Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	27
GEF Agency project ID	1516
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-2
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP
Project name	The Creation and Strengthening of the Capacity for Sustainable Renewable Energy Development in Central America (FOCER)
Country/Countries	Belize, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama
Region	LAC
Focal area	Climate Change
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP-6: Promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs
Executing agencies involved	Biomass Users Network - Central America Office (BUN-CA)
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Lead executing agency
Private sector involvement	Through consultations
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	10/27/1999
Effectiveness date / project start	04/14/2000
Expected date of project completion (at start)	07/30/2002
Actual date of project completion	07/30/2002

Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	0.025
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.725	0.725
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.796	

	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.750	0.750
Total Co-financing		0.796	0.271
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.546	1.021

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	08/02/2002
TE submission date	08/02/2002
Author of TE	Humberto Rodríguez
TER completion date	01/07/2014
TER prepared by	Sean Nelson
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Joshua Schneck

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/RS	S
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	U/A
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	S
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 overall GEO, according to the Project Document (PD), is to lower greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the project countries compared to the without-project scenario. This will be accomplished by replacing firewood with renewable energy in rural areas of all of the project countries. Firewood is the primary energy source for local rural populations. The project countries as of the PD's writing emitted 0.36 million tonnes of CO2 per year with energy demand growing at 7-10 percent per year. The PD estimates that implementing all of the proposed pilot projects would reduce 90,000 tons of CO2 in 20 years.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD, the main Development Objective (DO) is to expand rural electrification throughout Central America. This is to be done sustainably by promoting small-scale renewable energy. At the time of the PD's writing, electrification rates were around 50 percent, and PD states that there was large potential for renewable energy to expand electrification at the time. Hurricane Mitch had also recently exacerbated this problem. (It should be noted the region had a high level of variability on this metric, ranging from 91 percent electrification in Costa Rica to 36 percent in Guatemala.) This project will also help lay the foundation for a dialogue to increase the importance of renewable energy in Central American energy policies going forward.

The PD defines the following components by which project objectives will be achieved:

1) Eight demonstration projects whose experiences can be replicated

2) Creating innovative new financing mechanisms for project investment

3) Submission of 13 renewable energy project business plans to potential financiers

4) A replicable training program

5) Strengthening regional organizations to promote new partnerships

6) Awareness campaigns to convince government officials to include renewable energy in national development plans

7) Aid local stakeholders to carry out further renewable energy projects

8) Acquiring investment capital for local renewable energy

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

The TE does not mention any changes to the GEOs or the DOs.

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**

According to the PD, the project is relevant to the GEF under OP-6: Promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs. For participating countries, relevance is seen in that soon after the regional governments signed the UNFCCC, they entered into a regional dialogue to expand renewable energy, reduce firewood use and abate GHG emissions while also expanding electricity access in rural areas. The end of wars and increased deregulation (especially in electricity) were leading to economic growth and population growth, which was also increasing energy and electricity demand. Nations were looking for ways to address this demand without using firewood.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for effectiveness. This TER rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory, based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

Summary: The project successfully undertook 8 demonstration projects and a regional training program to increase local capacity. In addition, the project created 19 portfolios that were presented to potential financiers. The project also engaged local government officials to improve regional understanding and interest in promoting renewable energy. The main project shortcomings were 1) pilot projects were only held in 4 of the 7 countries instead of all 7 as originally planned and 2) the project had only secured US$3.15 million in financing to expand the project's approach in the region, which was insufficient to finance all of the projects presented to potential financiers.

According to the TE, "the implementation of the feasible projects, would [*sic*] result in the mitigation of 20,000 tons of CO2 per year, that would represent 200,000 in 10 years" (TE, p. 18) though the TE does not directly address which potential projects count as "feasible projects" for these purposes and how these numbers were derived.

Progress is detailed further along each of the project components defined in the PD:

1) Eight demonstration projects whose experiences can be replicated **Moderately Satisfactory**

The project met its goal of 8 demonstration projects. These were the SEDES, Tuva, CoopeUnioro, Ademipp, Ancon, Adter-BL, Funproteca and Bilwaskarma projects. These projects increased locally installed capacity by 9.7 kW, which benefited 300 families. However, these projects were only carried out in about half of the project countries: Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras. This was less than the project's stated goal of carrying out projects in 7 project countries. As a result, it is not clear that these projects could be replicated in other project countries that operate under slightly different circumstances.

2) Creating innovative new financing mechanisms for project investment **Satisfactory**

The project entered into a partnership with the Financing of Renewable Energy Entrepreneurs in Central America (FENERCA) regional program. FENERCA is a joint E&Co/BUN-CA project operating in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama that receives USAID funding. It was helping create the 9 business plans mentioned in Outcome 3 below, in addition to carrying out joint workshops on financial engineering. BCIE, Bank Atlantis had pledged US$750,000 for a project in Honduras. In total, the project secured an additional US$3.15 million in co-financing to expand the project.

3) Submission of 13 renewable energy project business plans to potential financiers **Moderately Satisfactory**

The project created 5 prefeasibility studies, 5 feasibility studies and 9 business plans for presentation. If completed, these projects would require an additional US$20 million in investment and increase local generative capacity by 20 MW. The particular financiers whom the project engaged are covered in Component 8.

The prefeasibility studies were for the CoopeSantos, PLC, La Castalia, El Rodeo and Sarteneja projects. The feasibility studies were for the Yojoa, Cececapa, Ucraprobex, MARN/CNC, Three Valleys projects. The business plans were for the Ademipp, Atder, Ancon, Yojoa, FSolar, Tres Valles, Cececapa, El Rodeo and La Castalia projects. Studies/business plans were not created for the El Riachuelo, Trojes, La Magdalena and La Cabaña projects because these were not seen as viable.

4) A replicable training program **Satisfactory**

The project provided more than 10,000 training person-hours through 6 national seminars, 8 demonstrative project technical workshops that included sharing experiences across the region and 10 project financing workshops.

With this said, the TE does not assess if this is a replicable training program nor does it address the quality of instruction.

5) Strengthening regional organizations to promote new partnerships **Satisfactory**

This component's activities were largely web-based. For instance, the project distributed both online and through print the bimonthly bulletin "Enfoque Renovable." Eleven issues were created in total. Similarly, the project created and distributed (both physically and online) posters, brochures and portfolios to inform local stakeholders on renewable energy issues. In addition, the project added roughly 700 contacts to the project database. These included regional and global contacts. The project also created a project website. The project also worked in tandem with 8 other UNDP/GEF OP-6 projects in renewable energy in the region. With this said, the TE provides little evidence on the effectiveness of these initiatives.

6) Awareness campaigns to convince government officials to include renewable energy in national development plans **Satisfactory**

The project engaged energy ministers across the region. For instance, the project planned and held a Central American Meeting of Directors of Energy where energy ministers discussed the barriers renewable energy faces in their region and how to overcome them. Similarly, the project successfully encouraged energy ministers (or their representatives) to attend the Regional Fair of Renewable Energy in Honduras. The project also wrote papers analyzing challenges renewable energy faces in 5 of the project countries. GEF and project contacts and relationships with stakeholders in relevant ministries were strengthened in 7 of the project countries.

The project also engaged local stakeholders on a national level. For instance, the project also provided support to UNDP and Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (SERNA) during discussions on Honduras's Renewable Energy Law. In Guatemala, the project provided support to the Law of Incentives to the Renewable Energy, though how this was done is not explicitly stated.

7) Aid local stakeholders to carry out further renewable energy projects **Satisfactory**

The project created 28 publications for distribution among local stakeholders. These included:

- Seven renewable energy development guides
- Five technical guides on hydroelectricity, biomass, solar (photovoltaic), thermal solar and wind energy
- One Manual of Managerial Models for Isolated Energy Services in Central America
- Six transcripts of proceedings of national seminars
- One policy document on the Promotion of Renewable Energy in Central America addressing issues in 5 project countries
- Eight demonstration project case studies

8) Acquiring investment capital for local renewable energy **Moderately Satisfactory**

The project presented portfolios to multiple potential financiers, including:

- Nine projects to E+Co with a potential investment of US$19 million
- Twenty projects to Banco Centroamericano de Integración Económica (BCIE) with a potential investment of US$25 million
- Four projects to the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) with a potential investment of US$14 million
- Eight projects to the Solar Development Group with a potential investment of US$2.2 million
- Three projects to the CASEIF Corporation with a potential investment of US$2 million
- Twenty projects to the Program of Energy and Climatic Change - PECC (UNDP Costa Rica) with a potential investment of US$25 million

As of the TE's writing, the project had secured US$3.15 million in financing for promoting renewable energy locally through these projects. The PD did not include a target level of secured co-financing by project's end. This component is rated as moderately satisfactory since the level of co-financing secured is adequate to move forward as of the TE's writing, but far under the amount needed to finance all of the potential projects presented to potential financiers.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for Efficiency. This TER rates effectiveness as Satisfactory, based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

Summary: The project appears to have been well-managed with minimal delays and no noticeable financial problems or irregularities.

Time Management: Some project activities started before project operations formally began in March 2000. Some of the business plans were delayed because of changes to technical specifications of the plan, which required those plans to be updated. These revised plans were supposed to be finished by the time of the TE's submission, but it was unclear if this was done. The TE follows this point by stating that "another important point was that arose difficulties were promptly discussed and solved in a special session of the Technical Committee," but it is not clear what happened here.

Management Issues: The TE mentions no management issues during project execution.

Financial Management: Financial management of the project appears sound. Project spending from GEF sources fit exactly within the US$7,250,000 GEF provided for this project.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for Sustainability. This TER rates effectiveness as Moderately Likely, based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

Summary: The project had secured a high level of sociopolitical and institutional support in the region through stakeholder engagement. It had also secured sufficient additional co-financing to implement further project activities, but this was still far under the total amount to completely expand the program.

The project's sustainability rating is assessed along the following 4 risk factors.

Environmental: **Unable to Assess**

The TE does not mention any environmental risks to project sustainability.

Institutional: **Moderately Likely**

The project enjoyed ongoing support from key stakeholder groups, such as the Central American Commission for Environment and Development (CCED) and FENERCA. The program implemented an extensive training program, but it was unclear if this was replicable.

Sociopolitical: **Likely**

According to the TE, renewable energy was rapidly becoming a priority for most regional governments at the time. The project fostered close relationships with regional energy ministers and supported legal changes in Honduras and Guatemala. The high degree of energy ministerial participation at the Central American Meeting of Directors of Energy and the Regional Fair of Renewable Energy also points to a high level of sociopolitical stakeholder interest in renewable energy.

Financial: **Moderately Likely**

The project had already succeeded in securing US$3.15 million in additional co-financing to expand project activities. With this said, this was still far under the amount that would need to be secured to finance every additional project. For instance, the 20 projects presented to BCIE would require an additional US$25 million in investment.

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 project received slightly over US$271,000 in co-financing for the demonstration projects and to put together the business plans. However, the TE does not establish exactly where this co-financing came from nor its effects on project outcomes. Some individual programs that this project sponsored also received additional co-financing, but the TE fails to address all of these sources and does not give an overall figure of co-financing. As a result, the total amount of co-financing is unclear. The TE is too vague on this topic to assess the affect of the level of co-financing on project results.

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?

Some of the business plans were delayed because of changes to technical specifications of the plan, which required those plans to be updated. These revised plans were supposed to be finished by the time of the TE's submission, but it was unclear if this was done.

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:

There appears to have been a high degree of country ownership overall due to the high level of engagement between public officials and the project team. The high degree of attendance at the Central American Meeting of Directors of Energy and the Regional Fair of Renewable Energy is evidence of this. The fact that Honduras and Guatemala were also considering legislation at the time to promote renewable energy also shows a high degree of country ownership for these 2 countries. However, the demonstration projects only took place in Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras. Choosing projects only in these countries limited the opportunity for other project countries to demonstrate country ownership of the overall 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: **Satisfactory**

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Design. This TER rates M&E Design quality as Satisfactory, based on the design of the M&E system detailed in the PD.

The M&E design in the PD required that the UNDP Costa Rica office monitor the project on a regular basis with GEF support. A Mid-Term Review (MTR) was required at the end of the first year. In addition, Tri-Partite Reviews (TPR) would also be submitted, though the PD is unclear of the schedule for submission. According to the PD, "during the TPRs, the project performance will be measured against established work plans, expenditures will be reviewed and overall technical performance assessed" (PD, p. 15). The work plan contained a clear schedule that laid out when each project task was to be started and completed. The indicators are SMART when applicable. The PD includes a dedicated M&E budget of US$10,000.

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

The TE praises the quality of monitoring, but provides few details beyond noting when TPRs were submitted. The TE neither assesses the quality of the TPRs nor even mentions the MTR at all. There is no information regarding adaptive management. As a result, the TE does not provide sufficient information to assess the quality of the M&E process.

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: **Satisfactory**

The TE does not provide a rating for Quality of Implementation. This TER rates implementation as Satisfactory, based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

The project design in the PD was rather thorough for a project of this size. The PD give sufficient details to outline how the project countries as a whole faced overarching regional challenges when it came to energy and promoting renewable energy, but still addressed the diversity within project countries. The schedule for starting and completing different project initiatives was logical and easy to understand. The M&E process was reasonably well-designed. Financing was well-budgeted and well-allocated according to project needs. UNDP and BUN-CA worked closely together to choose the final 8 demonstration projects from an initial list of 120 proposals.

With this said, the TE does not provide sufficient information on the quality of the M&E process. The rating above reflects the high quality of work performed for all other relevant project activities.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for Quality of Execution. This TER rates execution as Satisfactory, based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

According to the TE, BUN-CA put a great deal of emphasis on transparency in its operations in each country to ensure that its activities would be viewed as legitimate, which appears to have aided achieving project results. Since BUN-CA has secured some additional co-financing and was in the process of potentially securing even more, the project would likely be able to be expanded. BUN-CA carried out sufficient work on all project activities to ensure project success. The TE notes no financial management or personnel management problems. The project passed all of its financial audits satisfactorily.

The TE however does not provide sufficient information to assess if BUN-CA practiced adaptive management as a result of the M&E process. The rating above reflects the high quality of work performed for all other relevant project activities.

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.

According to the TE, when assessing the amount of GHG mitigated due to the demonstration projects, "for generation projects connected to the grid, the figure tCO2/MWh ranks between 0.111 and 0.395, and is different for each country. For stand-alone projects, the common index is 0.889 tCO2/MWh for all countries, except Nicaragua: 0.677" (TE, p. 23). However, the TE does say which demonstration projects were and were not connected to the grid. As a result, the TE does not provide sufficient information to assess the total amount of GHG emissions mitigated due to the demonstration projects.

In addition, the TE claims "the implementation of the feasible projects, would [*sic*] result in the mitigation of 20,000 tons of CO2 per year, that would represent 200,000 in 10 years" (TE, p. 18). It should be noted that these projects had not yet been executed.

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 demonstration projects increased local generative capacity by 9.7 kW and provided electricity services to 300 families (TE, p. 1).

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's training program provided 10,000 training person-hours through 6 national seminars, 8 technical workshops based on the demonstration projects and 10 workshops on project financing. Distribution of the project's 11 editions of its "Enfoque Renovable" bulletin, in addition to posters, brochures and portfolios helped to increase awareness and understanding of renewable energy issues among local stakeholders. The project also produced analyses of barriers to renewable energy implementation in 5 of the project countries to help inform local public officials concerned with renewable energy. The project also produced renewable energy development guides for each country, 5 technical manuals on individual renewable energy sources, case studies on each of the demonstration projects, a Manual of Managerial Models for Isolated Energy Services in Central America, a policy document regarding the Promotion of Renewable Energy in Central America and 6 transcripts of National Seminars (TE, pp. 17-18).

b) Governance

A number of regional energy ministers or their representatives attended Central American Meeting of Directors of Energy and the Regional Fair of Renewable Energy. Honduras and Guatemala were also considering legislation at the time to promote renewable energy (TE, p. 17).

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 TE does not note any unintended impacts due to 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 project had secured US$3.15 million to finance expanding the project (TE, p. 17). Some of these projects were nearly ready to start when the TE was written. For instance, the Tres Valles co-generation project was almost ready to start accepting equipment procurement bids (TE, p. 23).

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.

- Projects need to be well-designed, which requires a good deal of preparation and a thorough understanding of the current situation. Making sure local experts are engaged and part of the project is required for a project to be successful.
- A well-designed project takes into account a realistic assessment of the partners' management capacities, a realistic schedule and a realistic understanding of what can be accomplished given resources restraints.
- A quality M&E process is necessary to adapt to changes in the field in a timely fashion and to ensure a project remains on track.
- Implementing agencies and local country governments need to maintain a strong and positive working relationship to ensure project success.
- Networking between executing agencies and similar organizations can produce positive spillover effects.

- Regional projects require that project planners address commonalities that go beyond regional cultural similarities.
- Good management that practices good communications skills can help design quality projects. This high level of communication helped to avoid a common problem with small renewable energy projects. According to the TE, “very often when engineers develop small [renewable energy] projects they tend to underestimate the management and overemphasize the engineering work” (TE, p. 27).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The project has many possible avenues open to it. The TE recommends considering some of these possibilities moving forward:

- Follow a decentralized rural electrification plan.
- Research how to create a local market for renewable energy projects.
- Help local governments to improve national legislation and regulations in a way that creates policy coherence across the region.
- Barriers to renewable energy projects of all sizes need to be removed.
- Use the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) as a potential source of project funding.

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?	The TE addresses each project component and its achievements. However, the language and structure used often make understanding what each component actually accomplished a bit difficult to discern.	**MU**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Grammar issues often made understanding the TE difficult, which in turn made it difficult to assess what actually happened during the project at times. The project contains section headers that do not fully reflect the paragraphs under the header. Much of the content is dedicated to ensuring the reader that the TE author did the required activities instead of focusing on explaining what happened during project execution.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project provides a somewhat fair assessment of institutional and sociopolitical sustainability, though it is unclear what legal changes actually occurred in the region during the project. However, it does not directly address if the project could realistically secure co-financing to sufficiently expand the project.	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE's lessons learned section references the importance of quality M&E and adaptive management, but the TE's body contains insufficient information to conclude that this recommendation was evidence-based.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes a thorough budget with line items showing how GEF funding was spent during the project. However, information on co-financing in the TE is often convoluted. The TE does not directly state who provided additional co-financing.	**MU**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE provides insufficient information on the quality of M&E implementation. It does not address the quality of the M&E design. The TE fails to mention the MTR whatsoever.	**U**
Overall TE Rating		**MU**

Overall TE rating: (0.3 * (3+3)) + (0.1 * (3+4+3+1)) = 1.8 + 1.1 = 2.9 = Moderately Unsatisfactory

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