Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		31	
GEF Agency project ID		1237	
GEF Replenishment Phase		2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Introduction of Viable Electric and Hybrid-Electric Bus Technology	
Country/Countries		Egypt	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP11 Promoting Sustainable Transport and Reducing Incremental Cost	
Executing agencies involved		Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA), Social Fund for Development (SFD)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		none	
Private sector involvement		Automotive Feeding Industries (AFICO), Egyptian bus manufacturer	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 15th, 1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 7, 2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 7th, 2000	
Actual date of project completion		June, 2006	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant			
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.415	0.3828
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	.550	0
Total GEF funding		.7486	.7486
Total Co-financing		.965430	.3828
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.714	1.132
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2008	
TE submission date		October 21st, 2014	
Author of TE		Jan van den Akker	
TER completion date		11/19/2015	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Dania Trespalacios	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's overall objective as stated in the Project Document is "to introduce to Egypt a viable electric, hybrid-electric, and eventually fuel cell bus technology program, that would have significant benefits and sustainability in various segments of the country." (Project Document p.4) Establishing and operationalizing electric bus technology would reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the number of busses running on fossil fuels.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project's Development Objective as stated in the Project Document is "Increased utilization of electric and hybrid electric buses to replace diesel buses in historic sites, protectorates, and newly designed cities in Egypt." The project would introduce in Egypt a viable electric, hybrid-electric and eventually fuel cell technology program. Other immediate objectives listed in the project document were: 1) demonstration of Electric and Hybrid Electric Bus technology in historic sites and protectorates 2) sustainable manufacturing, operational, and maintenance infrastructure to support growing market. (Project Brief p.1)

This project was the first phase in a series of planned phases with a planned duration of 6 months.

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

Although the TE does not list any changes in Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives or other activities, in examining the PIRs, the wording of the development objective and outcomes was changed from what was stated in the project document:

Development Objective as stated in the project PIRs: Introducing a viable program for replacing diesel buses with electric, hybrid-electric, and, as applicable, fuel cell buses

Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of the transportation authority managers and the maintenance and operation personnel to participate in the program.
Outcome 2: Enhanced experience on electric busses by building on the monitoring of the operation of the two test vehicles

Outcome 3: Creation of the basis for launching the next phase, including: 1) configuration of the buses and routes for the next demonstration phase (phase IB) ii) elaborating the additional needs for institutional strengthening and capacity building and iii) evaluating and addressing the economic, environmental and social aspects of the project.

Additionally, one of the main activities listed in the project document- Development of comprehensive operational plan for 24 bus pilot project in Giza and Greater Cairo, and creation of proposal for funding of pilot project Phase 1 (b) (Project Brief p.1), was discontinued, as the planned follow up phase was cancelled.

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**

The TE does not provide a rating for project relevance, however this TER provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. This project was relevant under the GEF focal area of climate change, and under GEF Phase 3 Operational Program 11 "Promoting Sustainable Transport and Reducing Incremental Costs", which emphasizes and promotes "modal shifts to more efficient and less polluting forms of public and freight transport through measures such as traffic management and avoidance and increased use of cleaner fuels."(OP11 p.3) The project also supports GEF Operational Program 7 "Reducing the Long-term Cost of Greenhouse Gas Emitting Technologies"..

This project was relevant to Egypt's national goals, because it aims to enhance Egypt's energy security by reducing its national consumption of oil. The project would also reduce pollution and vibrations caused by heavy duty buses, and thus help reduce the degradation of national monuments, and also reduce health problems resulting from air pollution, which currently cost Egypt about US$2 billion per year. (Project Document p.4)

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

The TE provides an overall rating for project results of Marginally Satisfactory, and this TE, which uses a different scale, rates project results as **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project delivered largely on its goal of serving as a demonstration of Electric and Hybrid Electric Bus technology in historic sites. However, a significant aspect of the project was to create the basis for launching the project's next phase. Activities related to creating the basis for launching the project's next phase were shelved when GEF priorities

shifted and it became clear a follow on phase would not be funded by the GEF as originally planned. This loss of funding would have been a setback, but does not serve as a justification for discontinuing activities under this component, when they could have been continued in an effort to secure funding from other sources.

As mentioned above, the original 6 outcomes appear to have been changed over the course of the project.

The following section reviews achievements against the project's revised outcomes:

The revised project objective was to introduce a viable program for replacing diesel buses with electric, hybrid-electric, and as applicable, fuel-cell buses. The project's expected results were that two buses would be delivered, tested and handed over to end users, and that a proposal and agreement for follow-up phase would be agreed upon. By the project's end, two electric buses were operational at Luxor, however the plan to proceed with the follow-up Phase 1b was discontinued due to a shift in GEF priorities.

The project's first component was enhancing experience with electric buses by monitoring the operation of the two test vehicles. The project's expected results were that ownership and responsibility for the continuing operation of the buses would be transferred to the Egyptian Supreme Council for Antiquities. By the end of the project, the Supreme Council for Antiquities was running the two test buses with ownership transferred in 2003 with a maintenance contract with AFICO until 2006.

The project's second component was enhancing the capacity of transportation authority managers and O&M personnel to participate in the programme. The project's expected results were that local stakeholders are trained and capable of operating and maintaining the electric buses and related infrastructure. By the project's end two AFICO engineers were trained by New Generation Motors Corporation started in 2004, and engineers were performing maintenance of the buses.

The project's third component was the creation of the basis for launching of the next phase. Expected results under this component were that social, economic, and environmental impact studies are finalized, and that potential bus service routes are identified and computer simulation of various buys configuration and routes completed. By the project end, impact studies had been finalized and presented in final report, but the other activities had been shelved, as the plan for a joint GEF/Egyptian phase 1b has been discontinued due to changing GEF priorities. The project document listed as one activity the development of comprehensive operational plan for 24 bus pilot project in Giza and Greater Cairo, and creation of proposal for funding of pilot project Phase 1 (b). Ultimately this outcome was not met. No follow up phase was formulated as by 2002 it became clear that, due to changing priorities regarding sustainable transportation, GEF funding was no longer applicable. As mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, the loss of support from GEF for a follow on phase was regrettable, however should not have been an excuse not to undertake efforts for follow on activities which could be funded from other sources. (TE p.4)

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

The TE does not provide a rating for efficiency, however, considering the length of time the project ran against the outputs delivered, this TER rates efficiency as **Unsatisfactory**. The project experienced delays throughout implementation, especially relevant given the planned project duration was only 6 months, and the project ultimately ran for 6 years. These delays negatively impacted sustainability, as GEF strategic priorities changed during the course of the project, thus a second phase did not materialize.

There were several factors contributing to delays, some outside the project's control, and others which could have been avoided with better planning. One factor was that tendering contracts took longer than expected (already longer than the project's 6 month planned duration) The project also faced problems in customs upon arrival of the clean buses which had to be stored in the free trade area for a few months as it was not clear if the equipment would be exempt from duties. This delay also led to some technical problems with the buses due to lack of maintenance, as the battery pack became damaged and dust settled in the filters in the motor. This technical problem appeared to apply only to one of the two buses, which was of poorer quality than the other. The problem compounded when the damage was not repaired and the decision was taken to continue to run the bus. Finally the project also faced some political problems due to the terrorist attacks of September 2001 in the US 9/11, causing a temporary breakdown in communications.

In terms of financial planning and delivery of counterpart inputs, the TE notes that the budget was spent more or less as planned. (TE p.21) Additionally according to the project's 2005 PIR, the two buses were fully operational and generating income that covers operation and maintenance cost. (TE p.3)

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

The TE does not provide ratings for sustainability.

Financial Resources: This TER rates sustainability of financial resources as **Unlikely.** This project was planned as the first phase in a series of projects funding, the future phases of which ultimately did not materialize. The TE notes that no sustainability strategy was formulated in terms of Phases 1b, 2 and 3 as originally planned. Even without GEF support, some type of follow-up activities could have been formulated. (TE p.21) The TE notes that GEF support for follow up appears to be unlikely at the moment and in coming years, however it notes that follow up funding would likely come from Egyptian sources, if it materializes (TE p.5). However the lack of concrete follow up funding is a definite risk to sustainability and outcomes.

Sociopolitical: This TER rates sociopolitical sustainability as **Moderately Unlikely.** The TE states that as follow up phases have not materialized, it is not possible to make a statement about the impact of the electric bus initiative in terms of transformation of the market for electric vehicles. (TE p.24) Although the TE indicates that various key stakeholders see in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow, it does not appear that this awareness has been enough for them to take action. This pilot project

did demonstrate that political problems could pose a risk, as the terrorist attack of September 11,2001 on USA caused delays to the project. (TE p.4)

Institutional framework and governance: This TER rates sustainability of institutional framework and governance as **Moderately Unlikely**. Some government processes caused complications in the importing of electric vehicles, as issues with customs contributed to project delays. (TE p.4) For example, The 2001 PIR noted that due to the technology being new in Egypt, heavy restrictions and requirements were imposed, making the bidding process difficult for bus manufacturers. (PIR 2001 p.3)

Environmental: Likely Emission reductions from using an electric bus in comparison with a diesel but is about 1.75kg CO2 per km travelled. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation the two buses were in circulation, and would remain to be for the foreseeable future.

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?

In-kind co-financing of $550,000 USD by the Southern Coalition for Advanced Transportation (SCAT), an American based not-for-profit consortium, was not delivered, since the American based not for profit consortium did not participate in the project as intended. (TE p.21) Co-financing from EEAA was also about 30% less than expected, at $67,846 USD instead of $100,000 USD. Thus total co-financing was significantly lower than expected, at $382,800 rather than the expected $965,430 USD. However the TE and the PIRs do not discuss this deficit as affecting the achievement of GEF objectives. The main issues negatively affecting the achievement of GEF objectives as described in the TE were the significant delays of the project, and the shift in GEF priorities which occurred during the delayed implementation of the project.

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 was extended to last significantly longer than the original planned duration of 6 months. Rather than 6 months the project was implemented over 6 years. The project experienced delays in startup, especially relevant given the planned project duration for Phase 1 was only 6 months. The factors contributing to delay were several: tendering contracts took longer than expected; there were delays in customs upon the arrival of the clean buses, which led to technical problems with the buses due to lack of maintenance; and there was a temporary breakdown in communications after the terrorists attacks of September 2011 in the US. These delays probably negatively impacted sustainability, as GEF strategic priorities changed during the course of the project, thus GEF funding for a second phase did not materialize.

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:

Country ownership has had a significant positive effect on outcomes and potential project sustainability. The project was executed by the Social Fund for Development (SFD), an Egyptian Government Agency, along with the Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA). Co-financing was provided by the government as well. The Egyptian private sector also expressed interest in going for a co-production program for coming phases. (PIR 2001) The TE notes that if future support materializes, it will likely come from the Egyptian government. (p.24) However, at the time of the TE it was not clear that this support would come.

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 rate M&E Design nor does it give an assessment of M&E Design at entry, however this TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The project objectives, and outcomes listed in the Project Document do have relevant indicators to measure completion, however the majority are not specific or do not have specific targets. For example, an indicator of the immediate objective "sustainable manufacturing, operational and maintenance infrastructure to support growing market" one indicator is "socioeconomic impact and job creation" (project document p.2) The project proposal does not include M&E in its budget as a separate line item.(project brief p.24) In the final project budget given in the TE, a line item of 10,000$ is noted for Evaluation, otherwise there is no information for M&E budget. (TE p.20)

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

The TE does not rate M&E Implementation nor does it give an assessment of it. However, due to the fact that the PIRs do not track the indicators listed in the project document, and that no explanation is given for the changes in objectives, M&E Implementation is rated as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. For example, one outcome originally listed is "completion of alternate bus routes" which seems to have completely fallen out of the project by the final PIR. A footnote within the TE states that "given the fact, that only a few group of activities have been undertaken (namely, the delivery and operation of the two demonstration buses and associated training and impact analysis activities), no formal monitoring has taken place based on using the logical framework as a management tool." (TE p.21)

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 implementing agency for this project is the UNDP. The TE rates project implementation as Moderately Satisfactory**,** and this TER downgrades that rating to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The TE notes that all entities involved facilitated the implementation of activities, and does not note a lack of oversight. However, the original timeframe for phase 1a was too ambitious, as it included acquisition, testing and operation of two test buses, training on maintenance and operation, impact analysis of operation of buses, and formulation of a follow-up phase. Additionally follow up activities could still have been formulated even in the absence of GEF support, and this did not occur, as no sustainability strategy was presented.

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

The executing agencies for this project were the Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA), and Social Fund for Development (SFD) The TE does not provide a rating for project execution, however this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The TE concludes based on a review of PIRs and interviews that the project manager and entities involved facilitated the implementation of all planned activities. However, responsibility for some of the issues leading to delays might have been avoided. For instance, the issues with customs bringing in the buses could have been avoided with proper planning and communications, as it does not make sense that SFD, a government agency, would have to pay money to Customs, another government agency, for a government-funded programme. The project's Steering Committee was set up by the SFD and met about 5 times during 2001-2003, no information is provided on whether or not is met after 2003. The TE states did not consider meeting notes as they were not translated, and that there were a lack of progress reports. (TE p.21) As the TE notes, follow up activities, and a sustainability strategy, could have been formulated and were not.

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 two electric buses were handed over to the Egyptian Supreme council of Antiquities by mid-2003 and at the time of the terminal evaluation the two buses were operating on a commercial basis. As noted in the section on sustainability, emission reductions from using an electric bus in comparison with a diesel but is about 1.75kg CO2 per km travelled.

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 note any socioeconomic changes occurring as a result 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

This project, which was meant to be phase 1a of the Introduction of Viable Electric and Hybrid-Electric Bus Technology, has provided useful insights in the acquisition, operation and maintenance issues involved in introducing electric and hybrid-electric buses. As a result of the project, local technical staff are now capable of operating and maintaining buses, and interest among managers, including the SCA and Egyptian bus managers has also been raised. (TE p.23)

b) Governance

The TE and PIRs do not list any governance changes as having arisen from the project.

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 list any unintended impacts 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.

At the time of the TE, the Egyptian Supreme Council of Antiquities expressed interest in following up on project activities. The private sector in Egypt also expressed interest in locally manufacturing electric buses. The difficulty described in the TE is that government entities are interested in employing electric buses but are not able to take a decision on where and how to acquire and operate buses, while the Egyptian private sector will not do any investment without more information on what the demand for electric buses will be. (TE p.24)

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 Lessons learned as described in the terminal evaluation are as follows:

Through the course of the project there have been many delays, some of which could have been avoided. For example as the issue with customs which could have been avoided with proper planning and communications, as it does not make sense that SFD, a government agency would have to pay money to Customs, another government agency, for a government-funded programme.

Another lesson of the project is that when introducing new technology in a country, unexpected issues will occur. For example, one of the buses was hit by system failures. Testing the buses at various sites (for example Giza, Luxor) under different conditions would enable to determine the required specifications adjusted to suit the Egyptian environment. This also allows for a learning process in which Egyptian technicians can gain firsthand experience fixing problems on-site.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations given in the terminal evaluation, as described in the terminal evaluation are as follows:

At the time of the project evaluation the EEAA and UNDP had presented a proposal on ‘Sustainable Transport’ for GEF co-funding, which would have the following components-

1. Introduction of high-quality integrated public transport services for Cairo and its satellite cities that connect to the existing metro lines

    a. Connection of Cairo with satellite towns, starting with the lines Tahrir Square (Cairo) via Lebanon Square to Sheikh-Zayed, 6th of October and Media Production City
    b. Improved Services within the satellite cities, starting with 6th of October
    c. Feeder bus station with integrating ticketing for pilot stations of the existing metro lines
2. Increase of non-motorized transport in the modal share in provincial cities
3. Introduction of Transport Demand Management (TDM) including micro-pedestrian areas, parking policies and facilities, introduction of public transport priority treatment and priority bus lanes
4. Improved energy efficiency of freight transport

Although formally electric buses are not part of the UNDP/GEF proposal, the TE recommends exploring if some buses to be employed in component 1 could not be electric, or electric CNG hybrid vehicles for longer routes.

The TE also recommends conducting a study on the economic feasibility of manufacturing (parts of) the electric drive system in Egypt. Egypt has the infrastructure for the production of high-quality buses the range form 6 meter minibuses to large deluxe long-distance buses. Only the engine and driveline components are imported from international companies, such as GM, Scania, etc. Thus the existing bus production know-how can be extended to incorporating electric or electric-hybrid drivelines. The larger the market for electric vehicles, the more interesting it will be for Egyptian companies to set up the necessary technology and manufacturing infrastructure.

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 assesses the relevant outcomes and impacts of the project.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence is somewhat lacking as no explanation is given of the disconnect between objectives and outcomes listed in the project document and the PIRs. Additionally some information, specifically steering committee meeting notes, were not reviewed because they were in Arabic, which is an omission on the part of the evaluators.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project does not assess sustainability in terms of Financial resources, Sociopolitical risks, Institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks. It simply states that as follow up phases have not materialized, it is not possible to have a say about impact of electric buses initiatives in terms of transformation of the market for electric vehicles	**U**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned provided in the TE are supported by the evidence presented, but do not explain fully the issues leading to the long delays this project encountered and are comprehensive.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does include actual project costs, including per activity, and co-financing used. (TE p.20 & 21)	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does not discuss the project's M&E system, but does mention a lack of progress reports.	**U**
Overall TE Rating	0.3*(5+3)+0.1*(2+4+5+2) 3.7	**MS**

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

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