GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1305	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Initiating Early Phase-out of Methyl Bromide in CEITS through Awareness Raising, Policy Development and Demonstration/Training	
Country/Countries		Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Slovak Republic	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Ozone Depleting Substances	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Short-term Response Measure to enable compliance with the methyl bromide phase out provisions of the Montreal Protocol	
Executing agencies involved		Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE), UNEP	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 19, 1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		August 31, 2002	
Actual date of project completion		September, 2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.663	0.644
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.037 (UNEP)	N/A
	Government		
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		0.663	0.644
Total Co-financing		0.037	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		0.70	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		October 2003	
TE submission date		2004	
Author of TE		Reuben Ausher	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Antonio del Monaco	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Robert Varley	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		June 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

*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	S	2 (Very Good) (on scale of 1-5 with 1 being highest)	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	2 (Very Good) (on scale of 1-5 with 1 being highest)	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The GEO of the project, as stated in the Project Document (PD), is to promote the early phase-out of Methyl Bromide in Central and Eastern Europe and Baltic CEITs (Countries with Economies in Transition). Methyl Bromide is an agricultural fumigant and pesticide that contributes to the depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer. Stratospheric ozone plays a critical role in absorbing biologically-harmful ultraviolet radiation coming from the sun.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The DOs of the project, as stated in the PD, are to assist CEITs in complying with the methyl bromide phase-out provisions of the Montreal Protocol, based on the identified need for such assistance. Obstacles noted in the PD include lack of funding and institutional capacity in countries to undertake projects, inadequate information and training on the Montreal Protocol and technically feasible alternatives, communication difficulties due to telecommunications and language barriers, and lack of familiarity with working within the international environmental system. As noted in the PD, the issue of non-compliance and illegal trade in ODS from CIET countries is becoming a serious threat to the success of the Protocol. The project's objectives will be achieved through awareness raising, policy development and demonstration/training activities. The short-term DOs are to enhance the capacity of the national ozone focal points and agricultural ministries to design and implement effective methyl bromide phase-out policies through awareness-raising activities, policy development, demonstration projects and training programs. The long-term DO is to eliminate the use and production of methyl bromide in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and to promote the adoption of effective alternatives that are better for human health and the environment.

The following outcomes are expected at the end of this two-year project:

- Comprehensive data of methyl bromide consumption and production in each CEIT country, major crops/sectors using methyl bromide, and existing/potential alternatives;
- Awareness-raising publications and activities to inform methyl bromide users and the public about the health and environmental effects of methyl bromide, the requirements under the Montreal Protocol, and the existence of effective alternatives;
- National action plans designed, and that include establishment of national methyl bromide phase-out schedules with specific reduction targets in subsectors, policy measures, training activities and economic instruments to comply with Decision IX/3 of the Meeting of the Parties;
- Identification of effective, environmentally sustainable alternatives for major uses of methyl bromide in CEITs;
- Training programs to implement identified alternatives;
- Improved data reporting and compliance with the methyl bromide provisions of the Montreal Protocol; and
- Adoption of environmentally-sustainable alternatives to methyl bromide.

The follow six activities will be implemented to achieve the project objectives:

1. Surveys of methyl bromide consumption, major corps/sectors reliant on methyl bromide and existing/potential alternatives in each CEIT country (7% of total expenditures)
2. Methyl bromide publications and materials to support awareness-raising activities in CEITs (11% of total expenditures)
3. One regional workshop on policy development (14% of total expenditures)
4. Policy Mentor Program and follow-up activities to provide CEIT officers with ongoing assistance in developing and implementing awareness-raising activities, policy development and training strategies (9% of total expenditures)
5. One regional demonstration project to evaluate effective and environmentally sustainable alternatives for soil fumigation for growing fruits and vegetables (21% of total expenditures)
6. Two regional training courses to develop training strategies and training extension workers on methyl bromide alternatives (37% of total expenditures)

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

No changes to the project's GEO or DOs were stated in the TE to have occurred. However, TE states that the Czech Republic dropped out of the project at the start of project implementation but before substantial expenditures were made.

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 relevant for both the GEF and recipient countries. For the 8 CIETs that are the target of the project, relevance is seen in the project's link to the decisions of the 9th Meeting of the Parties of the Montreal Protocol in 1997 requiring Non-Article 5(1) Countries to phase out methyl bromide by 2005. All of the project's target countries are Parties to the Protocol and are non-Article 5 countries. For the GEF, the project is consistent with Short Term Response Measures that seek to support activities to phase out ozone depletion substances that are committed under the Montreal Protocol, with special emphasis on short-term commitments and enabling activities. These activities were not covered among GEF Operational Programs, but were important objectives for the GEF vis a vis the GEF's role in supporting implementation of the Montreal Protocol in countries with economies in transition.

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

The project achieved much of what it set out to in terms of information gathering and awareness raising among a key group of stakeholders. Less visible success was made on developing national action plans with phase out schedules and reduction targets, although the project is considered overall to have "catalyzed, accelerated and expanded processes related to MB phase-out, and came just in time to boost the MB substitution and phase-out processes" (TE, pg 5). Progress on each of the six outcomes and activity groupings is detailed below:

1. *Improved understanding of MB consumption and production in each CEIT country, and alternatives.* Surveys were undertaken in participating countries with the exception of the Czech Republic, which dropped out of the project at the start of project implementation but before significant expenditures had be made. Reports were compiled into a single UNEP report on MB consumption in the region. A follow-up questionnaire assessing the effectiveness of the report was responded to by 5 country ozone focal points, who reported that the report improved understanding of MB use and assisted in the development of action plans.
2. *Increased awareness among National Ozone Focal Points, agricultural ministries, pesticide control authorities, MB users and NGOs about MB, the availability of alternatives, and phase-out activities.* Efforts under this activity grouping appear to have been successful in reaching national ozone focal points and ministry professionals. Beyond this circle, the TE provides little

information regarding whether or not information dissemination activities, which included publication of leaflets handed out in meetings with growers, or publications in trade periodicals, and so on, were effective in reaching a wider audience. However, TE does state the three workshops organized by the project (see below) were very effective in raising awareness and overlap with this outcome (TE, pg 13).

3. *Formulation of policies for MB phase-out and implementation of alternatives and a phase-out plan.* The principle activities supporting this outcome was a regional workshop held in Warsaw, Poland, in 2000 where National Ozone Focal points and agricultural ministries identified policy measures, and developed a scenario for the formulation of national action plans for MB phase-out. No formal action plans were drawn up at the workshop. The TE is somewhat ambiguous on the extent to which action plans were indeed formalized by project closure. A survey conducted by UNEP in May 2002 found that among the five countries that responded, all five indicated that the workshop had initiated plans, while two, Bulgaria and Slovakia, reported that they prepared consequential national action plans. Thus, it appears that the overall objective in this regard was only partially met to date.
4. *Implementation and enforcement of established policies and regulations to enable compliance with the Montreal Protocol MB phase-out provisions.* Activities under this outcome consisted primarily of assisted networking among a wide group of stakeholders including national ozone units and technical experts. Survey results reported that assistance was "instrumental" to the implementation of activities in five countries (TE, pg 15). TE does not provide details on the extent of phase out activities occurring in targeted countries however.
5. *Identification of effective, environmentally sustainable alternatives.* Results under this outcome are mixed. A research institute in Poland, The Research Institute of Vegetable Crops (RIVC) was chosen to lead the development of MB alternatives. RIVC's program did generate a number of potentially useful alternatives. However, results generated by RIVC were not diffused to the targeted countries (TE, pg 5). Reasons for this include failure of the program to reach maturation over the project's duration, and the fact that some of the technologies/approaches developed are only applicable in one or two countries, and under certain environmental conditions. TE states that more time is needed for the project's demonstration activities to develop into more viable pest management practices (TE, pg 17).
6. *Development and implementation of national training programs to promote alternatives for major uses of MB in CEITS.* Two regional workshops were organized under this activity grouping, and the TE finds that both contributed to raising awareness and skills of stakeholders that included national ozone focal points, researchers, and other professionals.

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

By most measures, this was a well-run project that succeeded in generating anticipated project outputs on schedule and with sufficiently high degree of quality (TE, pg 18). The project did experience two

changes in task managers over the project's relatively short time schedule, but this is not reported to have affected administration or disbursements in any way. Project management can be faulted somewhat for not providing for greater dissemination of demonstration components to a wider group of stakeholders. However, TE states that insufficient time was provided for maturation of demonstration activities, and thus, it would be inappropriate to penalize the project efficiency rating on this basis. Moreover, the project appears to have facilitated a good flow of information between principle project stakeholders (National Ozone Focal Points), and UNEP was able to bring in its considerable experience in dealing with ODS phase out across other countries (TE, pg 19). Project was completed on time and within budget, and required reporting and monitoring also took place on schedule.

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

Sustainability of project outcomes at project closure is not assured. However, the desire among participating states to join the EU (as stated in the PD), which necessitates full harmonization with MB phase-out policies, and the project's success in raising the capacity and reach of National Ozone Focal Points, who will play a key role in sustaining and advancing the overall objectives of the project, is supportive of a moderately likely sustainability rating overall. Sustainability is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

- *Environmental sustainability* (**L**) – no environmental threats are found to affect the sustainability of project outcomes.
- *Financial sustainability* (**ML**) – National funding for research and development in the partner countries is low, and the same holds true for grower contributions.
- *Socio-Political sustainability* (**L**) – Despite the aforementioned low level of national funding for MB alternative research, sustainability along this line appears to be driven by desire among participating countries to join the EU. In addition, many of the participating countries have already put MB phase-out policy in place, or are moving in that direction (final PIR, pg 12).
- *Institutional sustainability* (**ML**) – TE finds that all National Ozone Focal Points are committed to the project's goals, and capable of advancing progress on MB phase-out. Institutional stability is compromised in Hungary by a lack of an agricultural extension service. Institutional stability is also weak in the area of linkages between research and extension services (TE. pg 22).

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?

No information on realized co-financing is provided in the TE or PIRs, or the effect of co-financing on the project. Promised co-financing constitutes little over 5% of project funding, and thus is unlikely to have had much of an impact on achievement of the project objectives.

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

Project did not experience any delays or receive any project extensions. TE notes that the research program supported by the project could have benefitted from a longer project duration.

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:

Country ownership appears strong in the sense that countries have committed to phasing out MB, and participation from key National Ozone Focal Points and ministries was robust. Moreover, most participating countries have already put MB phase-out policy in place, or are heading that way. This will be important for achieving the project's overall objectives.

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 Unsatisfactory**

Project has a dedicated budget for M&E, and a logframe with indicators. PD discusses M&E very briefly, and assigns monitoring responsibilities to UNEP, in consultation with project partners. However, targets and timeframes for achievement were not established prior to project implementation, and there is little explication of how M&E results should be used to guide implementation. Several of the indicators provided in the PD logframe should have been more detailed and tailored to participating countries and events. For example, logframe indicators call for "implementation and enforcement of established policies and regulations to enable compliance...." A more useful framework would have identified policies of interest in participating countries, and provided tailored targets and indicators so as to allow for a more accurate assessment of whether this overall objective is being met. Similarly, participation of stakeholders beyond national ozone focal points in project activities, while a stated goal of the project, is not captured clearly by the project's logframe.

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

M&E implementation is barely discussed in the TE, except to say that project supervision relied on regular written reporting, interaction with country representatives at regional workshops, and visits with various consultants (TE, pg 18). However, as project activities were completed on time, and included information gathering that was used to inform subsequent project components (i.e., surveying of MB usage and production in participating countries that formed basis of UNEP report), M&E implementation is assessed as moderately satisfactory. Moveover, all PIRs were submitted on time and are clear and informative. Shortcomings noted in the TE primarily concern the demonstration component of the project, where TE states that project could have benefited from clearer oversight that would have assisted UNEP in assessing the quality of demonstration results during the course of the project (TE, pg 19).

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**

Overall quality of project supervision had moderate shortcomings. Supervision from UNEP in terms of overseeing budgeting and procurement issues, and in providing expertise to facilitate such outputs as the project's reports on methyl bromide production and use in the region, and in facilitating effective regional workshops was strong. Areas where UNEP supervision was less than satisfactory are in the project's M&E design, which as noted above, is weak in several regards. TE also notes that UNEP supervision of the project's the demonstration activities was lacking, and that this is perhaps partly responsible for the limited utility of this project component (TE, pg 19).

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

As assessed in the TE, project appears to have been executed well, with all anticipated project activities undertaken and overall quality of project outputs satisfactory. Project was closed on time, and no issues in procurement or reporting were noted. Management of demonstration component could have been stronger, however, TE notes that the principle failing is on UNEP for not having provided stronger technical oversight and inputs into this project component.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

No changes in environmental stress or status are reported in the TE to have occurred by the end of the project.

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.

No changes in human well-being are reported in the TE to have occurred by the end of the project. Project was narrowly focused on supporting country focal points and ministries in developing capacity to phase out MBs, and did not include any direct socio-economic component.

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 – project activities were reported in TE to have strengthened the capacity of partner country Ozone Focal points to develop and oversee efforts to phase out MB. This occurred through awareness raising activities included a comprehensive report on MB production and use in regional countries; 3 workshops on various aspects of MB phase-out and alternatives; development of alternatives to MB (research phase); and facilitated networking of MB stakeholders.

b) Governance – TE reports that the project "catalyzed, accelerated and expanded processes related to MB phase-out, and came just in time to boost the MB substitution and phase-out processes" (TE, pg 5). It's unclear however the extent of policy of legislation on MB phase out and substation that is in place in partnering countries, and what the direct contribution of this project to that process is.

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.

No unintended impacts are reported in the TE to have occurred as a result 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.

No project initiatives were taken to scale by project close. The project did support a research component examining alternatives to methyl bromide (MB). However, TE reports that the length of the project (2 years) was too short to allow for maturation of this project component, and thus the efforts of this part of the project were less than anticipated. There are also economic barriers to the private sector taking up alternatives to MB, as the market for these products appears to be very small or declining (TE, pg 20).

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.

TE provides the following key lessons from the project:

- The project's larger focus on promoting environmentally-friendly crop production and protection is one that currently does not enjoy the backing of commercial firms, and therefore, requires further public assistance.
- The failure of the project's demonstration component results to be taken up and adopted in partnering countries is due in part to a project design that did not call for national demonstrations in each country (as originally proposed by UNEP).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE provides the following recommendations:

- The R&D effort at one location (supported by the project) should now be shifted to involve local, country-specific research and development capabilities to foster the fine-tuning of recommendations that are tailored to countries' specific needs.
- Crop protection research, extension and regulatory functions should incorporate an integrated pest management strategy for the control of soil-born pathogens.
- Projects like this should be geared towards ensuring dissemination of experimental results to as many growers/stakeholders as possible.

- Agricultural extensions services should be involved in project demonstration activities of this nature to provide feedback, and extensions services should set the dissemination of MB alternatives as a system-level priority going forward.
- Project proponents should ensure that project outputs are translated into local languages to ensure dissemination of findings to a wide group of stakeholders.
- Governments should develop economic support systems for the promotion of MB alternatives which require infrastructure investments.

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 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?	TE covers outcomes and achievements at the macro level but does not provide sufficient detail on many components. These include detail on the extent of phase-out activities occurring in targeted countries; detail on the extent of MB legislation and/or policy that has been adopted or is in process of being adopted as a result of the project; and detail on the project's demonstration activities.	**MU**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE is fairly consistent, although unclear on the extent of MB legislation and/or policy. More detail should have been provided on the demonstration activities. Ratings appear a bit high given weaknesses in demonstration activities and on adoption of MB phase-out legislation/policy	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability is touched on briefly, and is difficult to assess given the lack of detail on the extent to which MB legislation is in place.	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Many of the lessons that are provided are project outcomes. What would have been more valuable would have been findings related to policy adoption and on the interaction between the private sector and the research program supported by the project	**MU**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No. Project does not provide any detail on actual project costs or co-financing.	**HU**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE barely mentions the project's M&E system except to say that reporting did occur. Much more should have been provided on the M&E design which was weak in several regards, and how M&E systems/results were or were not fed in to the project's management. In addition, nothing was said about the project's mid-term review which was called for in the PD but does not appear to have taken place.	**U**
Overall TE Rating		**MU**

Overall TE rating = (0.3 *(3+3)) + (0.1 *(3+3+1+2)) = 1.8 + 0.9 = 2.7 = MU

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