned. According to the TE (TE, pg3-15), 48.2% (M US \$35.5) of the total financial sources are from the Government of Ecuador, and while 45.2% (M US \$33.2) are from other donors (donor agencies).

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays.

Regarding the period of the project, it is considered that the initial three years term was too restricted for the execution and should have been longer. The implementation period ultimately was 7.5 years. However, the need for project extension was largely a result of policy and regulatory changes that occurred in the country, as well as logistical and contractual difficulties encountered in implementing the projects in Galapagos (TE, pg3-5).

5.3 Country ownership.

The project was unlikely to be satisfactory without the active involvement and support of the Government of Ecuador. The degree of participation of stakeholders reached during this process of appropriation was high. The project interacted with all previous institutions to coordinate activities during the 7 years of execution. The project was also executed by a national agency, Ecuador Ministry of Energy and Mines, which also reinforce the country ownership of this project.

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 rates M&E Design at entry as Satisfactory. This TER rates M&E design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory. The M&E design in the PD states that project will be monitored and evaluated according to the rules of UNDP for projects implemented in a national manner (NEX). Initially, the M&E was allocated with a budget of \$240,000 from GEF at the planning stage of the project. The M&E plan puts responsibility with the executing agency (MEM, later MEER) to regularly monitor progress of the project

implementation. The plan also includes two independent evaluations: the first at midterm of the implementation and the other at the completion the project. (TE, pg2-16). Outcome and output level indicators and their baseline values are provided at all levels of the project’s logical framework, however the indicators provided are not always specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound, or SMART. Instead they often read more as results. For example, in the case of output 1.2: full feasibility and design completed, including more accurate cost estimates and an implementation schedule for repowering electricity generation on each of the 4 islands, the indicator provided, is “completed feasibility reports”. Taking into account this flaw in indicators, along with the overall completeness of the M&E Design, this TER rates M&E Design at entry as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

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

The TE rates M&E Implementation as Satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E implementation as Satisfactory. The monitoring mechanisms established by the UNDP have been applied. More specifically and regarding monitoring mechanisms, in this project all PIR / APR were developed (PIR: UNDP GEF Project Implementation Report and APR: UNDP Annual Project Review) from 2008 until the last dated 2014 (TE, pg3-10). The Midterm Evaluation (ME) was conducted in October 2010, the third year (fourth year) of effective start in 2007 (normal start in August 2006) of the project. All these evidence are clearly presented in the TE by numbers and tables. Therefore, the M&E was systematically implemented and was considered as satisfactory overall.

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 project’s implementing agency was UNDP. The TE considers that the UNDP Ecuador and the quality of the project implementation was satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating, for the following reasons (TE, pg3-16):

- Effectively supported selection, recruitment, assignment of experts and consultants and national counterparts in defining tasks and responsibilities.

- Led jointly with the GEF Regional Office in Panama the consultation process for the approval of contracts.
- Made the arrangements for payments in a timely manner in relation to fees and contracted services.
- UNDP’s role in designing the project was not perfect because it didn’t anticipate the length of the project and targeted for a short duration initially, but UNDP was able to adjust the length and other shortcomings of its design during the ongoing progress of the project, which makes the overall rating satisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	---------------------------------

The project’s executing agency was MEER, the Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy. The method of implementation of the project is National Execution (NEX: executed by a governmental agency). This method is advantageous because it enhances the technical and management level skills of the implementing agency and it strengthens its overall profile in terms of leadership and advocacy, which affects the sustainability of the project and helps to create the conditions for future replications (TE, pg2-12).

Project execution is rated as *Marginally Satisfactory (MS)* in the TE based on the assumption that if the project activities have been completed then it must have been well executed as well. There were deficiencies in areas such as activities related to capacity building, dissemination of technical information, and institutional strengthening (TE, pg3-151). Not much information was provided on assessing the performance of the overall project execution, as there was limited information on MEER from the TE. Therefore, the TER rates quality of execution as ‘unable to assess’.

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.

As regards the impact of the project, in its current state it has been shown that renewables have reduced diesel fuel consumption, CO₂ emissions and decreased the risk of fuel spills in the ecosystems. Therefore, the project has reduced the stress on ecological systems and when all systems are operational in the islands in 2017, the impact of ERGAL will be even greater (TE, pg3-58).

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

The TE doesn't provide relevant information on the impact of the socioeconomic change.

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

According to Outcome 2 in TE, numbers of EEPG staff were trained to run power of generation projects related to renewable energy. EEPG's establishment of a training program positively helped capacity buildings. Over nine training events included general information of the project to specific workshop on solar and wind energy.

b) Governance

The TE doesn't provide relevant information on the impact of the governance change.

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

The TE doesn't provide relevant information on unintended impacts of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE doesn't provide relevant information on the adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

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.

According to the TE, following lessons were learned through the project (TE, pg5-2):

- The operation of renewable energy systems in the midst of fragile ecosystems is feasible.
- The deadlines for implementation of projects are often too short and should be extended to advance their implementation.
- Community involvement is essential to the success of programs for renewable energy and energy efficiency.
- The interaction with authorities is essential because energy supply projects must be consistent with the Land Use Plans, especially when it comes to energy systems in remote, isolated and fragile ecosystems, and critical conservation areas.
- The use of Trust Funds is suitable for managing the finances of projects, provided there is agile management.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE offered recommendations to both the implementing and the executing agencies (TE, pg5-1):

To UNDP-GEF:

- In formulating the PD it is useful to consider the competencies of the projects because some goals can be beyond the scope of project intervention.
- The modifications made to the Logical Framework should include indicators for results.
- Systematization of the achievements and dissemination of the information obtained which may be made public, would have a greater impact on the achievements of this project and would make more visible this joint effort between the GEF- UNDP and MEER

To MEER:

- Continue and strengthen the achievements of ERGAL because it is an effort that responds to particular needs and realities of the Galapagos Islands.
- Continue strengthening the capacity of Elecgalapagos to develop Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency projects.
- Demand the best training of personnel in the delivery of renewable energy power plants to ensure their sustainability.
- For the sustainability of renewable energy systems in operation and maintenance in the long term, both permanent technical and financial support are required.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE uses consistent framework for evaluating relevant outcomes and achievement of the objectives. Outcomes were clearly supported by examples and indicators were quantified in tables. However, impacts of the project were not carefully assessed in the TE. There were only limited words contributed to the impacts in the TE, focusing on environmental impacts. The TE lacked evidence of other impacts such as socioeconomic change and adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent, the evidence presented is complete, and the ratings are well substantiated. Evidence is presented in tables, by figures and examples for each individual outcome, which are consistent through the TE. There are 41 tables and 11 figures in the TE (TE, pg V). Ratings are clearly summarized at the beginning of the conclusion section (TE, pg3-2) and then most of the ratings are clearly explained in further details in later sections.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE properly assesses different dimensions of the project sustainability and gives ratings for each dimension. The sustainability assessment is more focused on financial sustainability and institutional sustainability of the project, while lack of further assessment of the environmental and sociopolitical sustainability of the project, especially the environmental factor, which should be a key theme of the section.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learnt were straightforwardly stated in the TE. The section included some major factors that could otherwise affect overall success of the project. However, the lessons learnt should include M&E issues and other factors that could possibly negatively affect the overall project.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes, the TE includes the overall actual co-financing (TE, pg3-14) and compares it with the planned cost. Furthermore, the co-financing is presented in tables by per activity (TE, pg3-33).	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE briefly discussed the M&E design at entry, which included major stakeholders in charge of the M&E activities without much further details. However, the TE does a better job in presenting evidence of the M&E implementation. In the M&E implementation section, the TE clearly laid out the monitoring mechanisms and how much of each mechanism is applied (TE, pg3-8). The M&E activities are also clearly recorded in tables, especially ratings of each PIR from 2008 to 2014 (TE, pg3-11). The TE also highlighted the Midterm Review and pointed out the contributions of the external financial audits.	MS

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).