

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1198		Review date:		
		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID: 1893		GEF financing:	3.38	3.37
Project Name: Biomass Energy for Heating and Hot Water Supply		IA/EA own:		
Country: Belarus		Government:		
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	5.56	19.57
Operational Program: OP6		Total Project Cost:	8.94	22.92
IA: UNDP	Dates			
Partners involved: Department of Energy Efficiency (Government of Belarus)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)			July 2003
	Closing Date	Proposed: September 2007	Actual: May 2008	
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 51 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 59 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 8 months
Author of TE: Roland Wong Alexey Golonotsov		TE completion date: November 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: July 2009	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 8 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	-	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	-	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	-	S	-	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?
No. Although the report provides sufficient information on project activities and outcomes, it does not present sufficient information regarding the implementing agency's role in achieving the project objectives and the project's M&E system.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives				
a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?				
According to the project appraisal document the global environmental objective of the project is to: “reduce GHG emissions of Belarus by removing barriers to economically feasible wood and wood waste utilization for heat, hot water and power supply.” According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.				
b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?				
According to the project appraisal document the following were the project’s development objectives: Objective 1 “Strengthen institutional capacity to support biomass energy projects.” Objective 2 “Establish a track record for investments in sustainable biomass energy projects, including both fuel supply and demand.” Objective 3 “Develop straightforward financial “starter” mechanisms in a challenging investment climate that will allow continued financing for biomass energy projects.” Objective 4 “Overcome negative perceptions of biomass energy and provide public and private investors with much-needed market information.” According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.				
(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?				
Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components		Any other (specify)
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
Belarus has very limited access to energy resources and is highly dependent on energy imports from the Russian Federation. As a result energy security and independence is of high national priority. Prior to the project, Belarus had undertaken a number of institutional and policy changes to implement its goal of reducing its dependence on imported energy sources. In 1997 Belarus established a national “Energy-Saving” fund for energy saving activities. It also created a special inter-agency Steering Committee in 1998	

to promote and co-ordinate efficient use of local energy sources, including wood and wood waste. The project's objective in reducing GHG emissions in Belarus by removing barriers to economically feasible wood and the utilization of wood waste utilization for heat, hot water and power supply fits directly with Belarus's national priorities and is also consistent with GEF's OP6 (promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs) and its strategies and mandate regarding the productive use of renewable energy.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

According to the TE the project has achieved all its objectives but more importantly the project has been instrumental in removing "a significant number of barriers" for biomass investments in Belarus. As a result the project has been able to meet its targets for GHG emission reductions, for the most part, with a forecasted reduction in CO2 emission of 693,000 tonnes up to 2015 (720,000 tonnes target) and 1.12 million tonnes up to 2020 (1.08 million tonnes target) at the project's closure. Additionally, the TE asserts the project has further "catalyzed" GHG reductions through the establishment of the revolving fund that provides key financing for biomass conversions. Additionally the TE indicates the project has provided critical technical assistance that will allow for the future implementation of biomass projects.

Below is the breakdown of achievements by project objective:

Objective 1

Strengthen institutional capacity to support biomass energy projects.

- A twinning arrangement between BIES, the state energy investment enterprise under the DEE, and LEV (Austria), an agency dedicated to the increasing energy efficiency and the use of domestic and renewable sources of energy, was established in 2005
- Establishment of modern mobile emissions monitoring facility has been equipped with modern equipment.
- A GIS system for planning of biomass conversion projects was established
- A national plan for scaling up of biomass has been drafted and disseminated amongst stakeholders

Objective 2

Establish a track record for investments in sustainable biomass energy projects, including both fuel supply and demand.

- Fuel savings from four demonstration projects is 26,536 tce with annual emissions of 60,743 tonnes CO2eq
- Four (5 target) biomass district heating demonstration sites in operation and one fuel delivery mechanism established
- Reduction of actual costs for wood fuel preparations by 30 to 50%, depending on the wood harvesting technology

Objective 3

Develop straightforward financial "starter" mechanisms in a challenging investment climate that will allow continued financing for biomass energy projects.

- Investment briefs for 12 projects available at the end of project
- Non-DEE funding sources for replication projects identified
- Transfer of USD 1.54 million from Government of Belarus to match the GEF revolving loan funds
- Revolving fund established with a charter incorporating international best practices for revolving funds

Objective 4

Overcome negative perceptions of biomass energy and provide public and private investors with much-needed market information.

- Brochures, leaflets and guidebooks published and disseminated through project's website
- Study tours targeted to senior to mid-level policy makers conducted in Czech Republic, Austria, Finland and Sweden

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: S

As previously mentioned the majority of the project activities have been implemented satisfactorily with the project successfully achieving many of the project's key objectives. The project was completed nine-months after the original completion date due to delays that were experienced in the implementation of demonstration projects. According to the TE poor management and financial condition of the two original demonstration sites early on in the project contributed to these delays. Although the TE does not mention if these delays led to any additional expenses it does mention that overall "financial controls" of the project

were “adequate”. Originally the total project cost was estimated to be USD 9 million but by end of the project total project costs amounted to approximately USD 23 million. This is due largely in part to the difference in the expected level of co-financing, USD 5.56 million, and the actual amount of co-financing that was achieved, USD 19.57 million. According to the TE additional co-financing was secured to cover increased investment costs for project investment sites due to the depreciation of the US dollar which increased the cost of technical assistance and construction materials for biomass plants. Additional co-finance was secured mainly through government grants and through the establishment of a revolving fund which provided critical financing for the five demonstration projects that were established during the project.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

According to the project document the overall mission was to reduce GHG emissions in Belarus by “removing barriers to economically feasible wood and wood waste utilization for heat, hot water and power supply.” Although at project’s closure it is difficult to determine if the project has led to significant global environmental benefits, key intermediate outcomes have been achieved. By project’s closure it is forecasted the project will be able to achieve a reduction in CO2 emissions of 693,000 tonnes up to 2015 and 1.12 million tonnes up to 2020. The TE asserts the project was able to catalyze biomass conversions due to the success of the demonstration projects that were implemented. By the end of the project one large-size and 390 small and medium-size boilers with total capacity 221 MW were converted to biomass. Although significant achievements have been made it is unclear if continued development and replication of the biomass projects will lead to significant measurable impacts.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: ML
<p>As previously mentioned a revolving fund was established during the course of the project which will contribute to the long-term financial sustainability of the project outcomes. The Government of Belarus contributed USD 1.54 million to match the GEF revolving loan funds. Aside from adding to fund resources, the government’s contribution demonstrates its commitment to sustained growth of biomass energy projects. Approximately USD 5.95 million was also allocated by the DEE during the course of the project to match GEF’s contribution to the revolving fund and to cover the increased investment costs than were originally projected for project investment sites.</p> <p>Although the revolving fund will help “stretch” the funds invested in biomass energy projects there were concerns over its development and ultimately, its sustainability upon project’s completion. According to the TE the main issue regarding the revolving fund at project’s closure was that it was not operational under the September 2008 revised charter which incorporates international best practices. According to the TE, once adopted, the revised charter would help improve prospects for sustainable financing of biomass projects.</p> <p>In addition to the fund, the sustained development of biomass energy projects will be enhanced by Belarus’s ability to generate revenue from the carbon market through joint implementation (JI) and international emissions trading (IET). Recognizing the benefits JI programs, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MoNREP) has dedicated resources for JI and IET. Additionally it has taken significant efforts to strengthen their preparedness for emissions trading by establishing legislation for the establishment of transparent voluntary emissions reduction (VER) market, setting up a national registry system for GHG emission to strengthen and forming the Designated National Authority to review and endorse JI and VER projects.</p>	
b. Socio political	Rating: ML
<p>The TE credits the involvement of MoNREP, MoF, MoE, DEE, MoHPU, CoM and a number of stakeholders from private enterprises and technical institutes as being instrumental to the project’s success. The TE indicates stakeholders, both public and private, were consulted throughout the development and implementation of the project. Early on during project implementation efforts were taken to involve stakeholders and government officers through study tours and technical sessions. These session and tours, as well as workshops and informal meetings involving stakeholders were conducted up until the project’s completion. The project also provided awareness raising activities and reached out to stakeholder in outlying areas regarding the various expertise and technical and financial assistance mechanisms that were available. The TE indicates the sustainability of the project outcomes is likely as the project has been “beneficiary” to communities in the project area, providing them with reliable sources hot water and heating</p>	

using local wood biomass as a fuel. The TE asserts this has in turn generated indirect economic benefits for communities such as “steady employment, community centers for recreation and sport, and greenhouses for fresh produce.”

c. Institutional framework and governance

Rating: ML

Prior to the project’s commencement, Belarus had undertaken a number of institutional and policy changes to help reduce its dependence on imported energy sources. Some of these measures included the establishment of an “Energy-Saving” fund for energy saving activities and the creation of a special inter-agency Steering Committee to promote and co-ordinate efficient use of local energy sources. During the project, policies and governance structures were pursued that will allow for the continuation of the project’s benefits. By the project’s second year a twinning arrangement between BIES, the state energy investment enterprise under the DEE, and LEV (Austria), an agency dedicated to the increasing energy efficiency and the use of domestic and renewable sources of energy, was established. The twinning arrangement will help Belarus establish the “necessary linkages” and networks with foreign and technical expertise to improve knowledge on biomass energy projects with project stakeholders. Additionally a national plan for scaling up of biomass was also drafted and disseminated amongst stakeholders and approved by the DEE in October 2007. The plan provides the necessary framework and funding to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes.

d. Environmental

Rating: UA

No environmental risks were identified.

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good

The project was able to successfully produce several public goods:

- A modern mobile emissions monitoring facility established and equipped with modern equipment
- A GIS system for planning of biomass conversion projects established
- A national plan for the scaling up of biomass drafted and disseminated amongst stakeholders
- Four biomass district heating demonstration sites in operation and one fuel delivery mechanism demonstrated
- Revolving fund established with a charter incorporating international best practices for revolving funds
- one large-size and 390 small and medium-size boilers with a total capacity of 221 MW converted to biomass

b. Demonstration

By the project’s end four demonstration sites (5 target) were operating “clean and efficient” biomass district heating units with one fuel delivery mechanism being successfully demonstrated. All demonstration projects (with the exception of Volat-1) started operations in 2007. Originally, 6 demonstration projects were planned. However, due to implementation problems such as poor management and financial issues three of the original project sites were replaced and one was dropped. Of the four demonstration sites, three generated heat and power and one generated only heat. According to the TE, these demonstration sites were “well-managed” and provided a “good track record of implementation”. As a result these demonstration sites serve as a “model” for training platforms to demonstrate best practices for the “planning, design, construction and operations” of future biomass projects.

According to the TE the project deserves “significant credit” for catalyzing the development of biomass energy projects for heating and power generation in Belarus. Prior to this project, there was little biomass energy investment in Belarus. According to the TE the establishment of the Volat-1 project demonstrated to many stakeholders that “domestically available biomass” was a “viable fuel alternative” for Belarus and modern boiler technologies could be “successfully implemented” in Belarus through the investment of foreign institutions and companies.

c.. Replication

One of the project’s main objectives was to overcome negative perceptions of biomass energy and disseminate information regarding the project’s results and progress to public and private investors. In order to facilitate (??) this a number of brochures, leaflets and guidebooks were published and disseminated through the project’s website. According to the TE a “steady stream” of publications since 2004 was made available to stakeholders on the project’s website and funding was also secured for post-project

publications. The project director also actively promoted and communicated the progress of project to Belarusian press and Belarus's Council of Ministers. Additionally study tours targeted to senior to mid-level policy makers were conducted in Czech Republic, Austria, Finland and Sweden to improve the quality of biomass project development. According to the TE these tours were "essential" to overcoming technical barriers and helped facilitate knowledge regarding the best practices in "developing, implementation and operating" biomass projects in developing countries "from both the supply and demand sides."

However, more important to the project's replication was the development of "financial starter mechanisms" that will allow for the continued financing of biomass energy projects. According to the TE "several" non-DEE funding sources were identified for the replication projects and many "relevant" organizations expressed their interest in their implementation. Additionally, the TE indicates that compared to the target of 5 to 10 'investment briefs', by the project's end twelve "investment briefs" had been prepared for securing finance for replication projects.

d.. Scaling up

The project activities led to significant changes at the national level. By the end of the project, a national plan for scaling up of biomass had been drafted and disseminated amongst stakeholders in December 2006, and approved by the DEE in October 2007. These plans were contained in the "National Plan for Ensuring Sustainable Development and Efficient Use of Wood Fuel for Energy Supply (Heat and Electricity Production) in the Republic of Belarus for 2006-2012".

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project significantly exceeded its original co-financing objective. Originally the expected level of co-financing was USD 5.56 million, but by project's end the actual amount of co-financing that was achieved was USD 19.57 million. The additional co-finance was secured mainly through government grants and equity finance for the conversion of boilers to domestic biomass fuel to cover increased investment costs than were originally projected for project investment sites. The TE credits the successful demonstrations that were achieved during the project in raising investor confidence which facilitated an investment environment that was "friendly" to foreign investment. According to the TE the co-financing had a "direct effect" on achieving the intended project outcomes and helped in "spurring" sustained growth of biomass energy projects in Belarus.

b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was originally to be completed in September 2007 but was actually completed in May 2008. The project was completed later than had been originally expected due to delays that were experienced in the implementation of demonstration projects. According to the TE delays were due to the "poor management and financial condition" of two original demonstration sites, the mini CHP at the Olekhnovichi poultry farm and the biomass supply unit at JSC Molodechnoles. These demonstration sites were later replaced in 2004 by the Vileika CHP and Vileika Forestry Enterprise. Further contributing to delays was the IKEA company's decision to build a wood processing facility in Farinovo which led to the replacement of the Farinovo demonstration site with the Mostovdrev CHP. Additionally the unexpected addition of VAT charges and delayed delivery of a Russian sourced steam turbine for the Mostovdrev CHP also delayed project implementation. The TE asserts these delays ultimately affected the achievement of the project's original targets. Instead, 26,536 tce of energy was saved (35,000 tce target) and 60,743 tonnes CO₂eq (72,000 CO₂eq target) were reduced. Despite delays, the TE indicates due to the success of the demonstration projects the sustainability of biomass conversions have not been affected.

c. 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.

As previously mentioned energy independence and energy efficiency is of high national priority for Belarus. Prior to project's implementation, Belarus had undertaken a number of steps, through the financing of

projects and institutional changes to promote energy efficiency and energy-saving related issues. In 1997 Belarus established a national “Energy-Saving” fund for energy saving activities. It also created a special inter-agency Steering Committee in 1998 to promote and co-ordinate efficient use of local energy sources, including wood and wood waste. According to the TE the projects results were attained, to a “significant extent”, due to the “strong ownership and drivenness” of the Belarusian government. The government of Belarus provided critical financing, USD 1.54 million, that was necessary to offset the increase in investment costs for the establishment of the project’s demonstration sites. The government also established policies in support of the project’s objectives such as “Additional Measures to Ensure Cost-Effective and Efficient Use of Fuel and Energy” and “State Integrated Program of Modernization of Belarusian Energy System Generation Facilities, Energy Efficiency and Increase of Share of Domestic Fuel and Energy Resources Use till 2011”.

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): S
The M&E system was designed before the log-frame became standardized across GEF projects. An assessment of the M&E plan at entry appears that it was reasonable and sufficient given the period in which it was designed. Instead of the log-frame, the M&E plan included a project planning matrix which provided a detailed list of indicators to monitor the project’s progress, a list of verification sources and designated the frequency and responsibility for each M&E activity. Additionally the project document also designated funds for the implementation of M&E activities.	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): MS
According to the TE the M&E plan at the project design phase was “reasonably detailed” and acceptable given the project was designed before the establishment of the GEFEO and before M&E requirements became more “specific”. The project’s main monitoring and evaluation activities were conducted through the completion of APR and PIR reports which provided a “clear and concise” reporting on the project’s progress. However the TE indicates the implementation of the project’s M&E system was complicated by an inconsistent format to report project’s performance. For instance there were difficulties surrounding the correct usage of terms “indicators”, “outcomes” and “outputs” in the project’s log-frame. As a result indicators used in APR/PIR reports changed “subtly” from year to year as the log-frame was retrofitted due to GEF’s change to “outcome” reporting. The TE asserts the lack of an M&E specialist in the project management unit also affected the quality of the M&E reporting on project’s activities.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Approximately US \$30,000 was allocated for M&E activities in the project document.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess.	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? The TE mentions that “main reporting tools” for the project were APRs and PIRs. These provided “clear and concise” information of the project’s progress. However, the TE does not provide sufficient information to assess whether information was used effectively and which, if any, factors affected the use of the M&E system.	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. No. The implementation of the project’s M&E system was complicated by an inconsistent format which made it difficult report the project’s performance and the TE indicates the lack of an M&E specialist affected the quality of M&E reporting.	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in

supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

The TE indicates UNDP's office in Belarus and its regional office in Bratislava provided "satisfactory" supervision and deserves "significant credit" for the successful setup of the revolving fund. The TE credits the UNDP for resolving "key issues" surrounding the financing of the revolving fund. Although it praises UNDP as an implementing agency the TE provides very limited information describing its role in the achievement of the project objectives.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The project's main executing agency was Belarus's Department of Energy Efficiency (DEE), formerly the Committee on Energy Efficiency. Prior to the project's start the DEE had been implementing awareness-raising and research projects to promote energy efficiency and energy saving in Belarus. During the project the DEE played a critical role in securing co-financing to complete project activities. According to the TE two main factors, the devaluing of the US dollar and the increases in the cost of equipment, construction materials and labor after the project's start, threatened the establishment of original demonstration projects. Recognizing these financial gaps the Belarusian government responded by raising their planned contribution, from USD 2.1 million to USD 5.8 over 2004-2008 for the development project investment sites and contributed approximately 1.54 million to the revolving fund to match GEF's contribution. Additionally the DEE also drafted and approved a national strategy which provides a "concrete and realistic" plan for the continuation and scaling up the project's results. By the end of the project, the DEE was designated the responsibility to manage, jointly with BIES, the GIS and its databases upon the project's completion and use it for future biomass resources planning.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

These were the key lessons learned that were specified in the TE document:

- i) Since, depending on the country, a poor demonstration can adversely impact the rate of adoption of a new technology, demonstration programs are best implemented in increasing order of complexity.
- ii) Project implementers need to manage the expectations of stakeholders in terms of realistic time periods on realizing benefits from GEF financing instruments and should be familiar with the approval process for the use of GEF financing instruments, and provide stakeholders with the option of seeking another source of project financing.
- iii) Project implementation success is dependent on the stability of the government stakeholders involved with the project otherwise corporate memory of their project activities may be lost within a short period of time.
- iv) Introduction of a new financial mechanism such as a revolving fund requires detailed and thorough preparation such as legislation and regulation governing the sustainable use of the revolving fund.
- v) Projects incorporating revolving funds or other GEF non-grant instruments new to the country should take necessary measures in understanding the legal nuances of the host country and merging international best practices with local practices to increase the probability of

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

establishing a functional revolving fund.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

These were the key recommendations made in the TE document:

- i) Operate the revolving fund under the NEFCO revised charter of September 2008 with fund replenishment guaranteed by the Department of Energy Efficiency.
- ii) Explore and implement strategies to increase the reliance of project stakeholders of financing biomass energy projects through the revolving fund.
- iii) BIES, the entity responsible for the execution of the project, should seek technical assistance to manage their revolving fund under the NEFCO-revised charter as it provides measures to reduce the risk of the fund's depletion through set interest rates and loan terms, systems for evaluating borrowers and defined procedures and penalties for defaulters.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. 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 provides a sufficient assessment of the project outcomes and achievements.</p>	S (5)
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete / convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? While the report is internally consistent and the IA ratings are generally supported by the evidence that was provided, it provides very limited information regarding the implementing agencies role in achieving the project's objectives.</p>	MS (4)
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? While report provides a sufficient assessment of the project's financial sustainability, it provides a limited assessment of its social and institutional sustainability.</p>	MS (4)
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are, for the most part, comprehensive and are supported by the evidence presented in the report.</p>	S (5)
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE provides a breakdown of actual project costs by project component and information about the actual total co-financing used.</p>	S (5)
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report would have been of a higher quality had it provided a more detailed assessment of the project's M&E system it provides.</p>	MU (3)

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.