Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2241	
GEF Agency project ID		3001	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings	
Country/Countries		Mauritius	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP: Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation SO: Energy efficient buildings	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		September 24, 2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 31, 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		30 October 2010	
Actual date of project completion		31 December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	0.025
	Co-financing	0.020	0.020
GEF Project Grant		0.91	0.83
Co-financing	IA own	0.34	0.30
	Government	0.22	10.4
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	4.68	0
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.94	0.85
Total Co-financing		5.26	10.72
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.20	11.57
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 5, 2014	
Author of TE		N/A	
TER completion date		February 24, 2016	
TER prepared by		Matteo Borzoni	
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	N/R	Moderately Satisfactory	N/R	Satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	Likely	N/R	Likely
M&E Design	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Satisfactory
M&E Implementation	N/R	Moderately unsatisfactory	N/R	Moderately unsatisfactory
Quality of Implementation	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of Execution	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	Highly satisfactory

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global objective of the project was "To reduce GHG emissions sustainably through a transformation of the building energy efficiency market" (ProDoc, p.8).

Mauritius relies primarily on imported fossil fuels for the generation of electricity. In the decade prior to the start of the project, electricity demand in Mauritius had grown at an average annual cumulative rate of over 8%. Buildings were responsible for some 78% of electricity consumption in Mauritius.

An effective demand side management (DSM) program is supposed to reduce growth by at least 14% in the commercial and residential sectors in 10 years. Such a DSM program represents between 126,000 and 245,000 tons of CO2 equivalent.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was "To reduce GHG emissions sustainably through a transformation of the building energy efficiency market." (ProDoc, p.8)

This objective was expected to be achieved through four outcomes, which were formulated as follows (ProDoc p. 4):

- Outcome 1: Building regulations and codes for energy saving are developed, enacted and sustainably enforced
- Outcome 2: Demand and supply for energy saving services and technology stimulated
- Outcome 3: Building engineers, architects, compliance officers, policy makers, financial sector, suppliers and public are convinced of importance and market opportunities for building energy saving
- Outcome 4: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation

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

There were no changes to the project's Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives. There were modifications made to the project's activities as follows:

- During implementation, the project took on additional activities in the form of the establishment of a grid-code and a feed-in tariff system. This followed a specific request form the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities
- In addition, the project was expanded to include the industrial sector through funding received from AOSIS/SIDS-Dock, which resulted in an addendum to the project document in January 2012.

These changes represent a widening of the scope of the development objective, however the formulation of the development objective was not formally revised.

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 rated relevance as "Highly satisfactory" and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as satisfactory.

Mauritius is entirely dependent on imported fuels for electricity generation, with high energy generation costs and subsidies which consume hard currency. When the project was drafted energy efficiency measures, products and services particularly related to buildings were uncommon in Mauritius despite the exponential growth of energy demand in the last 10 years. This was crucial since buildings were responsible for two-thirds of the electricity demand (ProDoc, p. 3). Mauritius had no national energy efficiency agenda.

The project intended to address these problems by providing the country with effective energy efficiency mechanisms for the building sector.

The project is intended to overcome barriers to energy efficiency in buildings in Mauritius and to stimulate the development of a market for and non-residential building energy efficiency in both

existing stock and future buildings. The project tackled market barriers in all three areas of a building's energy use: building fabric, equipment, and people (behavior).

The project is therefore fully in line with GEF Operational Program #5: Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation and the new GEF-4 Strategic Priority of Energy-Efficient Buildings.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE rated effectiveness as "Moderately satisfactory" while this TER rates effectiveness as "Satisfactory". It is true some outcomes were not achieved, however the project managed to develop a bill that was passed by the government within the project life, which is very uncommon for the kind of international development projects funded by GEF. In addition the reduction in GHG emission caused by the project exceeded the expected target. Also the Energy Efficiency Management Office (EEMO) was established as an independent statutory body, which goes well beyond the Energy Efficiency Unit originally-envisaged in the project proposal.

Regarding Outcome 1-: Building regulations and codes for energy saving are developed, enacted and sustainably enforced - Regulations have been developed, beyond those originally envisaged by the project. A far-reaching Energy Efficiency Act was passed along with a Building Control Act and a feed-in tariff system. In addition the Energy Efficiency Management Office was established and an appliance labelling system was developed on a voluntary basis and was expected to become mandatory early in 2015.

For Outcome 2- Demand and supply for energy saving services and technology stimulated- training of local auditors was not delivered but at the time when TE was conducted the tender for training of energy auditors was on going. In addition the project laid the foundation for other projects to carry out industrial energy audits. More specifically, 30 industrial energy audits were carried out under the SIDS-Dock project, which is a continuation of the UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project. The adoption of standard designs for low and middle income housing (one indicator of outcome 2) was not deemed feasible by the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Stakeholders (TE, p. 24).

For Outcome 3- Building engineers, architects, compliance officers, policy makers, financial sector, suppliers and public are convinced of importance and market opportunities for building energy saving- The number of commercial actors (building engineers, architects, compliance officers, etc.) in the building sector has clearly increased. They were estimated to be 20-30 in total.

For Outcome 4-Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation - the project has produced 17 technical reports which are publicly available. According to the TE these documents could be better promoted if a single permanent online location were used.

The lack of certified auditors (outcome 2) represents on important shortcoming along with the lack of compliance enforcement mechanisms and capabilities for municipal buildings (outcome 1). Compliance enforcement capabilities were not in place because of two main reasons. On one side compliance enforcement capabilities are generally limited such that even the enforcement of the code on basic building violations may not occur (TE, p. 21).On the other side penalties specified by relevant regulation are quite small. Moreover, the project did not deliver related trainings and government budget was not allocated for enforcing regulation in new buildings.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rated efficiency as "Moderately Satisfactory" and this TER agrees with that rating. The project failed to mobile co-financing for investments that were supposed to result from energy audits (this was planned in the project proposal).

Moreover the project well exceeded its original timeline, taking more than twice the planned time. This was not only due to the overly ambitious initial plans, but also to the continuous turnover of the project managers.

The TE does no address further efficiency issues. It is therefore assumed that, project activities were implemented in a cost-effective way and that implementation followed standard UNDP rules and regulations, thus assuring that procurement processes were open, transparent and competitive.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Likely

The TE rated sustainability as Likely and this TER agrees with that rating. This is because the socio-political context, the institutional framework, the financial aspects and the environmental component all suggest that the benefits delivered by the projects will continue after the end of the intervention.

Financial sustainability was rated as "Moderately Likely" in the TE. This TER upgrades financial sustainability to "Likely". This is because the Energy Efficiency Management Office (EEMO) has a budget which is provided by the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities (MEPU). In addition, Mauritius was granted a 50 million Euro Energy Support Loan from the EU and a 1.5 million Euro technical assistance package from Agence Française de Développement (AFD) for the functioning of the EEMO.

Socio-cultural sustainability was rated as "Likely" by the TE and this TER agrees with that rating. The TE noted how social and political interest was high regarding energy efficiency concerns.

The TE rated the sustainability of the Institutional framework and governance as "Likely" and this TER agrees with that rating. The EEMO was established by law, thus assuring its future operations. Its management committee is made up of representatives for almost all relevant stakeholders.

The TE rated environmental sustainability as "Likely" and this TER agrees with that rating. The project did not provoke any environmental damage. On the contrary the energy efficiency measures supported by the project reduce the consumption of non-renewable energy sources.

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?

The total co-financing amounted to 10.7 Million USD. Of this 10 Million were from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and were used to subsidize the purchase of solar heaters for end users. Subsidies for renewable energy appliances were not included in the project so the 10 Million USD co-financing seems more an ex-post accounting device than a real co-financing effort. The delivery of subsidies for water heater would have probably happened anyhow since it was not related to the project.

Moreover the project was unable to mobilize 4.5 Million USD of co-financing investments from the private sector resulting from energy audits, as envisaged in the project proposal. This was probably an over ambitious target but it would have made a tremendous impact on the overall project performance.

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 overall duration of the project was more than twice the original time. The project document was signed on October 2007. The project was initially intended to have a duration of three years. The Project Manager was hired on July 20, 2008 after many problems in appointing a qualified project manager. The Mid-Term Review, commissioned in November 2011, recommended an extension to April 2013. On 28 December 2012, the UNDP Country Office requested and later received a no-cost extension to 31 December 2013. This last no-cost extension was partially due to secure finance from the AOSIS/SIDS-Dock initiative as a part of the GEF-financed project. A second no-cost extension was requested in September 2013.

Other causes for delays were the continuous turnover of the project managers along with difficulties in finding project managers with the necessary skills. The project had four different project managers, including long periods without a project manager in place. This situation contributed to important delays in procurement. Staffing of the EEMO was another reason for delays.

However these delays do not seem to have affected the quality of the outputs generated by the project.

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 is certainly very high.

The set-up of the Energy Efficiency Management Office with a government funded budget is a clear indication of country ownership. Another proxy for the high country ownership is represented by the various bills promoted by the project and that were passed by the parliament.

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 TE rated M&E Design at entry as "Satisfactory" and this TER agrees with that rating.

The project document includes a logical framework, which provides SMART indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

An M&E plan was detailed in the project document. It identified clear responsibilities along with a proper budget. The plan includes a baseline study, annual project reports, project implementation reviews, terminal tripartite reviews, steering committee meetings, audits, a mid-term evaluation and a final evaluation.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: "Moderately unsatisfactory"

The TER rated M&E Implementation as "Moderately Satisfactory". This TER agrees with that rating.

The monitoring and evaluation of the project met the minimum requirements, with a Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation being conducted. However, the project planned the developed of a baseline, which was not conducted. The absence of a baseline makes quantitative assessment of project outcomes impossible. Moreover, not all indicators included in the logical framework were measured.

At the moment when the TE was drafted the project was organizing the impact assessment of awareness raising campaigns.

The mid-term evaluation included seven recommendations. Of these only one (about project extension) seems that was put in place by the project. More specifically, the mid-term evaluation recommended an extension to April 2013 and that the UNDP Country Office requested a no-cost extension until 31 December 2013.

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 project's implementing agency was UNDP. The TE rated the quality of project implementation as "Moderately satisfactory", and this TER agrees with that assessment.

The project design is of good quality. The intervention logic is clear and coherent. Project implementation arrangements were clearly defined.

Assignment of responsibility between the implementing agency and the executing agency on execution is difficult given the Government's decision to shift responsibility for hiring of project managers during the project implementation period.

Cooperation between the implementing agency and the executing agency at a high level was evident in the evaluation and was a clear factor in enabling the parliamentary approval of promoted acts. However, the frequent absence of a project manager (during the period when the project manager was supposed to be provided by the government counterpart), together with a lack of clarity on specific roles between the implementing agency and the executing agency, meant that UNDP played a broader role than usually assigned to it, thus becoming involved in the daily execution of the project and management of stakeholder involvement, but with a less effective outcome than a dedicated project manager (TE. p.31).

.

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

The TE rated the quality of project implementation as “Moderately satisfactory”. This TER agrees with that rating.

Assignment of responsibility between the implementing agency and the executing agency on execution is difficult given the Government’s decision to shift responsibility for hiring of project managers during the project implementation period.

As the project manager provided by the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities was working part time on the project and was assigned to other duties, UNDP required that the project manager was employed on a full-time basis and therefore requested and obtained that the recruitment of a full-time project manager on UNDP contract (PIR 2014).

The high turnover of project managers and their intermittent presence was the main management problem the project faced.

The main reasons for the high turnover of project managers were: lack of competence in the required field, unreasonable demands on project manager’s time for project managers that were simultaneously managing the project and attending to responsibilities as government employees, and, to a limited extent, the low compensation provided (TE, p.16).

Part of the difficulty in appointing a Project Manager was the result of a change in procurement policy by the Mauritian Government, led by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. The change was not specific to this project but to all similar projects with Mauritian Government implementation partners. The Mauritian Government required that procurement and hiring was conducted by the Mauritian Government counterparts. This resulted in considerable delays in hiring. Procurement responsibilities were shifted back to UNDP at the end of 2013.

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.

The project exceeded its GHG reduction target and put in place durable and sustainable changes that can be convincingly shown to have made a change in the energy efficiency landscape in Mauritius and that can be expected to yield the desired reductions in GHG emissions in the future. More specifically the project caused 53,481 tCO2 of direct emissions reductions due to the establishment of a feed-in tariff system, while the original target was 42,000 tCO2.

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.

The Energy Efficiency Act was passed as a direct consequence of the project's activities along with the Building Control Act. These acts lay the foundation for important savings in energy costs of buildings.

The grid code and the feed-in-tariff system made it possible to promote investments in small-scale and medium scale distributed generation (TE, p.33) by the private sector. More specifically the total renewable energy installed capacities under the feed-in-tariff system on December 2013 amounted to 2,459 KW.

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

Training of local auditors was organized by the project, however a certification scheme is not yet in place.

The project has also organized an awareness campaign that included energy labels for appliances. The impact of the awareness campaign is still to be assessed.

The number of commercial actors in the energy saving sector clearly increased as a result of the project's activities. At the time when the TE was drafted there were 20-30 commercial actors, who include architects and engineers.

b) Governance

The project strongly contributed to improving the governance of building sector. The Energy Efficiency Act was passes in 2011, thus establishing an independent Energy Efficiency Management Office (EEMO)

with its own management committee. This clearly went beyond the original target of establishing an Energy Efficiency Unit. The energy performance of buildings was included in the Building Control Act in 2012.

Appliance labelling was promoted by the project. The result is that a voluntary agreement on labelling of appliances was entered into with retailers in January 2014. However appliance labelling was expected to become mandatory very soon (most probably in 2015).

The project laid the foundation for the approval of the SIDS-Dock project. Thirty industrial facilities received industrial energy audits under the SISD-Dock and eight additional facilities received energy audits under a scheme supported by the Agence Française de Développement (AFD).

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.

The project supported the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities in the establishment of a feed-in tariff (FiT) for renewable energy. As a result of this FiT, 2,459 KW of distributed renewable energy were installed as of December 2013, and resulted in the reduction of 53,481 tons of CO2 emissions. Although the establishment of a FiT was not an output of the project at inception, project staff time and resources were devoted to its development. These resources were credited with making the FiT possible. The FiT was responsible for the direct emissions reductions attributable to the project.

The Energy Efficiency Management Office was established as an independent statutory body, thereby ensuring its continuity and ability to function with autonomy. This clearly goes beyond the originally-envisaged Energy Efficiency Unit.

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.

According to the TE (p. 17) the project was credited with paving the way for later activities, even by other donor agencies. In particular, a major outcome of the project was the establishment of the EEMO. A 50 million Euro loan from the EU was granted to the government because the loan was conditional upon the establishment of the EEMO. In this way, this GEF-financed project contributed to the mobilization of very significant funds for energy reform in Mauritius.

The project's activities related to energy efficiency industrial sector have been retaken by the SISD-Dock 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 most important lessons included in the TE are reported below.

Clarity on assignments, capabilities and authority within the project are crucial. The project suffered from the lack of a project manager for significant periods as a result of the difficulty in hiring and retaining qualified project managers. In May 2011, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development made a request to the UNDP Country Office that all future project managers were recruited by the Government. The request was later rescinded, with UNDP returning to the hiring of project managers. Clearer, written, assignment of roles, responsibilities and authorities at the project start would help to avoid such situations and the resulting delays.

Investment at the project outset in the development of staff is a key element of project success and sustainability. An early investment in training staff would have been important because the project was meant to create an authority (i.e. EEMO) whose management required specific skills. The recruitment of individuals at the project start and their assignment for study periods of 1-2 years in an energy management bureau abroad would represent important training opportunities.

Effective relation with the executing agency and other relevant entities is critical for project success. A strong relation with the executing agency was very important for passing the bills promoted by the project along with support at the level of the relevant Minister. Communication between UNDP and the executing agency was noted by project participants as playing a crucial role in securing project outcomes in general and in the establishment of the grid code and feed-in tariff system.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE reported the following recommendations:

Complete project outcomes through the current UNDP Tender for Consultancy Services to assist the Energy Efficiency Management Office in Energy Audit Management and develop an Energy Efficiency Building Code compliance scheme. The UNDP tender (under the SIDS-Dock project) promises to achieve a number of outputs not achieved under the UNDP-GEF project. The careful implementation and monitoring of the activities under this tender will be important to the project's success.

Focus on staffing, training and guidance for the Energy Efficiency Management Office (EEMO). The staffing and training of the EEMO are critical for the long-term sustainability of the project's impacts. Staffing of the project and of the EEMO was a key reason for delays in the project implementation and

the project's failure to achieve deliver certain outputs. Specifically, staffing should include: i) long-term, focused training for EEMO staff, ii) recruitment efforts from both within and outside Mauritius (attempts were made to recruit international staff for the EEMO, with a generous allowance, but lack of effective advertisement of the positions led to no results, iii) coordination with other, well developed, national energy management organizations to organize internship abroad for EEMO staff for period of 6-12 months, iv) inclusion of representatives of the Central Electricity Board (CEB) in the EEMO's management committee.

Enhance municipalities' capacities to enforce the Building Control Act. Local authorities have limited ability to enforce existing building codes. In general, violations have small penalties. The result is that local authorities are often discouraged from pursuing violators, knowing that their ability to remove violations is limited. The following steps are recommended to allow municipalities to effectively enforce energy-saving measures: i) Inclusion of an architect with energy efficiency experience in each of the local authorities responsible for issuing building permits, ii) put in place a system of enforceable penalties that are high enough to represent a deterrent.

Invest in the long-term development of energy efficiency professionals. The lack of skilled human capacity remains a significant impediment to the implementation of energy-saving measures in the buildings sector of Mauritius. The skills of energy efficiency professionals should be developed through continuous training and sharing of experiences with other countries where energy-saving measures is effectively implemented.

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 TE reports a clear description of the project's outcomes, impacts and achievements. A useful table comparing achievements and underachievements is included in the TE	**HS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. The rating are well substantiated with clear evidence	**HS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability issues have been included along with some elements of the exit strategy. However a complete exit strategy is not described	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are really comprehensive and supported by a proper description of the context.	**HS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE include total actual costs and co-financing. Costs per activity costs have been included. There are also some inconsistencies regarding the description of co-financing sources in the text and the values included in the relevant table	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE properly assesses the M&E system. However considerations on adaptive management are weak.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**HS**

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