

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1240	
GEF Agency project ID		PIMS 1515	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency Improvement in the Steel Rerolling Mill Sector	
Country/Countries		India	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP5- Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency Improvement in the Steel Rerolling Mill Sector	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Steel (MOS), Government of India	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		Beneficiary, cofinancier	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		12-Apr-2004	
Effectiveness date / project start		1-May-2004	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		30-Apr-2009	
Actual date of project completion		31-Dec-2013	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M) Based on the June 2013 PIR, which had more recent information than the Dec. 2012 TE report.
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.280	0.280 (by June 2013, final PIR)
	Co-financing	0.06	
GEF Project Grant		6.75	6.329 (by June 2013, final PIR)
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0	
	Government	7.280	1.943 (by June 2013, final PIR)
	Other*	17.830	8.160 (by June 2013, final PIR)
Total GEF funding		8.030	6.329
Total Co-financing		25.110	10.103
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		33.140	16.712
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Oct-2013	

TE submission date	
Author of TE	Roland Wong, Sandeep Tandon
TER completion date	2/17/2014
TER prepared by	Pallavi Nuka
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Joshua Schneck

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	MS	MS	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	NA	ML	ML	ML
M&E Design	NA	MS	MS	S
M&E Implementation	NA	MS	MS	MS
Quality of Implementation	HS	MS	MS	MS
Quality of Execution	NA	MS	MS	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			S	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Based on the information in the Project Document the GEO was to “to increase end-use energy efficiency of steel rerolling mill (SSRM) sector and to reduce associated emissions of greenhouse gases (pg. 12).” India is one of the top GHG emitters in the world and the industrial sector accounts for over 50% of national emissions. This project aimed to reduce industrial sector GHG emissions by providing technical assistance to small and medium-sized steel rerolling mills to facilitate the adoption of more energy efficient and environmentally friendly technologies.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objectives of the project are “to increase end-use energy efficiency of the steel rerolling mill (SSRM) sector” and to “accelerate the penetration of environmentally sustainable energy efficient technologies through removal of barriers, which would ultimately lead to large - scale commercialization of EE technologies in the sector (pg 12, ProDoc).” The steel rerolling mill (SSRM) sector is unique to India, due its widespread application, and large number of small mills (1200). The project was to achieve the DOs through strengthening institutional arrangements, information dissemination and capacity building of stakeholders for enhanced private sector investments and removal of various technical, financial, institutional and market barriers, identified during project preparation.

The project had 8 Components corresponding to Expected Outcomes:

1. Benchmarks for EcoTech (ET) Options & Packages Established: To address the absence of an energy efficiency market, a transformation strategy, and partly, the lack of need based financing approvals and mechanisms related barriers
2. Strengthened Institutional Arrangements: A long-term institutional framework, improve utilization of exiting institutions, facilities and resource personnel, enhanced institutional capacity/expertise to provide energy services at local costs and provide improved connectivity.
3. Effective Information Dissemination Program: Information system and communication channels to lower the barriers pertaining to lack of information and information asymmetry which has limited the growth of the technology market.
4. Enhanced Stakeholders Capacity: Improved institutional capabilities, increased confidence level of stakeholders, low perceived technical and financial risks and reduction in transaction costs associated with implementation of advanced EE technologies in the sector.
5. Feasibility of ET Options and Technology Packages Established: Demonstration of advanced technology packages in sample mills to reduce barriers associated with limited commercial model experience in the sector, and with local consultants and FIs/Banks.

6. Innovative Institutional Mechanism Established [ESCO and Third Party Financing (TPF)]: Market-based mechanisms and third party financing made available to reduce the perceptive risks (technical, financial and commercial) and uncertainties associated with limited exposure to EE projects.

7. TIRFAC Established: Creation of technology information resource and facilitation center (TIRFAC) to house the Project Management Cell (PMC) and partner with industry to reduce the barriers related to technology absorption and transfer.

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

No changes were noted in the GEO or DO. A “Hardware Center” activity under Component 7 was dropped. There were also changes to other activities during implementation as discussed below.

4. GEF EO 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 project is consistent with national programs, policies and priorities targeting adoption of cleaner, energy efficient technologies. India’s 10th Five-year Plan stresses the need for efficient use of energy resources to achieve sustainable development. The Energy Conservation Act (2000) created the national Bureau of Energy Efficiency (BEE), with a mandate to provide policy frameworks, direct EE efforts, and coordinate energy conservation policies and programs amongst various national ministries, state governments, and the private sector. This project extends the interventions introduced by BEE and the Ministry of Steel in the primary steel sector, to the 1200 SMEs that make up the secondary steel production sector in India. Since the ‘80s India has tried to increase EE in the SRRM sector through a Steel Development Fund (SDF). But until 2003, the SDF was never utilized largely due to the resistance of SRRMs to change their business-as-usual practices, and a lack of incentives to reduce energy costs. This project aimed to use the SDF to subsidize investments in EE among the SRRMs.

The project contributes towards the environmental goals of UNDP in India as outlined in the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) of UNDP. The project is also linked to the Vulnerability Reduction and Environment Sustainability themes of the new UNDP Country Program for India (2003-2007) and this project is consistent with UNDP’s priorities to support sustainable energy use and build capacity to achieve global environmental and developmental goals.

The project is consistent with the GEF priorities in the Climate Change focal area and OP5-Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation. The project reduced barriers to energy-efficiency improvement in a national sector comprised mostly of SME’s.

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

At the time of the terminal evaluation (1-yr before project closure) the project was on track to successful achievement of its development objective. The project had made significant contributions to the SRRM sector, demonstrated the potential for the sector to become cost efficient and competitive through EcoTech options, and

improved understanding of energy efficiency in the sector. It largely achieved targeted outputs under most components except for #6- Involvement of ESCOs. Project activities, combined with rising energy costs and a cyclical downturn in the steel industry, have led to increased demand in the sector for EcoTech and energy efficiency measures. About five model SRRMs were recognized by state governments or central government for their investments in EE.

Component 1: According to information in the TE report viable EcoTech options were identified, accepted and adopted by SRRM enterprises only in 2008. Technology packages including re-heating furnaces, rolling sides, and a new energy-saving innovation of ‘direct rolling’ were demonstrated at various sites. The final PIR notes that ‘direct rolling’ is “a game changer and one of the greatest contribution of the project.” The project initially targeted 30 model EcoTech units, but this number was increased to 50. As of June 2013, 38 model units were commissioned and 4 more units are under consideration (2013 PIR). Benchmarking is underway but had not been completed at the time of the TE report and final PIR due to unforeseen complexities in the benchmarking approach,

Component 2: To deliver technical assistance to SRRM enterprises, the project set up resident missions in 6 geographical areas where SRRM clusters are located. Four of these were closed by the time of the TE report. The project also worked through a number of institutions (National Institute of Secondary Steel, National Productivity Council, Steel Authority of India Ltd., Petroleum Conservation & Research Association) to deliver trainings and energy audits.

Component 3: The project produced AV films capturing different typology of EE interventions, prepared and distributed Project Plans, and launched a regularly updated website targeting a wide audience from consumers to steel producers. The project also cultivated network

Component 4: Almost all the SRRM enterprises were contacted by the project. Project activities have successfully increased awareness on EE measures. Through trainings, workshops, and extensions services, the project has built the capacity of manages, foremen in individual SRRMs and strengthened the capacities of companies designing and building furnaces designers and rolling equipment.

Component 5: As of June 2013, 38 model units have been commissioned; 31 are in operation and the project is monitoring their performance. The target was 30 units by project closure. As of closure there were plans to commission another 4 units. In addition, feasibility studies have been conducted for 39 more units. The TE report notes that this has led to an investment pipeline and that it “attests to the growing interest of SRRM enterprises to embrace and implement changes that improves the energy performance of the SRRM sector.” Against the target of reducing 9 PJ of energy and 0.88 million tCO₂ through project interventions, the 31 evaluated units have yielded a lifetime energy saving of 7.78 PJ and avoided GHG emission by 0.64 tCO₂, based on a 10-yr lifetime. An independent study conducted by SAILCON revealed that 55% of a sample of 300 SSRMs have incorporated EE technologies, exceeding the target of 25% set during the project inception

Component 6: The project unsuccessfully tried to engage ESCOs. The MTE made a recommendation to drop ESCO activities, but the project continued to try to work with ESCOs. These efforts had not yielded solid results as of closure. However the project did implement a financial support mechanism (in partnership with the Ministry of Steel) to provide a partial capital subsidy to SSRMs investing in EcoTech measures. This has been of little help in financing the model units, but according to the TE report smaller SSRMs may find the capital subsidy to be useful.

Component 7: In line with expectations, technical assistance and software training was provided to SRRMs on reducing energy consumption and increasing productivity. The project also established a monitoring system for SRRM energy performance, which, according to the TE report, is operational in at least 31 of the units.

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

Project implementation and disbursement of GEF funding was very slow for the initial three years of the project. As of December 31, 2009, the original Project terminal date, only 44% of the GEF grant had been disbursed. The TE

report attributes the slow implementation and disbursement to several factors: (i) poor project design, (ii) lack of a plan for engaging SSRMs, (iii) lack of interest among most SSRMs, and (iv) ineffective design of some project activities/programs such as offering a rate subsidy for EE investments, rather than a capital subsidy (which is apparently what SSRMs wanted). Most of these factors were under control of the implementing and executing agencies, but insufficient adaptive management meant that the problems were not addressed fully until after the project MTE.

No-cost project extensions totaling 3-years allowed the project to complete all planned activities and achieve most expected outcomes. As of June 2013, about 95% of the GEF grant was disbursed. The final PIR notes “project supervision and monitoring is quite good and regularly conducted PSC meetings during last reporting period. The project financial delivery is good during last reporting period. The project demonstrated adaptive management on many fronts – technology development, responding to the needs of SSRMs and within its operation by reducing the number of Resident Missions from 6 to 2.” The TE report does not find any problems with inefficient procurement or financial management, but does suggest that the project management over the entire implementation period could have been more efficient, more responsive, and could have acted more decisively in dealing with stakeholders, subsidies, an exit strategy, and other matters.

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

Financial: (ML) Most of the SSRMs have the financial resources to adopt EE measures and reduce energy costs. Funding is available through MoS, AusAid and UNDP TRAC 2 funds for follow-on activities, transitioning of TIRFAC into the National Institute of Secondary Steel Technology (NISST) and continued support to SSRMs. Financial resources from the MoS are also available through the SDF for continuing work on benchmarking and developing minimum energy performance standards, but at the time of the TE report, these were not yet allocated.

Socio-political (L): According to the TE report, there is broad support within MoS for assistance to SSRMs to adopt EE measures, establishment of benchmarks for SRRM equipment, and for continuing the website has strong support from MoS. Awareness of the viability and feasibility of EcoTech investments is high among SSRMs. Moreover, high energy prices and the downturn in the steel industry are pushing SSRMs to demand continued support from MoS for improved understanding of other EE options. The SRRMP website (www.undpgefsteel.gov.in) that provides easily accessible information on implementing EcoTech measures to reduce energy intensities of the SSRMs.

Institutional (ML): The National Institute of Secondary Steel Technology (NISST) is the successor to the project management team and TIRFAC. NISST will be managing the capital subsidy program promoting investments in EE. According to the TE report, NISST lacks the capacity continue the full set of activities and programs established under the project and the TE report warns that “currently available post-project resources may not be sufficient to achieve the required strengthening [of NISST].”

Environmental (L): No environmental risks to sustainability of outcomes were noted in the TE report.

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?

As of June 2013 (final PIR) co-financing from the GoI amounted to USD 1.94 million, approximately 27% of the USD 7.28 million pledged by GoI in the ProDoc. These funds largely went into the capital subsidy program that was used to incentivize adoption of EcoTech options by SSRMs. According to the TE report, “while co-financing figure could

have been higher, the onerous and stringent requirements of the PMC for claiming the subsidy was a primary cause of the Gol only meeting 27% of its co-financing commitment.” According to the TE report and final PIR, Gol’s contribution should have been revised due to the dropping of some project activities such as the TIRFAC hardware center. Viewed in this light the Gol contribution is higher than 27%.

Based on information in the final PIR, the project leveraged an investment of approx. USD 8.16 million by 38 SRRMs through their investment in EcoTech. This is significantly greater than the USD 5.54 million expected in the project document. However the anticipated co-financing of USD 12.29 million from financial institutions, ESCOs and other promoters never materialized as the project failed to engage these stakeholders.

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?

The EcoTech installations were delayed almost 3-years, until 2008, when viable EcoTech options were identified, accepted and adopted by SRRM enterprises. Based on information in the TE report there was insufficient and mis-directed outreach to SRRMs to get them on board with the energy efficiency investments. The TE report also points to “inefficiencies in the reimbursement of the subsidies to model SRRM units caused by excessive amounts of paperwork required by the PMC for claiming of the subsidies” as a major cause of delays. The project’s closing date was extended three times allowing it to improve and eventually achieve key outcomes.

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:

According to the TE report, the project was very country driven as evidenced by the aims of the 2001 Energy Conservation Act and the 2008 National Climate Change Action Plan, which targets a 20% reduction in energy use by 2020. The Ministry of Steel (MoS) made it a priority to utilize SDF funds to improve energy efficiency in the SRRM sector. The TE report notes “the utilization of the SDF, however, has been poor up to 2007, largely due to the resistance of SRRMs to change their business-as-usual practices, a lack of incentives to reduce energy costs and an interest rate subsidy that was poorly subscribed by SRRMs who did not qualify for bank loans.” Nevertheless the MoS eventually adapted the subsidy to meet SRRM needs and made co-financing available to the project. MoS has also provided support for the project’s benchmarking and standards efforts, and it is supporting the transition of the project into the NISST.

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The M&E plan described in the Project Document is detailed and comprehensive. The plan provided for both project implementation monitoring and monitoring of strategic results in terms of CO2 emissions reductions. Project monitoring included mid-term, terminal and ex-post evaluations, dissemination of lessons learned, and quarterly and annual reporting through PIRs. Project monitoring also included a set of ‘milestones’ for project management and stipulated that financial management would subject to the usual UNDP procedures and audits. The logical framework for the project was overly complicated with too many components/outcomes. As noted in the TE report, “the outcomes could have been consolidated into four components related to the removal of

regulatory, knowledge/awareness and financial barriers as well as a technical component for pilot or demonstration project support.” The logical framework included indicators, targets, means of verification, and assumptions or risks for each outcome/component. Most of the indicators are essentially output indicators (i.e. 5 workshops held, master plan finalized, etc), but they do meet SMART criteria. However some of the outcome level indicators, such as “Share of EcoTech increased to 25% (3 million tons)” are imprecise. Also, it’s not clear what the baselines are for some indicators.

The plan also described an MIS for monitoring results: a “four-level (project inputs, outputs, effects and impact) MIS” to chart the “empirical progress of each of the five technology packages in SRRM sector will be quantitatively measured by ‘Progress Ratio’ over various ranges of their production/market volumes. This would serve the objective to determine the replication potential of each of the technologies deployed in the sector and to develop future strategies.”

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

Based on information in the TE report, implementation of the M&E plan was moderately satisfactory with “significant inputs coming from PSC and PAC meetings that resolved a number of outstanding project implementation issues.” The TE report finds that a “disproportionate amount of M&E effort” was placed on the subsidy programs for EE investments.

Based on information in the TE report, PIRs were regularly submitted, although the quality of PIRs varied. The MTE was carried out as scheduled. The project incorporated some of the MTE’s recommendations but ignored others such as the recommendation to drop any ESCO activities. The TE report finds evidence of some adaptive management during implementation “from work plan and staffing approvals to technical issues targeting SRRM energy efficiencies.” However, the TE report also notes “underreporting of key Project issues in the PIRs and PSC meeting minutes such as the exit strategy and increasing SRRM demand for TA.”

According to the TE report, monitoring of EcoTech measures at each SRRM unit was adequate. An external consultant, Ernst & Young, was contracted to develop the methodology for monitoring energy use and GHG emissions.

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: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The TE report rates UNDP’s performance on implementation as moderately satisfactory, largely as the TE report argues, UNDP should have pushed the project to adapt more quickly and effectively to the reality on the ground.

In terms of project design, the logical framework was overly complex with too many outcomes, but the basic premises of the project were sound. The main issue that the design overlooked was the initial low level of interest of SSRMs in energy efficiency measures. It took 3-years for SSRMs to get involved with the project. Another issue was that of engaging ESCOs and financial institutions, but this was less important to the overall objective.

Based on the information in the TE report, the UNDP-India was well placed to implement the project having much experience with GEF-funded projects in India. Financial management and oversight by UNDP appears to have been adequate. However, the TE report points to a few shortcomings in UNDP’s oversight of activities including (i) insufficient oversight of the functions performed by the project management cell leading to 3-year delay; (ii) failure to revise the logical framework to be consistent with the changes in implementation; (iii) underreporting of key issues in the PIRs and PSC meeting minutes such as delays in formulating an exit strategy and the increasing SRRM demand for technical assistance. Another issue is that according to the TE report the Project Steering Committee (PSC) was too large and the diversity of PSC members may have restricted the ability of the PSC to make crucial and adaptive management decisions to further implementation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---	--

The Ministry of Steel (MoS) was the executing agency. A project management cell (PMC) was set up, with a project coordinator reporting to the MoS. Six regional outposts were also setup. It’s not clear from the TE report, if there was ever any turnover in the project coordinator post, but the project execution improved considerably after 2008.

Project execution has been uneven, as evidenced by the slow initial implementation, with most outputs and outcomes being achieved after 2009. Based on the information in the TE report, project management has been strong on outreach and awareness raising, but overly bureaucratic and slow in responding to the needs of the SSRM sector. According to the TE report, the PMC had “excessive subject technical experts early in the Project when SRRMs were not interested in the Project and an insufficient number of qualified personnel after 2011, when SRRMs gained interest in the Project.” In 2012, 4 out of the 6 regional centers were closed for budgetary reasons, just at a time when SRRM interest in energy efficiency was increasing and firms were requesting more technical advice.

There were some examples of good, adaptive management from the TE report such as the project responding to SSRMs’ requests to change the original interest rate subsidy to a capital subsidy. Further changes were made during 2012 and 2013 to reduce paperwork and make applying for a capital subsidy less onerous to the SRRMs.

According to the TE report, reporting by the PMC was timely, but the quality of PIRs and Annual Work Plans varied. The TE report also suggests that the PMC should have begun preparing an exit strategy much earlier to ensure smooth transition to the succeeding agency.

8. Lessons and recommendations

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

1. A concise project planning matrix with identified risks and assumptions is essential for effective project implementation. The lack of a concise log-frame to a number of problems including: (i) loss of focus on building the capacity of government institutions; (ii) and poor, ineffective, engagement of SSRMs.
2. UNDP Country Offices should exercise flexibility in changing component outcomes and outputs, to adapt to changing contexts. Changes to the PPM can be implemented with the guidance of mid-term evaluators or the Regional Technical Advisors. In the case of this Project, the CO was not encouraged to change the logical framework notwithstanding the fact that the logical framework did not meet certain standards for clarity.

3. A capital subsidy program needs to be efficiently administered so that the intended purpose of the subsidy which would be to catalyze investment into a particular technology. On SRRMP, the capital subsidy did catalyze investment. However, if the conditions for claiming the subsidy were less onerous, there likely would have been further EE investments by SRRMs, more utilization of the SDF funds, and a higher percentage of GoI co-financing.

4. Projects involving energy conservation with SMEs need to carefully design project interventions that will bring immediate benefits and reductions to their operational costs. SRRMP did not originally do this when they provided an interest rate subsidy without any consideration that most SRRMs seldom use bank financing services. This was later changed to a capital subsidy at the urging of the SRRM sector.

5. Partnerships between donor agencies and governments in developing countries with a large SME and informal industrial sector are extremely important if they are to become energy efficient. In the absence of the commercial financing sector who view loans to the informal sector as high risk, donor agencies fill a large assistance gap by playing an important financing support role to assist informal industry in a structured approach to implementing energy efficiency.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. Use remaining resources of the SRRMP (assumed to be available to December 31, 2013) towards enabling the nominated technological information resource and facilitation center (TIRFAC) to continue technical assistance and financial support to the SRRMs after the end of the Project.

2. After completion of SRRMP and using post-project resources available from UNDP and co-financing from MoS, implement the training program for all SRRM staff members and for building the capacity of NISST as the succeeding TIRFAC agency.

9. 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 EO 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 assessment of outcomes, impacts, objectives is thorough, detailed, and comprehensive.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Minor inconsistencies were noted with regard to the budget and cost numbers. Otherwise the report is consistent and all ratings are well substantiated by the evidence presented.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report contains a detailed consideration of risks along the various dimensions of sustainability.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned draw directly from the project implementation and cover the main issues that arose.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes total and per activity costs only for the GEF budget. Actual co-financing figures are presented. However the cost figures are not internally consistent, and not consistent with the final PIR, even accounting for the time difference.	MU

Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The evaluation of the M&E system is comprehensive with a sufficient level of detail.	S
Overall TE Rating	Another excellent TE report from UNDP. Some clarification needed on the budget and cost numbers.	S

TE Quality = (.3*(6+5)) + (.1*(6+6+3+5)) = 5.3 = S

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

No other sources consulted.