

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF ID:	123		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Solid waste management	GEF financing:	5.12	5.12
Country:	Latvia	IA/EA own:	7.95	7.88
		Government:	N/A	N/A
		Other*:	N/A	N/A
		Total Cofinancing	20.08	16.68
Operational Program:	STRM	Total Project Cost:	25.20	21.80
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Republic of Latvia/Riga City Council	Work Program date		03/01/1997
		CEO Endorsement		02/04/1998
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		07/30/1998
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2003	Actual: 12/31/2004
Prepared by: Tarek Soueid	Reviewed by: Antonio Del Monaco	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 71 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 77 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 6 months
Author of TE:	WB	TE completion date: June 2005	TE submission date to GEF OME: September 2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 3 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

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	S	S	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	HL	L	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	HS	N/A	N/A	UA
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	U	MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?
The TE adequately covers issues pertaining to financial and economic viability of the project. On the flip side it does not accord adequate attention to M&E and sustainability related issues.
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?
No, the TE does not report on any follow-up issue.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The TE does not provide specific information on this issue. According to the PIR 2002, the global environmental objective of the project is to “collect land fill gas containing methane, and through burning in gas engines reduce the CO2 equivalents. The project is anticipated to reduce the emission of CO2 equivalents with about 233900 ton per year in average during the project life of 25 years.” The PIR 2005 lists this objective verbatim, indicating that no changes may have taken place in the Global Environmental Objectives of the Project.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The project document indicates that the development objectives of the project were:

- to simplify the separation of recyclable material;
- to reduce environmental disamenities for neighbors of a disposal site; and,
- to demonstrate how outdated and obsolete disposal sites can be remediated and converted into sanitary landfills to enable continued operation.

According to the TE, the project objective was not revised.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

According to the TE, the Project has resulted in a state-of-the-art municipal solid waste management facility, and it has demonstrated how an environmentally hazardous site can be converted into an environmentally sound facility providing services at an affordable cost for inhabitants of Riga. The current cost to customers is about US\$ 14.5/ton, compared with about US\$ 30/ton if a traditional waste disposal site meeting Western-European standards would have been built.

Other important results of the Project include arresting ongoing ground and surface water contamination, treatment of collected leachate and the reduction in emission of greenhouse gases. Over the lifetime of the Project, calculated at 25 years, the estimated reduction of Carbon Dioxide (CO2) equivalent is about 5.5 million tons.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain <p>The project outcomes that lead to greenhouse gas emission reduction are consistent with the priorities of the climate change focal area.</p>	

B Effectiveness	Rating: S
------------------------	------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	
---	--

According to the TE, the project objectives of improving management of solid waste through measures that would improve environmental quality, containing contamination of ground water, and creating new financial arrangements for recovery of the cost of solid waste service have been almost fully achieved.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: S

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?**

The IEG review says that the methodologies used at appraisal and in the TE for the economic and financial analysis of the project appear reasonable and indicate that the economic rate of return for the project could be from 15% to 18% per annum and the NPV at a 10% discount rate could be about US \$ 4.7 to 6.5 million. The TE informs that the project achieved all of its stated objectives and resulted in a state-of-the-art solid waste management facility with a strong demonstration impact at an affordable cost. Actual costs are \$14.5/ton, compared with an estimated \$30/ton if a "traditional waste disposal site meeting Western-European standards would have been built". Despite the fact that the Project incurred additional costs to comply with EU regulations, there were no overall cost overruns. These performance measures indicate that the project has been cost effective.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

According to the TE, the project is anticipated to reduce the emission by about 233,900 tons of CO2 equivalents per year in average during the projects lifetime of 25 years. The projected result for 2004 based on collected methane at 100% is emission reduction of 271,800 ton CO2 equivalents. The result clearly indicates a larger than anticipated generation of landfill gas, and that the project is meeting its global environmental objective.

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.

A Financial resources	Rating: L
The TE indicates that the Getlini Eko was earning profits at the time of project closure. Its financial situation was sound and it was in a position to attract private sector investors. It is likely that the Office of the Riga City Public Service Regulator will keep adjusting the tariffs in a timely manner so that these reflect real cost of waste handling and allow for continued sustainable operations of Getlini Eko. The financial risks to the sustenance of the global environmental benefits from the project are quite low.	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
The TE indicates that the rivalry between the two municipalities, the Riga City and the Stopinu Pagasts, was an impediment during Project preparation and this rivalry continued to impede the project during early stages of implementation. These problems resulted in substantial implementation delays and negative press. IEG review indicates that the social problems were effectively dealt with by project management. Other than the rivalry between the two municipalities, the socio-political risk to the project is low.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: UA
No institutional or governance related risks to global environmental benefits of the project have been described in the TE.	
D Environmental	Rating: L
No environmental risks, that could affect the sustainability of the benefits of the project have been specified in the TE. However, given the nature of the project such risks are not expected either.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

A Financial resources	Rating: L
------------------------------	------------------

B	Socio political	Rating: L
C	Institutional framework and governance	Rating: UA
D	Environmental	Rating: L

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good

According to the TE, the project is anticipated to reduce the emission by about 233,900 tons of CO2 equivalents per year in average during the projects lifetime of 25 years. The projected result for 2004 based on collected methane at 100% is emission reduction of 271,800 ton CO2 equivalents. Thus, project is leading to substantial reduction in carbon emissions, which is a public good.

2. Demonstration

3. Replication

4. Scaling up

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

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)

There was no logframe at appraisal though performance indicators were listed with a legal requirement for the implementing agency to monitor and evaluate the project performance "in accordance with indicators satisfactory to the Bank." The IEG review mentions that performance indicators were generally well chosen - few in number, closely related to the project objective and readily measurable. This said, the project did lack a well chalked out M&E plan and hence its performance on this dimension was inadequate.

Rating: MU

B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

The TE does not assess the project's performance in implementation of its M&E system.

Rating: UA

C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?

The ICR does not inform on whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted and whether it was properly funded during implementation.

Rating: UA

Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?

Although there is insufficient information to conclude either way, based on the quality at entry of the M&E plan it could be said that the M&E system of the project was certainly inadequate on at least few dimensions.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and

could have application for other GEF projects?

The TE report mentions that following major lessons could be learnt from the project:

Political Problems during Project Preparation and Implementation. Disposal of municipal solid waste is as much a social problem as it is technical. Given the socio-political issues mentioned under socio political sustainability, for better implementation of similar projects greater efforts need to be made to achieve political consensus at the grass-root level.

To avoid managerial problems the lead staff should be appointed in good time for negotiations.

For projects that involve construction the team members involved in designing structures and products should an understanding of national design and construction requirements before the actual design process starts.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report 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 the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.

No additional comments of use available.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The TE follows the guidelines in its succinctness and does a good job of presenting the basic facts on the project and its achievements in a very readable form; the economic and financial analyses are particularly thorough.</p>	S
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</p> <p>In general, the report is internally consistent, evidence mostly convincing and IA rating not always substantiated (such as in their ratings of M&E). Some important dimensions such as M&E and sustainability have not been adequately covered.</p>	MU
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The report did not adequately assess all the dimensions of project sustainability. This said its coverage of financial and economic sustainability aspects is very thorough.</p>	MU
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>Yes, the lessons learned are sometimes supported by the evidence presented and were comprehensive and elaborate.</p>	MS
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p>	MS

F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	U
No, the report does not present an assessment of project M&E systems and its results.	

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes:	No: X
------	-------

Explain: The results of the project are quite straight forward and reasonable to believe that if the project is actually collecting methane and is being able to sell it to customers than it must be the case that it is leading to reduction in CO2 equivalent of GHG emissions.

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

Project Appraisal Document; PIR 2002, 2005; IEG Evaluation Summary