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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2775	
GEF Agency project ID		3513	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Development and Implementation of a Standards and Labeling (S&L) Program in Kenya with Replication in East Africa	
Country/Countries		Kenya	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-5; SP-1	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Industrialization and Enterprise Development	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not given	
Private sector involvement		Kenya Association of Manufacturers; Kenya Bureau of Standards	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 9, 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 2009[1]	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.35	.35
	Co-financing	.05	.05
GEF Project Grant		2	1.29
Co-financing	IA own	.25	.06
	Government	8.21	.21
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.3[2]	
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.35	1.64
Total Co-financing		8.81	.32
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.16	1.96
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 23, 2015	
Author of TE		Not given	
TER completion date		2/16/2016	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	

[1] The Project Document was signed by UNDP in May 2009, however implementation did not actually begin until March 2011.
[2] The Project Document indicates that the Kenya Association of Manufacturers would provide additional co-financing, as well as other public and private sources (pg. 37).

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	S	MS	--	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	UA
M&E Design		MU	--	MU
M&E Implementation		MU	--	U
Quality of Implementation		MS	--	MU
Quality of Execution		MS	--	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not directly state the Global Environmental Objectives, however the goal of the project was to “reduce Kenya’s energy related CO_2 emissions by improving the energy efficiency of selected appliances and equipment in the residential, commercial and industrial sectors” (PD pg. 44).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective was to “remove the barriers that are currently hampering the rapid and widespread uptake of energy efficient motors in the industrial sector; refrigerators in the residential; display refrigerators in the commercial sector; air- conditioners in the commercial sector; and lighting in the residential, commercial and industrial sectors” (PD pg. 44).

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

There were no changes to the Global Environmental or Development Objectives during implementation. A review of the Project Implementation Reviews (PIRS) indicates that some outputs were dropped from implementation (i.e. Output 2.1: the integration of energy performance compliance checking in the pre-export inspection process, and Output 2.3: the establishment of trade inspections for distributer and retailer compliance), however the reasons for these changes were not documented.

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 provides a rating of "relevant" for this component of project outcomes, which this TER that uses a different scale revises to **Satisfactory**. The project outcomes are consistent with GEF-3 Operational Program 5, *Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation*. Specifically, the project focused on the introduction of appliance standards and labeling, which contributes to Strategic Priority 1, *Transformation of Markets for High-Volume Products and Processes* (PD pg. 15). The project outcomes are also consistent with Kenya's priorities regarding climate change and energy conservation, including its obligations as a signatory to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. At the time of the project design Kenya was also seeking to scale up access to modern energy services. The project also sought to replicate project results in other East African Community (EAC) countries. The Project Document notes that Tanzania, Burundi, Uganda and Rwanda had also established climate change institutions and had initiated, to different extents, programs on energy conservation (pg. 26).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER revises to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. Actual project outcomes were significantly lower than expected, and the development objective was not achieved. The main achievement of the project was the development of minimum energy performance standards and associated regulations, although these were not adopted until after the project ended. Overall, the project had significant shortcomings, as many of the other outcomes were dependent on the adoption of the minimum energy performance standards. It should be noted however, that the outcome regarding policy support (Outcome 5) was very poorly formulated at the design stage, and the outcome regarding replication (Outcome 6) was overly ambitious given the project's budget and timeframe.

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

- **Outcome 1: Selection and adoption of international test procedures, minimum energy performance standards and label classifications:**
  Under this outcome, it was expected that international test procedures, international label classifications, and energy performance and quality standards would be selected and adopted in Kenya. By project end, minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) had been developed, including the international test procedures and associated regulations. Although the MEPS and regulations were approved by the Ministry of Energy and Petroleum, adoption did not take place within the project timeline. The TE also notes that Kenya did not have the internal capacity or relationships with international labs to test products. Labels were designed through consultation with distributer and consumers, however they were not adopted by the end of the project. Similarly, energy performance and quality standards were selected but not adopted (TE pgs. 31-33).

- **Outcome 2: Development and implementation of a verification and enforcement system:**
  Under this outcome, it was expected that a legal enforcement system would be established and that Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) staff involved in inspections would be trained in energy efficiency regulations and compliance.[3] By project end, very little progress had been achieved under this outcome. The proposed MEPS regulations were ambiguous in respect to enforcement, and the regulations had not been adopted by the end of the project. The TE also notes that only 10 KRA staff were trained, well below the target of 30% (or 420 staff) (TE pgs. 33-35).[4]

- **Outcome 3: Awareness raising campaign for standards and labels, targeting distributers, retailers and end-users:**
  Under this outcome, it was expected that (1) importers, distributers, and retailers would be informed about energy efficiency in Kenya, (2) distributers and retailers would be trained in energy efficiency benefits, and (3) energy efficiency awareness would increase in other East African Community (EAC) countries. By project end, promotional materials on energy efficiency were developed, including television and radio advertisements and websites. The TE notes that the campaigns were not differentiated based on target groups (i.e. importers, distributers or retailers), and there is no evidence provided that indicates an increase in awareness as a result of the campaigns (pg. 24). The 2014 PIR notes that over 200 Kenyan distributers and retailers were trained on the new MEPS. Additionally, the 2014 PIR notes that a regional workshop was held on standards and labeling (pg. 9). There is also no evidence that indicates an increase in awareness in EAC countries.

[3] The Project Document outlines two additional results: (1) the integration of energy performance compliance checking in the pre-export inspection process, and (2) the establishment of trade inspections for distributer and retailer compliance. These two results appear to have been dropped from the project design as they were not reported on in any of the PIRs. However, the TE does note that neither of these results were achieved by the end of the project.
[4] The 2014 PIR indicates that 60 KRA staff were trained, as opposed to the 10 indicated in the TE. It is unclear why there is a discrepancy between these figures, however in either case, the results were well below the target.

- **Outcome 4: Development of voluntary agreements for efficient commercial display refrigerators and hotel air conditioners:**
  Under this outcome, it was expected that appropriate target levels for the energy performance of commercial display refrigerators and hotel air conditioners would be analyzed and voluntary agreements would be developed. By project end, a study was carried out to determine consumption levels and a voluntary agreement was drafted (i.e. the Equipment Energy Efficiency Accords) (TE pg. 27). Market actors were willing to sign the voluntary agreement, however the Energy Regulatory Commission, representing the government, rejected the agreement and it was not adopted (TE pg. 38).

- **Outcome 5: Policy support and policy framework:**
  The TE notes that the purpose of this outcome is unclear in the Program Document, and this TER concurs. It appears that it was expected that the policies and frameworks for the widespread uptake of energy efficient appliances would be refined. The only indicator for this result was that the "Centre for Energy Efficiency and Conservation at KAM was successfully operating and continued to receive government support." However, the Centre was already operating prior to the start of the project. The TE does note that energy efficiency was incorporated into national policies, however this occurred independently of the project. It also appears that it was expected that there would be an uptake in energy efficiency activities in other EAC countries, but there is no evidence that this occurred (TE pgs. 39-40).

- **Outcome 6: Learning and replication:**
  Under this outcome, it was expected that (1) a program for replicating activities in other EAC countries would be designed, (2) test procedures, standards, and labeling schemes would be introduced in other EAC countries, (3) market transformation activities would be monitored and evaluated in other EAC countries, and (4) support for replication activities would be provided. By project end, very little progress had been achieved under this outcome, as the results were largely dependent on achievements under the Kenya component. A regional workshop was held and a discussion was initiated on the potential for exchanging experiences and harmonizing standards (TE pg. 41).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Unsatisfactory**

The TER provides a rating of **Unsatisfactory** for project efficiency, and this TER concurs. The project was approved by the GEF in December 2008, however the project did not begin activities until March 2011. In May 2010, the GEF issued the following statement: "The project has experienced worrying delays; to date, the project has not achieved much within the almost two and half years that it has been in existence. This situation is of great concern… this project faces imminent closure by GEF if drastic measures are not taken to fast-track activities," (TE pg. x). The 2011 PIR notes that the delays at project start-up were due to political turmoil within the Kenyan government following the 2007 elections. Government ministries were reshuffled, and leadership of the executing agency, the Ministry of Industrialization and Enterprise Development, changed three times (UNDP CO, line 14). Additionally, the TE notes that the project's timeline was mismanaged. The achievement of the majority of project outcomes was dependent on the adoption of the minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) and associated regulations. The MEPS took two years to finalize, and the development of the regulations did not begin until August 2013 (TE pg. 26). Although the project was issued a no-cost extension until December 2014, this was not enough time to achieve results under the enforcement, awareness-raising, and replication components. It should also be noted that the project did not efficiently utilize resources. By project end, only 65% of GEF funds had been spent. Overall, the project experienced significant shortcomings in regard to project efficiency, and a rating of Unsatisfactory is therefore justified.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for project sustainability. However, the TE and project documents do not provide enough information to adequately assess sustainability. The TE does note that the adoption of the minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) regulations should provide the framework for the registration of appliances and compliance, and therefore move the long-term objective of the project forward (pg. 57).

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?

Actual co-financing was significantly lower than expected, totaling only $0.27 million (compared to the anticipated $8.76 million). The TE does not provide a reason for the shortfall in co-financing, however the Midterm Evaluation speculated that it might have been due to the severe drought Kenya experienced in 2010. The Kenyan Government established a $121 million Drought Relief Fund that diverted non-essential funds from other projects (Midterm Evaluation pg. 31). As a result of the lack of co-financing from both UNDP and the Kenyan Government, 88.6% of total GEF expenditures up to the year 2012 went toward project management; well over the 10% GEF threshold (Midterm Evaluation pg. 39). It is therefore very likely that the lack of co-financing affected the achievement of project outcomes and sustainability.

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?

As mentioned in the efficiency section, the project experienced significant delays at project start-up. The project was approved by the GEF in December 2008, however the project did not begin activities until March 2011, putting the project at risk of cancellation by the GEF. The 2011 PIR notes that the delays at project start-up were due to political turmoil in the Kenyan government following the 2007 elections which resulted in the reshuffling of government ministries, including the executing agency (UNDP CO, line 14). These delays prevented the project from achieving its outcomes and objectives, largely because the adoption process was delayed for the minimum energy performance standards (MEPS), around which the project was designed. The project was ultimately extended from December 2013 to December 2014.

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:

The TE does not directly assess country ownership over the project. The Ministry of Industrialization and Enterprise Development executed the project, however it does not appear to have been a priority for the government, as evidenced by the lack of co-financing. The TE also notes that most of the stakeholders in the project were unaware of the specific project goals. The stakeholders, including those in the Project Steering Committee, were also unaware of the under performance of the project (pgs. ix-x). As with the lack of co-financing, it is highly likely that the lack of country ownership affected the achievement of project outcomes and sustainability.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for M&E design at entry, and this TER concurs. The results framework outlined in the Project Document had several flaws. As the TE notes, the results framework did not articulate clearly the causal links for achieving the project objectives. The interdependencies between the outcomes, outputs, and activities were not clearly articulated (TE pgs.

25-26). For example, the achievement of all project results was dependent on the development and adoption of the minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) and associated regulations, however this is not clearly articulated in the results framework. In addition, the indicators provided in the results framework were not appropriate. Nearly all of the outcomes and outputs shared the same baseline indicator, “No standard and label programme in existence at present.” Final targets were differentiated by outcome and output, however the targets had no clear relationship to the baseline indicators, making it very difficult to track project performance (TE pg. 46).

The Project Document does include a general M&E plan, which outlines M&E activities (baseline report, day-to-day monitoring, annual reviews, and midterm and final evaluations) and associate responsible parties, timeframe, and budget. Overall, the Project Document provides a dedicated budget of $.09 million, or 4.5% of the total GEF budget (PD pg. 33).

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Unsatisfactory**. The TE notes that monitoring of project performance did occur, however this TER finds very little evidence that an M&E system was operational over the life of the project. A review of the Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) indicates that there was no effort to develop appropriate indicators with legitimate baseline values and targets. The PIRs largely report on the status of project activities, rather than progress toward achieving outcomes and objectives. It is therefore unsurprising that the reports failed to raise alarms that the project was not on target to achieve its outcomes (TE pg. 46). The Midterm Evaluation (MTE) conducted in late 2012 did indicate that the project was behind schedule, however it also found the project to be “relatively well-positioned for the remaining implementation period,” which was an inaccurate assessment. Overall, M&E implementation was weak, and therefore a rating of Unsatisfactory is justified.

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 Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation. The TE provides a separate rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for UNDP's role in supporting the project (pg. 52). As mentioned above, the project design did not clearly articulate the steps needed to achieve the project's outcomes. In particular, there was a lack of clarity on how project activities would be replicated in other East African Community (EAC) countries. As the TE notes, activities in other EAC countries would have had to proceed in parallel to the activities in Kenya in order for results to be achieved by the project's completion date, which was unrealistic (TE pg. 26). Additionally, the results framework outlined at the design stage was ineffectual as a monitoring and evaluation tool.

The TE does note that UNDP made moderate efforts to address the delays and inefficiencies experienced by the project. Ultimately, UNDP took over project procurement and addressed other operational challenges facing the project. The UNDP Regional Technical Advisor also raised concerns over project execution and issued critical ratings in the Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs). At one point, UNDP sent a letter to the Government of Kenya indicating its intention to close the project if a number of issues were not addressed. However, the TE notes that no decisive action was taken, and the project proceeded inefficiently (TE pgs. 51-52). Overall, shortcomings with regard to supervision and assistance, compounded by a weak project design, justify a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for quality of project implementation.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project execution, which this TER revises to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The original executing agency for the project was the Ministry of Industry and Trade, which split into the Ministry of Industry and Ministry of Trade in 2008/2009. In 2013, the Project Management Unit (PMU) was moved again to the newly created Ministry of Industrialization and Enterprise Development (TE pg. 16). Ultimately, the project cycled through four different Permanent Secretaries under the relevant ministries. This, combined with the frequent turnover of project managers and coordinators, contributed to the delays and inefficiencies experienced by the project (TE pg. 17). The TE does note that the PMU expended considerable effort to achieve project outcomes, however it did not adequately track its performance or adapt its strategy when it became clear that the adoption of the minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) would take considerable time. Additionally, the PMU did not utilize all of the financial resources available to it, spending only 65% of GEF funds by the end of the project (TE pg. 57). It should also be noted that the Project Steering Committee (PSC) did not provide adequate oversight over implementation, and PSC members were largely unaware of the project's under performance (TE pg. x).

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 TE does not cite any environmental changes that occurred by project end. The project was designed to reduce Kenya's energy related CO_2 emissions, however this was not achieved by project end.

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 TE does not cite any socioeconomic changes that occurred by the end of the project.

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 TE does not provide any concrete evidence of capacity or awareness changes that occurred by the end of the project. The TE does note that at least 10 Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) staff were trained in energy efficiency regulations and compliance (see footnote 4) (TE pg. 33). Additionally, the 2014 PIR notes that over 200 distributers and retailers were trained in Kenya on the new MEPS (pg. 9). The project also implemented aspects of an awareness raising campaign, however the results from these initiatives were unclear (TE pg. ix).

b) Governance

By project end, minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) and associated regulations had been developed. However these measures were not adopted by the Ministry of Energy and Petroleum until July 2015, after the project ended (TE pg. iv).

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 cite any unintended impacts that occurred by the end 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 does note cite any GEF initiatives that had mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by stakeholders by project end.

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 TE states the following lessons learned (pg. 58):

- Effective and detailed project design is imperative to the success of the project. The S&L (Standards & Labeling) project lacked a clear roadmap of sequential and causal activities.

- Effectiveness of M&E design and implementation is crucial to maintaining the project on-track, identifying deviations, and taking corrective actions

- The Project Steering Committee must “steer” the project to effective outcomes, and must in-turn be steered by the PMU and IA to having clear vision of the immediate and ultimate outcomes, outputs, and objectives of the project.

- Frequent turnover of PSC members is highly detrimental to project success, and while it is largely beyond the control of the project commitment of the various stakeholders to appoint personnel with institutional longevity to the project is an indicator of chances for success and should be sought early in the process.

- Although projects may be under Nationally Implemented/Executed modalities, UNDP must exert considerable oversight and monitoring in order to help achieve project goals. This is perhaps one of greatest values that UNDP can offer developing countries - providing the impetus to government agencies to act in a coordinated manner towards agreed upon outcomes.

- The process of replication in other countries is difficult and will take almost as much time and effort as the initial task as the main hurdle is getting individuals and organizations to adopt new behavior. As such, it’s unrealistic to expect that a project will be developed in a country and replicated in several others within the project timeframe.

- A timeline for project implementation showing the sequence and schedule for activities should be a core part of every project design. Updates on the timeline and percentages of completion of the various tasks should be an element of every major progress report.

- The financial reporting of a project should be coherent. The obstacles leading to inconsistent reporting should be studied and eliminated, i.e. time-spans, currency exchange sources, definition of items to be included, etc., should be unified and used by all reporting parties.

- Multi-stakeholder involvement, both from private and public sectors, enhances the sense of project ownership, and contributes positively to the success of national programs.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pg. 58):

- The modalities of enforcement of the approved regulations must be agreed upon between the various enforcement agencies (Kenya Revenue Authority, Anti-Counterfeit Authority, Kenya Bureau of Standards), with clear steps and roles for each, and actions to be taken as part of enforcement.

- Establishment of a testing facility, or establishment of agreements with interim testing facilities should be a priority.

- Proceeding immediately with voluntary agreements or declarations in some form as possible, and dissemination of labels and awareness raising should be prioritized.

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 assesses project outcomes and impacts in a systematic and comprehensive manner. More attention could have been given to project relevance.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was internally consistent and the evidence provided was complete. Ratings were moderately inflated in some areas.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides ratings for the different components of project sustainability, however no justification or discussion is provided.	**HU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations are consistent with the evidence presented.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report included actual project costs, however the information was not disaggregated by activity. Actual co-financing was provided.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of M&E design at entry was satisfactory. This TER disagrees with the TE's assertion that project monitoring was adequate.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

Midterm Evaluation (2012)