

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1897	
GEF Agency project ID		2754 (PIMS)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Building Integrated Photovoltaic (BIPV) Technology Application Project - MBIPV _{SEP}	
Country/Countries		Malaysia	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-7: Reduction of the long term costs of low greenhouse gas emitting energy technologies _{SEP} S-5: Global market aggregation and national innovation for emerging technologies	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Energy, Communications and Multimedia (MECM)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations only	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 29 th , 2004	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 2005	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 2010	
Actual date of project completion		May 2011	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.13	NA
	Co-financing	0.13	NA
GEF Project Grant		4.70	4.56
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	12.54	11.24
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	7.72	13.69
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		4.83	4.56
Total Co-financing		20.26	24.93
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		25.22	29.49
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		August 2011	
Author of TE		Peter Ahm, Ghazali Talib	
TER completion date		December 20, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	HS	--	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		NA	--	L
M&E Design		NA	--	MS
M&E Implementation		NA	--	UA
Quality of Implementation		NA	--	UA
Quality of Execution		NA	--	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective is "to mitigate GHG emissions from the power generation sector of Malaysia, which presently accounts for a large share of the country's total GHG emissions. The sector is forecast, based on a "business as usual scenario" to produce GHG emissions 30% higher than its 2000 level by end of year 2010." (PD p.18)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective as stated in the project document is "the reduction of the growth rate of GHG emissions from fossil fuel fired power generators, through the widespread implementation of BIPV [building integrated Photovoltaic] application to replace part of the current fossil fuel utilization, and the cost reduction of BIPV technology".

This objective will be delivered through the following project components:

1. BIPV Information Services, Awareness and Capacity Building Programs
2. BIPV Market Enhancement and Infrastructure Development Program
3. BIPV Policies and Financing Mechanisms Program
4. BIPV Industry Development and R&D Enhancement Program

(PD pp.18-28)

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

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not rate relevance, but describes the project as “relevant to the development objectives of Malaysia”. This TER rates the project as relevant as it is well aligned to the development objectives of Malaysia, as well as to the GEF-3 priorities under the climate change focal area.

Malaysia has embedded the importance of renewable energy into its legislation. In 2002, the Government introduced the Fifth-Fuel policy, which identified renewable energy sources (biomass, solar, wind, etc.) and encouraged its broader utilization. At the same time, the government adopted the Small Renewable Energy Power (SREP) Program to encourage and intensify RE utilization (PD p.6). In conjunction, “renewable energy at the national level was first stated in the Eighth Malaysia Plan (2001- 2005), and in the Third Outline Perspective Plan 2001-2010. Renewable energy is again explicitly addressed in the Ninth Malaysia Plan (2006-2010), and in the current Tenth Malaysia Plan (2011-2015) targets for and instruments to promote the use of renewable energy have been set. This has further been minted out in the Renewable Energy Act 2010, which inter alia details a feed-in-tariff scheme for renewable energy electricity as well as in the Sustainable Energy Development Authority Act defining a new Sustainable Energy Development Authority (SEDA).” (TE p.4)

The project is also well aligned with the GEF’s priorities under the climate chance focal area. The project is directly related to strategic priority 5 (global market aggregation and national innovation for emerging technologies) as it aims to promote the greater use and improve the competitiveness of solar energy in Malaysia.

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

The TE does not rate effectiveness specifically, but rates project outcomes as highly satisfactory. Indeed, the terminal evaluation describes the project as having exhibited “considerable overachievement” and as having been “highly successful both on a national and international level” (TE p.7). This TER agrees that achievements under the project have been impressive, but absent a clear evaluation of project achievements against the logframe, is unable to verify that all targets have been met or surpassed. For this reason, a rating of satisfactory is assigned, even though effectiveness might in fact have been highly satisfactory.

Overall the project “played a crucial role in getting RE and PV on the political agenda in Malaysia, and in getting a national regulatory framework in place underpinning a sustainable post- project development. Other projects and activities have also contributed to this, but MBIPV has played a key role as mover. MBIPV has thus had considerable impact on key actors affecting decision-making concerning PV and renewable energy at several levels, e.g. government, parliament, agencies and institutions, utilities, academia and industry as well as consultancies, architects, developers and other professionals.” (TE p.7) Finally, the project also surpassed its target for GHG emissions avoided, with about 1,400 tons of CO2 reduced per year. (TE p.17)

1. BIPV Information Services, Awareness and Capacity Building Programs

Under this component, the project delivered various outputs including training courses on solar energy, quality control programs for the local industry, and knowledge sharing initiatives (TE p.56). According to the TE, “by establishing the national base for the MBIPV project, this has created an interest from many foreign parties to explore more detail about the project implementation and its successfulness” (TE p.33).

2. BIPV Market Enhancement and Infrastructure Development Program

Under this project component, more solar energy capacity has been developed than expected, which has resulted to lower prices for solar energy in the country (TE p.33). Outputs delivered as part of this component include the development of standards and guidelines, the set up of BIPV demonstration sites, as well as the review, promotion, implementation and operation of the program “Suria 1000”, a programme with the objective of creating awareness of PV demonstration projects (TE p.56).

3. BIPV Policies and Financing Mechanisms Program

Under this component, the project achieved “a major key milestone with the establishment of National RE Policy & RE Action Plan as well as National Green Technology Policy by GoM. This was later followed by the endorsement of RE Law (FIT Mechanism) and SEDA Act by the parliament which underpins the successful achievement of the component” (TE pp.33-34). Overall, the regulatory framework for solar and renewable energy in Malaysia appears to have been noticeably strengthened.

4. BIPV Industry Development and R&D Enhancement Program

Outputs under this component included the upgrading of local industry capabilities, the establishment of a BIPV quality control center, and the revision of building codes (TE p.57). The TE does not describe the way in which those outputs have contributed to project outcomes.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
----------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not rate project efficiency, nor does it provide any useful discussion of efficiency. The TE only mentions that “In general, the utilization of the GEF funding component is found to be balanced

and to reflect the actual project progress” (TE p.33). Due to missing information, this TER is unable to assess efficiency.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for sustainability. This TER rates sustainability as likely due to the new legislation passed as part of the project that will continue to ensure the development of renewable energy in Malaysia following project end.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE provides no evidence that funds will be available to pursue related activities following project end, but the continuation of project activities is not a necessary condition for project sustainability. Indeed, the project successfully strengthened the regulatory RE framework in Malaysia, and no further activities are necessary to maintain what has been accomplished in the project. As such, there are no financial risks threatening project sustainability.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely

Project documents do not present any social or political risks to the project’s accomplishments. Socio-political sustainability is therefore rated likely.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely

As mentioned in the TE, “the sustainability of the MBIPV project has been ensured by the passing of the Renewable Energy Bill 2010 (D.R. 47/2010) defining a scheme of RE feed-in-tariffs (FIT) and the establishment of an RE Fund (a levy of 1% on top of the normal electricity tariff) to fund the feed-in-tariffs; in support of this the passing of the Sustainable Energy Development Authority Bill 2010 (D.R. 43/2010) defining a new Malaysian authority (SEDA) under the MEGTW dedicated to the Malaysian RE sector including the FIT scheme.” Those new bills will shape the Malaysian economy and its framework for renewable energy going forward.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

There are no reported or known environmental risks to this project. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as likely.

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?

Co-financing contributions exceeded the amount committed initially, mostly due to private sector contributions that were larger than expected (\$13.7 million instead of \$7.7 million). The project was able to bring in \$120,000 in additional funding from the Egyptian American Enterprise Fund. The TE does not describe the way in which this co-financing contributed to the project's outcomes.

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 project was expected to be completed by the end of 2010, but was extended to May 2011 "to facilitate the establishment of the SEDA, to mint out the FIT scheme in supporting regulations and to ensure the competence of the project core team would be available to the MEGTW" (TE p.7). Overall, the extension was granted to ensure project sustainability.

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, the success of the project "is very much also due to the willingness by the current Malaysian Parliament, Government and in particular MEGTW staff to receive and accept recommendations in the fields of RE and PV" (TE p.8). However, the TE does not provided any specific information regarding how the Government of Malaysia supported the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE does not rate the project's M&E design at entry. This TER rates M&E design as moderately satisfactory due to the vagueness of the M&E plan presented in the Project Document and some of the gaps in the logical framework of the project.

The project’s M&E plan is presented in the project document (pp.40-41). It describes the planned M&E activities for the project, including quarterly project reports, project implementation reports, independent mid-term and final evaluations, as well as continuous monitoring activities. However, the PD does not define roles for the execution of those activities, nor does it present the budget that would be allocated to those activities.

A logical framework is presented in the project document (PD p.54) and features clear and verifiable project indicators, means of verification, and relevant assumptions. However, the logical framework does not present baseline data, and several indicators are oriented towards outputs instead of outcomes. The TE does not present an analysis of the M&E design at entry, nor a discussion of the quality of the indicators established.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide information about the implementation of M&E activities for this project, except that the periodic APR-PIR process was completed (TE p.40). A mid-term evaluation was conducted in 2007, but was not available to consult as part of this TER. Overall, this TER does not have sufficient information to rate M&E implementation for the project.

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: Unable to Assess
--	---------------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP’s quality of implementation for this project was not rated or assessed. Due to a lack of information, this TER is unable to assess the quality project implementation.

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

The executing agency for this project was the Malaysian Ministry of Energy, Communications and Multimedia (MECM). In the TE, the MECM’s quality of execution for this project is not rated. This TER rates

it as satisfactory due to the project team having been able to adapt to new circumstances and identify project risks.

According to the TE, the success of the project is “to a very large extent contributable to the competence, dedication and skills of the project core team (management and team). The core team has not only reached overachievement of original project targets, but has taken on additional assignments en route, e.g. activities in off-grid PV technology, preparation of a FIT / SEDA website and in particular extensive support to the Malaysian government. The Evaluator further finds, that the core team has been very effective in adapting to recommendations and in the handling of project risks by quickly identifying risks and by creating alternative plans to accommodate same risks. “ (TE p.8)

Despite the lack of detailed information on this topic in the TE, this TER rates project execution as satisfactory based in the limited information available.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Due to its activities promoting the development photovoltaic energy in Malaysia, the project surpassed its target for GHG emissions avoided, with about 1,400 tons of CO₂ reduced per year (TE p.17). The regulatory framework developed will continue to increase the size of the solar energy capacity in the country, and thereby further improve the project’s environmental impact going forward.

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.

Not applicable

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

The project delivered various capacity-building outputs including training courses on solar energy, quality control programs for the local industry, and knowledge sharing initiatives (TE p.56). In addition, “beyond establishing the national base for the MBIPV project, this has created an interest from many foreign parties to explore more detail about the project implementation and its successfulness” (TE p.33).

b) Governance

The project achieved “a major key milestone with the establishment of National RE Policy & RE Action Plan as well as National Green Technology Policy by GoM. This was later followed by the endorsement of RE Law (FiT Mechanism) and SEDA Act by the parliament” (TE pp.33-34). Overall, the regulatory framework for solar and renewable energy in Malaysia appears to have been noticeably strengthened.

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 were reported as part of the project.

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

The TE and other project documents provide no evidence of the project initiatives having been adopted beyond what was planned in the project.

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.

The report presents the following lessons learned:

1. One lesson learned is that even if a project such as the MBIPV by definition must have a sharp focus, care must be taken not to focus only on a single RE technology or applications such as BIPV and GCPV. RE and for that matter energy conservation present a palette of options to be addressed in a coordinated manner, and as such project planners and executors should look into the bigger perspective when implementing projects. A broader approach, in particular with regard to dissemination, communication and ownership, may contribute to reduce the competitive/critical landscape otherwise easily created around a successful project. The MBIPV project has successfully adapted such a broader approach since mid of project.
2. A second lesson learned is that – at least in Malaysia – the time to introduce new legislation (the regulatory framework necessary for a sustainable continuation of the MBIPV initiative) can be considerably reduced by involving private sector legal expertise to carry out the necessary drafting of bills and subsequent regulations instead of relying exclusively on the often overworked office of the Attorney General (AG) and the line ministries involved.
3. A third lesson learned is, that the crucial and costly competence and skills built up in the project core team during the project execution can be (and should be) transferred intact to ongoing activities if at all possible. In this case the core team has after project completion as “interim SEDA” provided the MEGTW with invaluable services, and the core team is expected to form the nucleus of the new SEDA. Carefully build competence and skills are thus kept intact for the benefit of the country instead of, as often is the case, being dispersed and “lost” by end of project.
4. A fourth lesson learned is, that because of many demonstration projects have been applied at high cost residential houses, PV is often perceived to be suitable for the high income/rich people. A continuous awareness effort will be required to educate the public and to get rid of this perception. The above-mentioned Eco Village concept could be seen in this context.
5. A fifth lesson learned is, that the ‘Suria 1000’ programme has been very successful in creating awareness and PV demonstration projects. The innovative bidding mechanism of the programme instead of a grant approach has led to good value for money and as a result over-achievement of the PV capacity targets set. The MBIPV programme can thus be regarded as a best practice and the approach can be replicated in other coming projects and in other developing countries as well.

(TE p.10)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report makes the following recommendations:

1. As a direct follow up of the MBIPV project it is recommended to carry out two minor studies:
 - a. One to highlight the impact of the MBIPV project on cost reductions of GCPV in Malaysia in a scene of changing world market price reductions and exchange rate fluctuations;
 - b. One to map out the impact of the MBIPV project on the relevant local industry.
2. At the time of the evaluation the SEDA was not firmly established with the project core team acting as an “interim SEDA”. Taking into account the short time until the FIT scheme shall go operational (01.09.11) and the associated outstanding measures to be completed, the envisaged negative effect on the public by an eventual postponement of the FIT scheme and the risk of “depletion” of the core team, it is recommended to formalize the effective establishment of the SEDA very quickly. ^[11]_[SEP]
3. As the PV market has shown to be very volatile it is recommended to investigate the PV FIT at least every 6 months and to adjust same in a fully transparent manner.
4. For companies MIDA administers a set of basically tax holidays at present in force up to 2015. It is recommended to investigate the viability of a continuation in one form or another in order to provide companies with a more long-term signal. ^[11]_[SEP]
5. In more general terms the local PV industry and commercial sector in Malaysia is perceived as having “suffered” from the lack of official long term PV market targets and indicators resulting in a relative slow local take up. These market targets, indicators and instruments are now in place as explained elsewhere, and it is recommended to develop and initiate suitable instruments to promote the development of a Malaysian PV related industry, which e.g. could encompass low iron PV glass, module assembly incl. tailor made PV modules for BIPV, electronics, DC switch gear and tailor made support structures and integration packages. In this context a more open collaboration between universities and industry in Malaysia should be encouraged.
6. The MEGTW has taken the commendable initiative to create awareness of PV and RE in the banking sector in Malaysia to facilitate future loans for such installations, it is recommended, as an eventual supplementary action, to activate the expertise of the ADB in this, as the ADB currently is executing its major Asian Solar Energy Initiative (ASEI), which includes capacity building in the banking sector. ^[11]_[SEP]
7. While regional (ASEAN) dissemination of the MBIPV via the NRE-SSN has taken ^[11]_[SEP] place with perceived limited impact – not due to effort of the MBIPV, it is recommended with the above mentioned ADB ASEI in full deployment including its know- ledge platform the Asian Solar Energy Forum (ASEF), to enhance the use of this new knowledge platform to disseminate the very successful MBIPV project regionally.
8. The MBIPV project has successfully addressed individual BIPV installations. As a natural follow up it is recommended to investigate the possibilities of establishing a new project targeting a concentrated BIPV deployment in a large scale development, say 500-1 000 low energy houses or

more. The overall implementation principle should reflect integrated energy design. Such an “Eco Village concept” will partly be a very visible demonstration of BIPV combined with energy conservation measures (housing of the future), partly enable Malaysian market actors, in particular TNB, to obtain experience with high penetration of PV in grids, as the “Eco Village” periodically can be expected to be a net producer of electricity (Smart Grid functions). A very first step could be to identify an interested and suitable developer and to investigate funding options.

9. With the expected success of the RE FIT scheme the penetration of RE generators, some of which are intermittent/stochastic of nature, in the Malaysian grid system will increase. International experience clearly shows, that with increasing penetration of intermittent generators a Smart Grid approach to grid management is needed in order to avoid unnecessary increase of conventional generating capacity and to keep balance and quality of the grid system. Although a high penetration of RE in the Malaysian grid system might take time, it is recommended to initiate suitable Smart Grid actions in a combination of local actions (see also point above) and international collaboration in order timely to build Malaysian capacity in this complex field and to avoid unnecessary investments.
10. The PV System Monitoring Centre (PVMC) at the UiTM is doing an important service in providing national data on BIPV system performance in Malaysia. Such data are important for future analysis of trends and for future decision-making. It is recommended to make certain, that the PVMC can continue providing this service – also following the three year period after MBIPV completion as per present contract – and it is recommended to investigate the possibilities of extending the scope of work of the PSMC to include a representative selection of the many off-grid PV systems in Malaysia thus building a national PV performance database.
11. As the MBIPV project has been highly satisfactory only a couple operational recommendations can be given:
 - a. For projects dealing with/focusing on a single technology it should be emphasized to ensured a sufficiently broad interphase to the surroundings in terms communication and dissemination to prevent the project from being “isolated” and this way maybe create unnecessary animosity.
 - b. When/if conflict of interest is encountered communication efforts shall be in- creased and base for ownership broadened, not the opposite.

(TE pp.8-10)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report does report on the achievement of project outputs, but the discussion of the extent to which objectives have been met and outcomes achieved is limited. The TE does not report on the achievement of the project against logframe indicators.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	No ratings are provided, and several assessment categories (M&E, performance of the implementing agency, sustainability) are missing.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Only a very limited discussion of sustainability is provided, without a comprehensive or complete discussion.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned appear comprehensive and supported by evidence provided in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Costs (total and per activity) are provided, as well as actual co-financing.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does not specifically assess the project's M&E.	U
Overall TE Rating		MU

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.