

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		29	
GEF Agency project ID		1130	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Palawan New and Renewable Energy and Livelihood Support Project (PNRELSP)	
Country/Countries		Philippines	
Region		EAP	
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		Center for Renewable Resources and Energy Efficiency (CRREE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		One of the beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		10/29/1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		02/28/2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2002	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2005	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.750	0.750
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.300	0.250
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.100	0.100

	Private sector	1.400	1.627
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.750	0.750
Total Co-financing		1.800	1.877
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.550	2.727
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		03/2007	
TE submission date		03/2007	
Author of TE		Rogelio Z. Aldover	
TER completion date		12/15/2014	
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	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the global environmental objective of the project was to lower greenhouse gas (GHG) emission growth from energy production in Palawan province. This was to be accomplished by promoting renewable energy to replace diesel generator use through a viable Rural Energy Service Company (RESCO).

If replicated across Palawan, the project would be expected to displace 15 million liters of diesel consumption, resulting in 12,000 tons of CO₂ reductions each year. This would lower oil imports by US\$4.5 million. The PD does not state what Palawan province's annual GHG emissions were at the time.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD, the projects' development objective was to expand renewable energy use in Palawan province by removing commercial barriers.

The Palawan Provincial Energy Master Plan (1997-2021) (PEMP) sought to increase the provincial electricity supply tenfold from 25 MW as of the Project Document's writing to 250 MW in 2021. The local district units called barangays, which were made up of 50 – 200 households each, had a low electrification rate at the time: 35 percent of all barangays. This was lower than the nationwide 72 percent barangay electrification rate. The PEMP had a goal of universal electrification in all Palawan barangays by 2021. The provincial government expected to bring in significant revenue from the production and sale of natural gas starting in 2002. The PD foresaw that if the project was successful, the Palawan provincial government could use natural gas revenues to invest in renewable energy

generative capacity. The RESCO would then be in charge of bringing electricity services to the non-electrified barangays in Palawan, as well as outside the province.

In addition, the central government, under the Energy Resources for the Alleviation of Poverty (ERAP) program, sought to increase nationwide barangay electrification to 90 percent by 2004. This was to be accomplished by using domestic energy sources, including renewable energy. The central government also re-affirmed its commitment to renewable energy in the Philippines Agenda 21 and the National Action Plan on Climate Change.

The project had the following components:

- 1) Increase local government and rural electric co-operative capacities
- 2) Carry out a renewable energy public awareness campaign
- 3) Create a Renewable Energy Development Center
- 4) Create a risk-sharing mechanism aimed at supporting RESCO

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

This project was originally intended to demonstrate the viability of a RESCO model of renewable energy delivery systems. However, such a model failed in a separate but similar project in Aklan province, so this project was changed to use a direct sales approach instead before project execution. The direct sales model also had a back-up loss reserve fund (LRF) built into it. The LRF allowed the Cooperative Bank of Palawan (CBP) to finance home owners who wished to borrow to buy solar home systems (SHS). However, the TE never clearly and directly defines what the LRF or the direct sales approach entailed.

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
----------------------	-----------------------------

As stated in 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. The project explicitly aims to remove barriers to adopting renewable energy in Palawan province and making it relatively more affordable. As for the Palawan provincial government, this project is in line with the government's goals stated in the Palawan Provincial Energy Master Plan. It is also congruent with the central government's plans under the ERAP program, the Philippines Agenda 21 and the National Action Plan on Climate Change.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for effectiveness. This TER rates project effectiveness as satisfactory based on the evidence presented in the narrative of the TE.

Summary: The project succeeded in its goals of training local stakeholders to improve local capacities, creating a functional REDC and promoting solar home systems (SHS) use through a direct sales approach. As a result, the project appears to have set a reasonable base to promote expanding energy use in Palawan through renewable energy use. However, it is not possible to assess the public awareness campaign's effectiveness from the TE.

In addition, the TE states that the project had likely not yet done much to reduce Palawan's GHG emissions since the demonstration sites were not expected to reduce GHG emissions on their own, but were expected to spur greater GHG mitigation and displacement upon replication. The project helped to displace 28,980 liters of diesel, which was 97 percent of its goal of 30,000 liters of diesel displaced, but the TE did not assess the amount of GHG mitigation of this displacement.

Project achievements are detailed further under each project component defined in the PD:

1) *Increase local government and rural electric co-operative capacities* **Satisfactory**

The TE notes that the project increased capacities at local government agencies and the rural electric cooperative (PALECO). The project trained 245 people. Personnel who received training went on to promote renewable energy through passing local resolutions and ordinances to promote renewable energy. The provincial government also created a Renewable Energy Division within the Policy and Planning Coordination Office. According to the TE, the provincial government “has demonstrated capability to manage the RE [renewable energy]-based electrification in addition to the grid-supplied electrification” (TE, p. 23).

2) *Carry out a renewable energy public awareness campaign* **Unable to Assess**

The project has sold a rapidly increasing number of SHS units for domestic use. This was due to increasing public demand, which appears to have been due to the project's renewable energy public awareness campaign. Sales rose from 0 in 2000 and 120 units in 2002 to 1,088 in 2005.

While the TE is clear on the results of the public awareness campaign, but was vague on what actually comprised the campaign. As a result, it is difficult to determine what effect, if any, was due to the public awareness campaign.

3) Create a Renewable Energy Development Center (REDC) Satisfactory

The project created the REDC and provided training. It answers to the Energy Division of the Programs and Planning Development Office in Palawan's provincial government. Once the staff had grown to 20 personnel, the provincial government provided new office space. This location was also more useful for providing hands-on training to members of local communities. Some of the provided courses cover biogas and maintaining and operating battery charging stations and solar-powered duck hatcheries. Students tend to be potential financiers, local beneficiaries and local government officials. The Center operates renewable energy models for solar hydroponics, biogas, biodiesel, solar mud crab farming, solar-powered nipa huts, solar-powered duck hatcheries, battery charging stations, satellite phone operation, 200W pico-hydro power systems and vermiculture/vermicomposting.

Note: The REDC is also referred to as the Renewable Resources Learning Center (RRLC).

4) Create a risk-sharing mechanism aimed at supporting RESCO Satisfactory

Due to the failure of the RESCO model in Aklan province in a separate but similar project in the Philippines, the project was altered to use a direct sales approach for selling SHS units instead as mentioned in section 3.3 of this TER. Using the direct sales approach, the project sold a total of 2,719 units as of June 2006. This was well above the original target of 2,200 units. The project handed out 788 loans for 789 units. In June 2005, the total principal was PhP 13,964,696. 73 loans had been repaid in full. 14 were past due, while 1 had been in default.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for efficiency. This TER rated project efficiency as moderately satisfactory based on the evidence presented in the narrative of the TE.

Summary: The project experienced 2 major delays. However, the first delay was due to modifying the project to make it more effective. The second was due to the executing agency ceasing operations, but the local UNDP office used adaptive management to carry on the project. UNDP management appears to have been satisfactory, but the TE is internally inconsistent on CRREE's management abilities. The project came in under budget.

Delays: According to the TE, the project experienced 2 years of cumulative delays. The first was caused by the switch from the RESCO approach to the direct sales approach. The second was caused by CRREE experiencing internal difficulties that affected its ability to carry out project tasks. CRREE shut its doors in December 2004, so the local UNDP office had to adapt and take over project operations. With this said, the majority of project activities were completed within the project's first 3 years.

Management Issues: According to the TE, following CRREE's closing, “the Project Steering Committee (PSC) as the highest-level decision making structure may have been affected by this situation in terms of lack of accurate and appropriate technical and policy advice that has come from CREEE [*sic*] and consultants in the early part of the project” (TE, p. 7). However, the TE earlier praised CRREE's management abilities prior to December 2004. The TE is too internally inconsistent to appropriately assess CRREE's management abilities. However, the PSC and the local UNDP office showed a high degree of skill in adaptive management following CRREE's closure.

Financial/Asset Management: Project audits had raised concerns about project financial management and cost-effectiveness. According to the TE, “project implementation appears to have areas for improvement in cost-effectiveness in terms of staying within budget or reducing transaction costs” (TE, p. 7). The project lost a vehicle purchased with UNDP TRAC funds and failed to retrieve it. With this said, according to the TE, the project came in under budget overall (using only 97.7 percent of its allocated funds). However, the TE's chart comparing the allocated budget vs. the actual expenses for project activities said the total allocated project budget was US\$50,000 and the total actual expenses were US\$830,115.95. The TE's claim that 830,115.95 is 97.7 percent of 50,000 is obviously false. The allocated budget figure should have been US\$850,000 based on the numbers given in the chart. The TE only evaluated project spending coming out of GEF and UNDP financing and did not assess project spending backed by co-financing.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for sustainability. This TER rated project sustainability as moderately likely based on the evidence presented in the narrative of the TE.

Summary: The project had seen a high degree of ownership by the Palawan provincial government, which remained committed to project goals. Provincial government officials had raised their capacities through project-provided training. The project had secured future co-financing to continue promoting renewable energy locally. However, the executing agency's closure before the project's completion remains a cause for concern.

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

Environmental: **Unable to Assess**

The TE does not include an assessment of environmental risks to project sustainability.

Institutional: **Moderately Likely**

The project appears to have improved local capacities at numerous local institutions and organizations, including at the provincial government. However, the main executing agency did cease operations during the project. UNDP did show adaptive management skills in continuing on the project. With this

said, REDC and the Energy Division of the Policy and Planning Development Office appear to be committed to continuing project activities in the wake of CRREE's closure.

Sociopolitical: **Likely**

The Palawan provincial government was a key project partner. Its Rural Energy Master Plan, which was adopted during the project's life, promotes using renewable energy to electricity rural Palawan. Both REDC and the Energy Division are housed within the provincial government to ensure provincial government commitment to promoting renewable energy.

Financial: **Likely**

The project's success has been used as a basis for gathering further co-financing for related renewable energy projects in Palawan. For instance, Shell Philippines Exploration, B.V. had started funding the Solar Power Micro Enterprise Project, which covered 6 pilot sites in the province. Ford had provided 1 million PhP for the Solid Waste Management Project. The Shell Solar Philippines Corporation (SSPC) had set up a funding facility for 100 SHS installations, which came to PhP 7 million. The GEF and the World Bank were building off of this project with 2 new projects: the CBRED Project and the World Bank Rural Power Project. The CBP continued to support the LRF.

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?

According to the TE, the planned co-financing was largely delivered as expected. SSPC co-financing was somewhat above expectations, though project spending from provincial government co-financing was somewhat below expectations. This included US\$1.627 million from SSPC (versus US\$1.4 million at assessment), US\$250,000 from the Palawan provincial government (versus US\$300,000 at assessment) and US\$100,000 from UNDP through its Target for Resource Assignments from the Core (UNDP TRAC) program. The Palawan provincial government co-financing was used to pay project personnel salaries, provide office space and update the Rural Energy Master Plan. SSPC's co-financing was originally supposed to support the RESCO model, but was instead used to the SHS direct sales approach. This included supporting SSPC's micro-financing scheme, 5 SHS sales centers and 7 SHS subcontractors operating in the field.

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?

According to the TE, the project experienced 2 years of cumulative delays. The first was caused by the switch from the RESCO approach to the direct sales approach. The second was caused by CRREE

experiencing internal difficulties that affected its ability to carry out project tasks. CRREE shut its doors in December 2004, so the local UNDP office had to adapt and take over project operations. With this said, the majority of project activities were completed within the project's first 3 years.

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 provincial government was a key project partner during project execution. Provincial government officials took part in training to better understand promote adopting renewable energy in Palawan. During the project's life, the provincial government made promoting renewable energy a key part of its Rural Energy Master Plan. Project funding helped to revise this Plan. As part of this Plan, renewable energy would be used to bring electricity to rural residents whose homes were unable to be connected to the grid in the medium-term. The provincial government also created the Energy Division of the Policy and Planning Development Office. The REDC is also located in the Energy Division.

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 does not provide a rating for M&E design. This TER rates M&E design quality as moderately unsatisfactory based on the design of the M&E system detailed in the PD.

The M&E design in the PD is insufficiently developed. As of the PD's writing, the project's performance indicators had not yet been developed. There is no mention of a Mid-Term Review (MTR) or annual PIRs, though the project was required to have at least one formal evaluation, which was scheduled for about 6 months prior to project completion, as well as Tri-Partite Reviews (TPR). The project team, in consultation with UNDP and CRREE, were to evaluate performance indicators semi-annually. The PD also required Annual Performance Reports be submitted. The M&E budget was US\$30,000.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E implementation. This TER rates M&E implementation quality as moderately unsatisfactory based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

The TE's "Lessons Learned" section asserts that oversight of project partners like SSPC was lacking due to inadequate resources and mechanisms. In addition, it appears that the indicators were never adequately developed to ensure proper M&E implementation.

A total of 5 Annual Project Review and Project Implementation Reviews and 5 Annual Tripartite Reviews were completed. The project team also submitted quarterly reports throughout the project that included financial information and each subsequent quarter's work plan. According to the TE, "the Project has been subjected to close monitoring and evaluation using UNDP and GEF standards through the Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) and adaptive management processes to ensure achievement of the targets" (TE, p. 18), though little information is provided on the M&E process's findings in the TE's body. The M&E process also may have not been adequately updated to reflect the switch from the RESCO model to the direct sales approach.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The TE does not provide a rating for project implementation. This TER rates project implementation as moderately satisfactory based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

The project design was clear and focused. The PD was written with a strong understanding of the state of renewable energy and rural electrification in Palawan province. Aside from the shortcomings of the M&E design, the project was well-designed. In particular, UNDP showed strong adaptive management abilities. The local UNDP office took the initiative to implement adaptive management once the executing agency shuttered. This ensured that the project could be completed satisfactorily. In addition, learning from the failure of the RESCO model elsewhere in the Philippines and agreeing to experiment with a direct sales model helped to ensure project success. UNDP also engaged with the private sector, in particular SSPC, and the Palawan provincial government to ensure project sustainability and stakeholder buy-in. The principle shortcoming with project implementation was the failure to develop a robust M&E system for the project and oversee successful M&E implementation during the project.

The TE does not provide a rating for project execution. This TER rates project execution as satisfactory based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative.

CRREE carried out work on all project components before it closed prior to project completion. UNDP and the Palawan government did a good job of carrying on project duties once CRREE closed. The delays were understandable, as CRREE closed and the project design had to be updated to avoid repeating the RESCO project mistakes encountered elsewhere in the Philippines. However, there may have been some management problems within CRREE, but the TE is unclear on this point.

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's activities displaced the consumption of 28,980 liters of diesel, which was 97 percent of its goal of 30,000 liters of diesel displaced. The TE does not estimate how much GHG's were mitigated through this displacement (TE, p. 20).

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 project sold 2,719 132 KW SHS units in Palawan. This was well above the original target of 1,000 units and the revised target of 2,200 units (TE, p. 20). According to some estimate, the actual number sold may have been as high as 3,072 units (TE, p. 22).

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 supported 5 pilot mud crab culture pilot sites that used SHS's to show this locally important sector could successfully implement renewable energy technology. The project also set up pilot projects for solar photovoltaic technologies, rice hull gasifiers using renewable energy and 4 household and 1 REDC biogas systems (TE, pp. 21-22).

The project supported training 245 local stakeholders. Creating the REDC also increased local capacity (TE, p. 23).

b) Governance

The project supported updating the Rural Energy Master Plan to use renewable energy to electrify rural Palawan communities that cannot easily be connected to the grid. The provincial government also created the Energy Division of Policy and Planning Development Office as a result of this project (TE, p. 31).

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 mention any unintended impacts due to this 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.

This project inspired Shell Philippines Exploration, B.V. (SPEX)'s Solar Power Micro Enterprise Project, Ford's Solid Waste Management Project and SSPC's financing scheme for selling 100 SHS. In addition, two subsequent World Bank/GEF projects – the CBRED Project and the World Bank Rural Power Project – built off of this project (TE, p. 31).

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 following are drawn from the TE's "Lessons Learned" section:

- 1) Project teams need to be able to make quicker decisions when changing a project design. While SSPC may not have been able to make a unilateral decision to drop the RESCO approach and adopt an alternative, the World Bank and GEF could have better facilitated making a quick decision to avoid having the project fall behind schedule. In addition, the M&E process does not appear to have been updated to reflect this change.
- 2) Monitoring of project partners was lacking, especially oversight of SSPC. UNDP, the GEF and project partners should have written clearer indicators. Each project partner's responsibilities needs to be clearly defined and widely understood prior to project execution.
- 3) Renewable energy on the local level requires buy-in and understanding from local communities, so community engagement is important and should be encouraged.
- 4) Local loan facilitators can be useful partners in the field. After CRREE closed, local loan facilitators helped to distribute funds in remote rural areas where other financial and communications systems were inadequate.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following are drawn from the TE's "Recommendations" section:

- 1) The CBP should expand the LRF design to cover services like battery replacement, which would help to expand electrification in unelectrified barangays. The World Bank could also strengthen the LRF by adding support from the CBRED Project's Loan Guarantee Fund (LGF).
- 2) The Palawan provincial government should also support expanding the size of the LRF to ensure it can actually finance enough borrowers to match Palawan's renewable energy needs. The provincial government should also support creating the proposed Palawan Renewable Energy Trust Fund.
- 3) Continuing monitoring of the LRF and other renewable energy financing programs connected to this project would help create similar projects elsewhere.
- 4) SHS marketing should emphasize how it can help bring in additional income for households and businesses. The SHS systems' accountability, maintenance and operation should be emphasized during the post-project phase since these systems (and their usefulness or lack thereof) will outlast the project itself.

- 5) The risk-sharing mechanism's experience should be shared with other banks so that they can replicate this project's experience when promoting renewable energy.

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 does assess each of the project components, though its assessment of the public awareness campaign is inadequate. It is vague and makes it hard to figure out which project outcomes to attribute to this component. The discussion of the other project components is adequate.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE has multiple grammatical errors that make it hard to follow. The TE provided no ratings for each component under evaluation, though this was not a GEF requirement for TEs at the time. The evidence provided is reasonably consistent, though underdeveloped and vague at times.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE should have more clearly assessed the effect of CRREE's closing on the project's institutional sustainability, but otherwise the sustainability assessment was adequate.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The "Lessons Learned" section is noticeably more critical of the GEF, the World Bank and SSPC than the TE's body as a whole. As a result, the "Lessons Learned" section feels disconnected from the rest of the TE. While it praised the M&E process in the TE's body, it was very critical of the M&E process in this section. These problems make assessing this section's accuracy difficult.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does include a budget breakdown per project activity in a chart on pages 29-30. The chart breaks down expected versus actual costs for project outcomes. The TE also includes co-financing figures.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The section devoted to the M&E system was underdeveloped and vague. The discussion on M&E in the "Lessons Learned" section was much more informative, but could still have provided a clearer picture of what exactly happened. These sections were inconsistent.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating: $(0.3 * (4+3)) + (0.1 * (4+3+4+3)) = 2.1 + 1.4 = 3.5 = \text{Moderately Satisfactory}$

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

N/A