

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 2649		Review date: 02/19/2010		
IA/EA Project ID: TF054713		at endorsement (Million US\$)	0.999	at completion (Million US\$) 0.995
Project Name: Yemen Rural Electrification and Renewable Energy Development Project		GEF financing: IA/EA own:	-	-
Country: Yemen		Government:	0.202	0.250
		Other*:	0.8	0.783
		Total Cofinancing	1.002	1.033
Operational Program: CC 6		Total Project Cost:	2.001	2.028
IA: WB		<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved: Ministry of Electricity (MOE)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		02/21/2005	
	Closing Date	Proposed: 02/28/2007	Actual: 06/30/2008	
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 24	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 40	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 16
Author of TE: Somin Mukherji, WB Project Task Team Leader		TE completion date: not available May 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: Jan 2009	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 20 months

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	-	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	Moderate Risks	-	L
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	-	-	UA
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	U

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

No. This is not an independent TE, but a 4 page Implementation Completion Memorandum prepared by the project task team leader, and which is almost an identical copy of the last PIR.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No mention of any of these issues.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives				
<p>a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?</p> <p>According to the project appraisal document, “the project will directly help in reducing CO₂ emissions through the implementation of the pilot PV and wind projects”.</p> <p>No changes during project implementation.</p>				
<p>b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)</p> <p>According to the project appraisal document, the development objectives are : “(i) To create a comprehensive Rural Electrification Strategy and an enabling environment for exploiting renewable energy; and (ii) To implement appropriate institutional set-up and regulatory framework for rural electrification and renewable energy development in a sustained manner”.</p> <p>There were no changes in the overall objectives, but one of the 7 activities planned, the completion of wind pilot projects, – stopped being pursued and the GoY is instead seeking financing for commercial scale Wind Farm at Al-Mocha (60 MW) to serve as a demonstration project.</p>				
Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
			X (activity)	
<p>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</p>				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
				The 2008 PIR mentions that this activity was dropped following the recommendation from consultants. The TE does not provide an explanation of why this was recommended.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
<p>The Project was relevant to the GEF OP # 6, as it directly contributed to wider use of renewable energy technologies, especially for off-grid electrification in rural areas, and to diversify supply options by creating an enabling environment for grid-connected renewables.</p> <p>Project outcomes were also relevant to the GoY, whose National Rural Electrification Strategy goal is to contribute to economic growth and social development of the rural sector in Yemen.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: S
<p>The project objectives have been substantially met, and implementation of the planned activities has largely been satisfactory. While all studies have been completed, implementation of the necessary institutional framework is still in progress. The Government has already adopted the Rural Electrification Strategy developed under the project, and the adoption of the Renewable Energy Strategy is expected to be accomplished very soon. Implementation of the Institutional Framework has made significant progress. Provisions in the electricity law include the creation of a new Rural Electrification Authority and Rural Electric Service Providers (RESP). In addition, the law also encourages</p>	

renewable energy based power generation, and it has recently been approved by the Cabinet and is awaiting ratification by the parliament.
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: S
According to the TE, the project activities have been efficiently implemented and the cost of implementation was in line with the estimated expenditures. Project implementation involved extensive stakeholders' consultation processes which are crucial for ensuring appropriate ownership of new policy directives. Such an approach was never adopted in the past. Also, time required for data collection was underestimated. In view of the above, the Closing date of the project was extended from February 28, 2007 to June 30, 2008.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

The Project laid the foundation for a strong investment program in rural electrification with preliminary cost estimates for Phase-I for about US\$124 million and wind energy development through a 60 MW Pilot Wind Park Project in the range of US\$125 million. There is also a possibility of developing a geothermal energy project of about 100 MW at Al-Lisi in Dhamar Governorate with support of developers from Iceland, Reykjavik Energy Invest (REI) at an estimated cost of US\$200 million. Thus, the Project (of approx. US\$2.0 million) could ultimately result in investment potential of more than US\$400 million.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources Rating: L
The project has leveraged a firm pipeline of about US\$ 123 million for a Rural Energy Access Project and about US\$ 100 million for the Al-Mocha Wind Farm (60W) Wind Power Project. These initiatives are a follow up of this project because they support RE activities based on the priorities identified by the RE Strategy developed by the project.
b. Socio political Rating: L
The Government commitment to the activities remained high during implementation, and participation of relevant stakeholders in all stages of project implementation had a positive result in country ownership. The Government has already adopted the Rural Electrification Strategy developed under the project, and the adoption of the Renewable Energy Strategy is expected to be accomplished very soon.
c. Institutional framework and governance Rating: L
The project resulted in the creation and adoption of strategies and regulations that promote the use of renewable energy and it also focused on increasing the capacities of personnel working on the Ministry of Electricity and other relevant institutions. The adoption of the RE strategy has led to the proposal of new initiatives to continue the work related to RE that will continue increasing the capacities created by this project.
d. Environmental Rating: N/A
No environmental risks related to this project, as it was geared towards policy development.

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
This project was focused on policy development and resulted in the adoption of the Rural Electrification Strategy developed under the project, and the adoption of the Renewable Energy Strategy is expected to be accomplished very soon.
b. Demonstration
Not relevant to this project
c. Replication
According to the TE, the project activities are highly replicable in developing countries where modern energy can improve livelihoods and contribute to increased income in rural areas by making it possible to increase production and productivity and create jobs, particularly in agriculture and related commercial or agro-processing activities.
d. Scaling up
The TE concludes that this project will serve as a basis for implementation of GoY investment projects related to rural electrification in the future.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p>a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>
<p>The Project was to be co-financed by the GEF, GTZ, CIDA Inc. and the GoY. In particular, CIDA Inc. was expected to finance the preparation of a wind atlas and implementation of business demonstration projects. Subsequently, CIDA Inc. indicated its inability to participate in the project as a co-financier leaving a financing gap of about US\$550,000. In October 2007, financing from USTDA/NRECA/USAID of about US\$580,000 was made available; this helped retain the elements of project design.</p>
<p>b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>
<p>Implementation was delayed because finalization of procurement activities, stakeholder consultation process and countrywide data collection were not completed on schedule. As a result of these factors the project had to extend its closing date.</p>
<p>c. 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.</p>
<p>Country ownership of this project was particularly high, starting with a participatory approach that was introduced by the project, which contributed to the success in developing and adopting the Rural Electrification Strategy, among other achievements.</p>

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

<p>a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): S</p>
<p>The ProjDoc mentions that the project manager will be in charge of M&E activities. It specifies that an Advisory Committee should be set up in order to ensure that the Project meets its stated objectives, monitor progress, review/approve work plans and reports, and provide policy directives and strategic guidance. The Logframe included in the document identifies relevant and measurable indicators for all activities.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): UA</p>
<p>The TE does not include any assessment of the implementation of the M&E system.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?</p>
<p>No budget for M&E activities is specified in the ProjDoc.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?</p>
<p>Unable to assess.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</p>
<p>Unable to assess.</p>
<p>b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.</p>
<p>Unable to assess.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</p>
<p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</p>
<p>The WB played an important role in the success of this project. The TE mentions that a significant amount of co-financing was arranged by the task team from the WB, including US\$579,616 from USTDA/NRECA/USAID for</p>

funding the institutional framework for implementing the rural electrification investment program and US\$200,177 from GTZ for funding the solar market assessment. As a result of carrying out these studies, a significant amount of capital investments are expected to follow.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The TE rates the EA performance as satisfactory as it successfully completed all activities and also increased the project level of co-financing. As it contains no information to indicate otherwise, the evaluator agrees with the TE rating.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

1. Stakeholder Consultations during Project Preparation and Implementation

Involving relevant stakeholders during all stages of the project proved to be an essential factor in the success of the project. A consultative process with various stakeholders over the duration of the Project helped create awareness and build capacity on renewable energy technologies. It also helped with market assessments of these technologies. The stakeholder process also facilitated the creation of a comprehensive strategy that was quickly adopted by the GoY.

2. Integration of Off-Grid Renewable Energy Development Strategy into the National Rural Electrification Strategy

For areas that are clearly beyond the reach of grid connected service, off-grid service through photovoltaic and other renewable energy technologies were considered. Zones that should not be electrified through connection to the grid in the next ten years or so were demarcated. These areas were then addressed through a Renewable Energy Action Plan. Such an approach could be useful in similar situations elsewhere.

3. Testing multiple business models utilizing existing institutional networks for the delivery of Solar Home Systems:

A positive lesson learned is the development and pilot testing of several delivery models for solar-based systems by utilizing existing institutional networks. Well functioning networks that are established and known to the population are able to disseminate more effectively and efficiently with lower overhead costs.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

No recommendations included.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The assessment contained in the TE is very brief and contains almost the same information as the last PIR.</p>	MU
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The TE has some serious information gaps and ratings are not always supported by complete</p>	U

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

evidence.	
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The assessment of project sustainability is lacking, as it concludes that “there is moderate risk that project outcomes will be sustained in the long run as external factors could change and influence the interest of development partners and financing institutions in energy efficiency” but provides little information to support this.</p> <p>On the other hand, information related to project sustainability is included in other sections of the TE.</p>	MU
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>The section of lessons included in the TE is mostly a list of project achievements.</p>	U
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>The TE does include total project costs, but does not include data on project costs per activity.</p>	MU
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?</p> <p>The TE does not include information related to M&E.</p>	HU

<p>7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.</p>
--