

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

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2777	
GEF Agency project ID		3327	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Barrier Removal to the Cost-Effective Development and Implementation of Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Project (BRESL)	
Country/Countries		Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Pakistan, Thailand, Vietnam	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change Mitigation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 5: Removal of barriers to energy efficiency and energy conservation	
Executing agencies involved		China's National Development & Reform Commission (NDRC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		February 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.05	NA
	Co-financing	0.032	NA
GEF Project Grant		7.8	
Co-financing	IA own	0	NA
	Government	24.2	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.3	NA
	Private sector	3.578	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	0.005	0.005
Total GEF funding		7.8	7.61*
Total Co-financing		28.09	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		35.78	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		18 February 2015	
Author of TE		Umm e Zia, Gao Peijung, Munazza Zia	
TER completion date		February 28, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

\* Amount spent as per December 2014

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The overall environmental objective for this project is “the reduction in the annual growth rate of greenhouse gas emissions from thermal power generation in selected Asian Countries.” (PD P.70)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The objective of the project is the removal of barriers to the development and effective implementation of energy efficiency standards and labeling (ES&L) programs, thereby facilitating the transformation of the regional product markets of targeted energy consuming appliances, equipment and lighting products. It will also facilitate harmonization of test procedures, standards and labels among developing countries throughout Asia, when appropriate.” (PD p.5) By removing those barriers, the project aims to reduce energy use by certain products by 4 to 30% (PD p.24). Indeed, implementing energy-efficient standards and labeling (ES&L) is a very cost-effective way to reduce GHG emissions, much below the cost of changing the type of energy supply (PD p.5).

In order to achieve this objective, the project planned to focus on five main outcomes:

1. Establishment of legal and regulatory basis for removing lowest technologies from the market and promoting high-efficiency technologies.
2. Building of institutional and individual capacity to secure on-the-ground implementation of regulatory frameworks, as well as actual standards and labeling programs.
3. Provision of information and technical assistance to manufacturers of covered products
4. Regional cooperation and information sharing on-going and helps to maximize impacts
5. Demonstration of various aspects of the development and implementation of ES&L programs

(TE p.16)

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

No changes in objectives or activities took place during implementation. However, following initial delays and issues getting the project started, the project structure was changed in order to better focus efforts. All activities under the five outcomes listed above were grouped under the following three action themes:

1. Training
2. Technical Working Groups (TWGs)
3. Regional Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Network (REESLN)

#### 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: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates project relevance as satisfactory due to the importance of the topic and the readiness of the countries involved in improving their ES&L policies. This TER also rates relevance as satisfactory due to the demonstrated interest in improving ES&L policies in the regions, and to the project’s good alignment with GEF priorities.

According to the PD, ES&L awareness was already high in the region, but “only a few Asian countries are systematically implementing ES&L programs in a way that leads to significant, sustained savings” (PD p.12). Countries were willing to scale up their ES&L programs, but needed help to establish the institutions necessary to operate those programs, and to harmonize and align regulatory processes in the region (PD p.13).

Several regional initiatives were already underway and demonstrate the regional commitment to ES&L. First, APEC had already set up an Expert Group on Energy Efficiency & Conservation, working under the APEC Energy Working Group. The SARI-Energy initiative already conducted three ES&L Harmonization Meetings in Sri Lanka and India during 2003 to 2005. In 1999, ASEAN identified ES&L as a priority in the energy sector, and developed the ASEAN Energy Labeling project. Several other initiatives had been developed in relation to energy labeling (PD pp.14-15).

In addition to taking part in those regional efforts, each of the six participating countries had already made efforts towards climate change mitigation, first by ratifying the UNFCCC, and submitting their First National Communications under the UNFCCC framework. “These communications all highlighted that EC&EE, in general, and ES&L, in particular and among the measures each country are considering for the reduction of GHG emissions. At present, some of the participating countries have already carried out ES&L programs. Two of them (China & Korea) are already well-advanced in their activities in this area. The others are either just starting (Bangladesh, Indonesia, Pakistan, Vietnam) or have done significant work on ES&L as part of their demand side management (DSM) activities (Thailand). All of these countries are now preparing their Second national Communications to the UNFCCC.” (PD p.47)

In addition to being well aligned with regional and national priorities, the project was well aligned with GEF’s strategic priorities. Part of the climate change focal area and the “removal of barriers to energy efficiency and energy conservation” operational program, the project indeed has as a primary goal the reduction in greenhouse gas reduction, to be achieved by better energy efficiency labeling.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory, a rating that is also adopted by this TER because the project has delivered most of the planned activities and achieved most of its logframe targets, thereby achieving its objectives. Progress towards achieving objectives and outcomes are listed below:

**Overall objective**

The project’s overall objective was to reduce GHG emissions by improving energy efficiency. The target for GHG emission reduction was 20.8 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>/yr (TE p.18). The project achieved GHG emission reductions of 55.9 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>/yr, most of which came from China (TE p.53).

**Outcome 1. ES&L Policy-Making Program**

Under this component, it was expected that the project would establish a legal basis for standards and labels, and assist with the development of regulations for the targeted products. According to the TE, “all the six participating countries have made considerable progress on ES&L legal framework” (TE p.39). As part of this component, China, Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam adopted new laws and regulations on ES&L, while Bangladesh and Pakistan developed draft policies (TE p.41). New energy standards were developed in all six countries, and labeling schemes are now in use in five out of six countries. The logframe targets for this component have been met.

**Outcome 2. ES&L Capacity Building Program**

Under this component, it was expected that the project would build institutional and individual capacity to secure on-the-ground implementation of standards and labels, including establishing regional working groups for each of the targeted products. When the TE was written, seven training workshops had been held, training about 350 participants. Unfortunately, the workshops only

targeted government staff and largely excluded private sector stakeholders (TE p.36). The technical working groups set up were successful, having “made significant contributions to the potential of E&SL trade and exchange among the Partner Countries in the form of testing protocols, performance specifications, and product testing that has led to harmonization among PCs” (TE p.38). In addition, as a result of the Technical Working Groups, complete feasibility studies of the seven target products were made, and harmonized BRESL specifications were developed (TE p.36). The logframe targets for this component have been met.

### **Outcome 3. ES&L Manufacturer Support Program**

Under this component, it was expected that the project would deliver Information and technical assistance for local product manufacturers to help them develop efficient products and realize profit opportunities from efficient products. The project provided support to manufacturers for production of energy efficiency products. The support included trainings and technical assistance. As a result of the project, several more manufacturers are producing energy efficient products. Logframe targets have been achieved.

### **Outcome 4. ES&L Regional Cooperation Program**

Under this component, it was expected that the project would support regional cooperation activities that would aid individual countries with development and implementation of their ES&L programs. The Regional Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Network (REESLN) was launched in 2013, and supported outcomes under the five project components. “Key services include information sharing, technical assistance, training, and facilitation of harmonization initiatives. Interviews with some of the PC representatives revealed that REESLN has been received as a welcome cooperation initiative by the stakeholders in these PCs” (TE p.39). However, the network was started late in the project, and its operational phase has been pushed past the project timeline. In addition to the network, a website was developed, and a plan was prepared for regional activities to continue after the end of the GEF-funded project.

### **Outcome 5. ES&L Pilot Projects**

Under this component, it was expected that the project would set up pilot activities showcasing various aspects of the design, facilitation and implementation of ES&L programs, including support activities that build on the regional foundation provided by BRESL. Procurement schemes were piloted in three countries, with two countries (China and Vietnam) having a government procurement scheme in place by the end of the project. By the end of the project, four countries had some form of database for energy efficiency. Finally, all countries involved in the project carried out consumer campaigns to increase awareness of ES&L and energy efficiency (TE p.49). Here again, logframe targets were met.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
----------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory largely due to operational delays. For the same reason, this TER also rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory.

The TE provides little evidence for or against the project’s efficiency. The cost effectiveness of the project is not discussed or assessed, nor does the TE feature a cost-benefit analysis for the various activities undertaken by the project. The TE mentions that most of the project funds (97.61%) have been disbursed. “The lowest spending in Bangladesh (92%) is reflective of the late start of activities and the fund is planned to be fully utilized by project closure in Bangladesh in June 2015. Also, the remaining five countries plan to utilize the remaining funds by the time of administrative closure of the project” (TE p.27).

Despite the apparently smooth financial management of the project, there were some initial project setbacks that slowed down implementation. Those delays were “due to issues of ES&L awareness across the PCs [participating countries], lack of suitable ES&L experts in the region, and limited coordination between the PCs” (TE p.50). The Project Management Unit, after realizing the issues that arose in the project, took action to encourage the participating countries (PCs) to accelerate project implementation. It refocused the project activities under three main activities (training, technical working groups, regional network) and successfully accelerated the achievement of project results (TE pp.50-51).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Likely</b>
--------------------	-----------------------

The TE rates sustainability as likely due to low financial risks. This TER also rates sustainability as likely based on the overall low risks to sustainability.

**Financial Risks – Sustainability Likely**

As a result of the project, the six participating countries have started investing in ES&L policies and activities. For example, the Government of Indonesia has independently decided to include 15 additional products for ES&L development, and the Government of Pakistan plans to set up a national ES&L center of excellence (TE p.52). In addition, several countries have already accessed additional donor resources for ES&L promotion from JICA, AusAid and USAID. The project management unit is also preparing a BRESL follow up project. Overall, financial resources will not be a barrier to the continuation of ES&L activities in the six participating countries. (TE pp.52-53)

**Socio-political risks – Sustainability Likely**

The TE does not mention any socio-political risk to project sustainability. All partner countries appear to be committed to developing ES&L policies and programs, and there is nothing to indicate socio-political risks to the future of those programs. Socio-political sustainability therefore appears likely.

### **Institutional risks – Sustainability Likely**

The TE does not mention any institutional risk to project sustainability. One of the main achievements of the project - the Regional Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Network (REESLN) – is well grounded and will continue its operation following the end of the project. Institutional sustainability is likely.

### **Environmental risks – Sustainability Likely**

No environmental risks were identified as part of this project. Environmental sustainability therefore appears likely.

## **5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE does not provide final budgetary figures related to the project's co-financing. According to the TE, "the NDRC, Energy Foundation, and ICA have been the most active co-contributors to the project. The Energy Foundation (China) provided support in the form of staffing for test labs, studies on EE standards, and label development. As part of its commitment to energy efficiency, the NDRC under the Government of China, has spent R&D, equipping testing laboratories, and promotion of energy efficiency products. ICA provided assistance in the development of MEPS, market awareness, and TA to manufacturers. The co-financing at country-level mostly comprised of contributions from the respective country governments" (TE p.30). As demonstrated in this excerpt from the TE, co-financing was very important to the project. Co-financing was expected to make up most of the funds for this project, which would not have been possible without co-financing.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project did not suffer from any delays substantially postponing activities or requiring a project extension. However, "during its first half, project implementation faced numerous challenges that resulted in a sluggish pace of planned activities. Major problems included little understanding and technical knowhow among the PCs [participating countries], lack of trained technical manpower in the region, limited RPMU budget, and difference in priorities among the PCs that led to difficulty in activity coordination" (TE p.55). The Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) solved these problems, and project outcomes were not affected.

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:

China’s National Development & Reform Commission (NDRC) was assigned as the executing agency for the project. China was chosen as lead executer “due to its comparatively advanced ES&L status”(TE p.51) and demonstrated its commitment throughout the project. The Government of China facilitated key aspects of the project, including information exchange activities, which were delivered by leading Chinese ES&L institutions.

The governments of the six participating countries also “demonstrated their ownership by providing key operational resources in the form of co-financing, developing laws and regulations, and signing MRAs” (Mutual Recognition Agreements) (TE p.52).

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory due to the overall adequacy of its M&E arrangements. For the same reason, the TER also assigns a rating of satisfactory.

All aspects of a standard M&E framework were planned from the start – monitoring reports, data collection, evaluation activities, responsibilities, plan for learning and knowledge sharing, budget, etc. Baseline data was also provided for most quantitative indicators, which proved useful to measure project achievements (PD p.53-55, 71-82). However, some of the key monitoring data relied on external sources for validation (for example, national statistics or official publications of each country), which created the potential for important evaluation data gaps in the project. That aside, indicators were well selected, most of them meeting the SMART criterion. Overall, the M&E plan was very detailed, clear and comprehensive.

The Project Management Unit was tasked with most of the M&E activities, although individual participating countries were charged to “develop their specific M&E plans for tracking progress and assessing impacts”(PD p.99).

<b>M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------------	-----------------------------



The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory due to the project M&E having been “carried out as devised in the monitoring framework provided in the Project Operations Manual and have been in line with the GEF-UNDP project guidelines” (TE p.24). For the same reasons, this TER also assigns a rating of satisfactory to this project’s M&E implementation.

M&E activities by and large took place as planned. “However, from time to time the M&E has suffered from late reporting due to the delay in receiving information from the different participating countries. These delays have lessened over time as the coordination between RPMU and participating countries have continually improved. Nevertheless, there is still need for improvement in coordination and timeliness of reporting, e.g. for incorporation into this T.E, only the final evaluation report of Indonesia was provided on time, while reports by 3 PCs (China, Pakistan, and Vietnam) were submitted with some delay, and the reports for Thailand and Bangladesh were not provided during the period of evaluation” (TE pp.24-25). Other M&E delays were incurred due to project implementation delays that took place at the beginning of the project. This made it unfeasible for the project to carry out surveys to measure project impact. The M&E in project design also stipulated surveys to be carried out during project implementation to assess project impact. However, the project has not been able to assess comprehensive impact due to delays in implementation during the first two years and the country-wise approach to impact assessment.

Overall, the M&E plan was well implemented, with some delays that could have been prevented by a “stronger collaboration between the RPMU and PCs” (TE p.25). Overall, the project management unit was still able to deliver quality M&E outputs.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. The TE rates project implementation as satisfactory due to the good project formulation as well as the adaptive management demonstrated during project implementation. This TER shares this assessment and also assigns a rating of satisfactory to project implementation.

According to the TE, “the project design was simple, appropriately flexible, responsive to the issues that the project sought to address, facilitated replication, and was cognizant of the key potential risks (...)

However, due to limited resources, some key elements of the project design were prescriptive as the design was unable to fully take into account the situation on availability and level of technical expertise within the target countries and the participation of private sector in E&SL issues” (TE p.22).

This weakness in the project formulation did create some initial delays in project implementation, but the project team, including both the UNDP and the executing agency, solved those. Indeed, the team demonstrated good adaptive management when it decided to restructure project activities. It proposed for the project to adopt a synergistic strategy by focusing on three key areas, i.e. training, technical working groups, and networking. Consequently, adjustments were made to *Components 2, 3, and 4* for the regional activities. However, to ensure that implementation was in line with the original project design, the activities within these priority areas were aligned with the five components in the project’s logical framework. In line with this proposed strategy, higher emphasis was placed on trainings of related stakeholder staff such as technical agencies, testing laboratories, etc. Also, seven TWGs were established, one for each target product, to provide technical guidance to E&SL activities under the project. Moreover, as an alternative to developing linkages with the APEC-ESIS database, it was decided to develop a regional network, titled Regional Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Network (REESLN)” (TE pp.23-24). This change in strategy was successful in putting the project back on the right track and ensuring positive outcomes.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---	--

The executing agency for this project was China’s National Development & Reform Commission (NDRC). The TE rates project execution as moderately satisfactory due to the ability of the NDRC to bring project stakeholders together and to use adaptive management to ensure satisfactory project outcomes, but noting several shortcomings that slowed down implementation. This TER agrees with the rating.

As explained above, there were some important delays at the beginning of the project. As a result, the production of some of the NDRC deliverables were delayed, including “regular monitoring reports, official invitations of delegates to project training, submission of completed outputs and studies, etc.”(TE p.33). However, as discussed in the implementation section above, the NDRC and UNDP worked together to develop a solution that solved the issues faced, and thereby displayed good adaptive management.

Apart from those initial delays, the TE also notes other operational delays due to the late hiring of a part-time international CTA, the project’s move from the CS to CNIS and the lack of revisions to the Project Operation Manual to reflect important project changes that took place during early project implementation (TE p.34).

The TE does not provide very specific information regarding the role of the NDRC during the project. Based on the information listed above, a rating of moderately satisfactory is assigned.

## 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 successfully initiated new ES&L policies and activities in the six participating countries, and strengthened regional collaboration on this topic in Asia. The project has also contributed significantly to the ES&L knowledge. Those achievements have already started making a difference, with “reported energy savings of 175,000 Gigawatt-hours (Gwh), equivalent to 55.9 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>” (TE p.55). It is expected that the ES&L policies in place will continue to contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and that the new emphasis put in ES&L in the region will further increase the magnitude of the emissions reduced by the project.

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.

No socioeconomic change was described as having taken place as a result of this 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

One of the most important components of this project was capacity building. As part of the project, seven training workshops have been held, training about 350 participants. Several technical working groups were set up and “made significant contributions to the potential of

E&SL trade and exchange among the Partner Countries in the form of testing protocols, performance specifications, and product testing that has led to harmonization among PCs” (TE p.38). Overall, the project generated a lot of knowledge on ES&L, and significantly improved the capacity of government officials in the six participating countries to develop and manage ES&L projects.

#### b) Governance

A new body for regional cooperation on ES&L was set up as part of the project: The Regional Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Network (REESLN). Launched in 2013, the REESLN aims to sustain cooperation between participating countries on ES&L matters, including knowledge exchange and technical assistance.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts for this project were recorded in the project documents.

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.

This project was already a regional initiative, involving the governments of six Asian countries. The project documents do not mention additional countries having signaled their interest in joining the initiative.

## 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 key lessons presented in the Terminal Evaluation are the following:

1. South-south cooperation is an effective way for improving the E&SL programs of countries in the region;
2. The experiences regarding the seven BRESL targeted products can be effectively applied to establishing ES&L regimes for other products in the PCs as well as non-participating countries.

3. After improvement in understanding E&SL concepts, countries in the region (including public and private sector) are more supportive of the E&SL programs; and
4. Future project design needs to be based on detailed baseline information regarding all stakeholders and their respective capacities and needs.

(TE p.56)

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The Terminal Evaluation presents the following recommendations, shortened for this report:

1. **Follow up BRESL project:** The lack of funding to ensure appropriate technical support and knowledge transfer is likely to pose a substantial threat to the continuation of key BRESL activities. It is therefore recommended that the newly designed BRESL project be presented to interested donor organizations such as GEF, JICA, USAID, World Bank, and ADB, who have existing relevant technical capacities and interest in climate change and energy efficiency. Similarly, active partners such as the ICA and Energy Foundation should be provided important roles in future projects for working in BRESL and non-BRESL countries.
2. **Engagement of Policy Makers:** Public sector stakeholders mostly included technical agencies and their representatives. However, to push the process of legislation, it is highly recommended that the future BRESL project maintains direct linkages with legislators in the PCs through awareness and technical support activities.
3. **Private Sector Participation:** To enhance ownership by the private sector future, ES&L projects and activities should make efforts to enhance private sector participation. Some likely activities include inclusion of private sector in activities such as training, higher co-financing by the private sector, and help in overcoming of financial barriers through alternative financial mechanisms such as matching grants, tax breaks, and loans, etc.
4. **Capacity on Labeling Schemes:** By building on the positive project outcomes, it is recommended that the country-level capacity of labeling schemes for the target products are enhanced through training, information exchange, and implementation guidance.
5. **Baseline Scenarios:** It is recommended that future ES&L projects should be based on the existing technical capacity and infrastructure such as expert knowledge, laboratory capacity, etc. This assessment would ensure that proposed activities are in line with a country's existing capacity and measures can be advised for improvement of this capacity.
6. **Range of Targeted Products:** It is recommended that a larger range of products be included in any future projects.

7. **REESLN:** To ensure that the REESLN network becomes operational and achieves its planned objectives, it will be necessary to provide future funding and technical support to this initiative. Otherwise, the fate of REESLN will be the same as numerous other similar initiatives that have fizzled out after the expiration of funding and technical support. Moreover, the long term financial sustainability of the network should be ensured through different initiatives.
8. **Regional Reviews:** A similar project would also benefit from additional annual external reviews so that country-level issues can be identified and corrected in time. The classification of such issues will also clarify understanding and enhance coordination between the regional and country offices.
9. **Alternate Information Exchange Mechanisms:** Considering the complex nature of the regional project encompassing six countries, occasional face-to-face meetings are insufficient to address the project's ongoing concerns of developing a mutual understanding and improving coordination issues. Considering the resource limitations, it is recommended that alternative economical forms of ongoing communication be utilized by the RPMU, such as the establishment of quarterly video-conferencing meetings, ongoing discussion platforms, etc. The REESLN itself can be used as a starting point / platform for such interaction.
10. **Provision of a larger and diverse pool of experts to the RPMU and PMUs:** It is recommended that a wider list of expertise be made available to the RPMU through activities such as signing of MOUs with public and private sector entities, developing a roster of regional consultants, etc. This expansion in the expert pool will have to be complimented with higher budgets.

(TE pp.56-58)

## 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 report does assess all relevant outcomes and impacts of the project. However, the achievement of specific targets is unclear as the logframe data in Annex 10 is not well discussed in the report, and not clearly presented in the annex.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and well structured. All necessary ratings are provided, but not always well evidenced and substantiated.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE briefly describes financial sustainability, but other aspects of sustainability are left out.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Taken together, the 'lessons learned' and 'key recommendations' sections provide comprehensive and well-evidenced lessons that will be useful to the project's continuation or to similar projects in the region.	S

Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Adequate budget figures are provided for the GEF component of the project, but co-financing figures are missing, and it remains unknown how much of the co-financing received was used. Budget figures provided for the GEF component are disaggregated by country and by component, but not by activity.	<b>MU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report discusses the quality of M&E systems and their implementation, but does not provide a thorough assessment. The M&E description could have been less descriptive and more analytical.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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

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