

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		March 2011
GEF Projects ID:	2118 FSP + 3185 MSP		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion (Million US\$)</u>
IA/EA Projects ID:	3233 (UNDP) + ---- (UNEP)	GEF financing:	2,151,325 + 835,000	5,000,000**
Project Names:	Total Sector Methyl Bromide Phase Out in Countries with Economies in Transition (UNDP) + Continued Institutional Strengthening Support for CEITs to meet the obligations of the Montreal Protocol (UNEP)	IA/EA own:	0.0 + 300,000	0.0**
Country:	Regional (UNDP): Bulgaria, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Uzbekistan + Regional (UNEP): Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan	Government:	1,871,929 + 108,040	515,187 Bulgaria + 541,064 Hungary + 120,800 Latvia + 150,200 Lithuania + 918,078 Poland**
		Other*:	50,000 + 0.0	50,000**
		Total Cofinancing:	1,921,929 + 408,040	2,295,329**
Operational Program:	Ozone STRM – Short-Term Response Measures (UNDP & UNEP)	Total Project Cost:	4,073,254 + 1,243,040	7,295,329 **
IAs	UNDP + UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	National Ozone Units (NOUs)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		February 2005 + June 2007
		Closing Date	Proposed: December 2007 + March 2010	Actual: December 2007 + March 2010
TER Prepared by: Oreste Maia-Andrade	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 34 months + 33 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 34 months + 33 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 0 month + 0 month
Author of TE:		TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and

Tom Batchelor, Valery Smirnov		March 2010	August 2010	submission date (in months): 5 months
----------------------------------	--	------------	-------------	--

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

**These numbers refer only to project 2118.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	HS + S	U/A	N/A	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	U/A	N/A	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S + S	U/A	N/A	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	U/A
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	U

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

No. The report is extremely extensive (750 pages) and its presentation structure is not reviewer-friendly as are other UNDP and UNEP Terminal Evaluations.

- This TE does not provide a unified overall evaluation to all criteria as per GEF EO guidelines to agencies for the preparation of TEs referring to two projects.
- The provision of a significant amount of information is provided per individual project per country.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings were noted in the TE.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the TE:

- In summary, the main objective of these projects was the rapid phase-out of Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS), particularly the Total Sector Methyl Bromide Phase Out in Countries with Economies in Transition (CEITs), consistently with international efforts in this direction – i.e. a continued institutional strengthening support for CEITs to meet the obligations of the Montreal Protocol.
- The TE further clarifies that “the *Ozone-Depleting Substances Portfolio* aimed to phase-out of ODS in nine CEITs. It comprised 42 sub-projects in the refrigeration and air-conditioning, foam blowing, solvent, aerosol and fire-fighting sectors. The nine CEITs involved in this project were Armenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Seven of these countries are classified as developed in the Montreal Protocol and required to phase out ODS earlier than Turkmenistan and Armenia which are classified as developing countries.”

Considering that the TE was about two projects, the document explains that:

- The *ODS Portfolio* consisted of a Mid-Term Evaluation of the sub-projects implemented in Armenia, and Terminal Evaluations of the sub-projects implemented in Azerbaijan, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania,

- Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.
 - The *Methyl Bromide Regional Project* consisted of Terminal Evaluations of the sub-projects implemented in Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland.
 - These evaluations determined the extent to which the sub-project's objectives had been achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assessed any other positive or negative impact of the projects. Where possible, the extent and magnitude of the impact of the sub-project was documented and the likelihood of future impacts determined.
 - The Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations assessed the performance of each sub-project and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results achieved.
- No changes were noted.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

According to the TE:

- The projects had two components: a technology conversion component (UNDP) and a technical assistance and training component (UNEP). The technology conversion components of these projects comprised of sub-projects in the refrigeration and air-conditioning, foam blowing, solvent and aerosol sectors, and in the halon sector containing ODS phase-out targets, to be implemented by the UNDP. The technical assistance components were implemented by UNEP and typically involve institutional strengthening, training for customs officials and refrigeration technicians.

The TE also mentions that the main project objectives and outputs were as follows:

- The leveraging of existing infrastructure and local expertise for the development and implementation of cost-effective, national phase out co-ordination structures and mechanisms to carry out the work of the project,
- Rapid transfer of alternative technologies to methyl bromide users, including installation of relevant equipment and participatory training at local level, focusing on a rapid replacement for the 2005 growing season to permit country compliance with the Montreal Protocol (based on alternative fumigants to the extent necessary);
- Enhanced awareness and confidence of MB users and stakeholders in the phase-out process, providing easy-to-use technical information materials for the MB users, and increasing users' ability to manage their pest control problems and find their own solutions. Monitoring the technical efficacy and economic performance of alternatives, improving alternatives where necessary to achieve phase-out.
- Building capacity and carrying out pilots for the longer-term development of more sustainable alternatives based on non-chemical or IPM methods, reducing dependency on potentially hazardous chemical alternatives to ensure sustainability in the long term. This also has interlinkages with chemical management and enhanced health security.

No changes were noted.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As explained in the TE, “Phasing out ODS is one of the goals of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The GEF finances projects that phase out ODS where these activities would be complementary to those funded under the Multilateral Fund of the Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer. So as not to duplicate those activities funded under the Multilateral Fund, GEF financing is targeted primarily to activities in Eastern Europe.” The TE further explains that “The activity is consistent with the GEF Focal Area of Ozone Depletion, and the GEF Strategic Priority called ‘Ozone Depletion OZ-1 Methyl Bromide Reduction’. The GEF Operational Strategy for the Ozone Depletion Focal Area, as well as the strategic priority for the Ozone Depletion Focal Area aim “to reduce - and to the extent feasible, eliminate -- the remaining Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS): methyl bromide and HCFCs”. It should be recognised that implicit in this priority is the goal of bringing Article 2 countries into compliance with the Montreal Protocol, which requires phase-out of non-exempted uses in 2005. The project is also consistent with the GEF document ‘GEF Support to Countries with Economies in Transition in Phasing Out of Annex C1 and E Substances of the Montreal Protocol’ (GEF/C.18/Inf.6) which states that “In order to achieve compliance with the Montreal Protocol, a full phase out of all reported (non-QPS) consumption (and production) needs to be achieved by the end of 2004... consumption needs to be reduced from the current levels... to zero in 2005.”” Considering the valuable importance of the Project for the implementing agencies and the CEITs, as well as with regard to ODS phasing out, its relevance is rated as satisfactory. 	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: U/A
<p>Unable to Assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although it is possible to infer satisfactory results from comments, that was no clear reference to overall effectiveness provided in the TE. 	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, “the total funding by GEF/UNDP for the implementation of CFC-free refrigerator and compressor production in these six countries was \$6.718 million. Based on the phase out of 275.6 ODP-tonnes, the cost-effectiveness was \$24.38 ODP-kg per year. The cost-effectiveness of the installation of CFC-free technology for domestic refrigerator production was compared with the cost-effectiveness of similar projects carried out in developing countries. The MLF- (Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol) financed the evaluation of 28 companies in 11 countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia, which was 20% of the total number of 144 refrigeration projects completed by February 2000. The average planned cost-effectiveness of these MLF-funded projects was \$21.69 ODP-kg per year. The overall cost-effectiveness of \$24.38 ODP-kg per year in the <i>ODS portfolio</i> was therefore similar to the cost of the phase out of ozone-depleting substances in domestic refrigerator production projects that had been carried out in developing countries.” Also, “based on the phase out of 260.3 ODP-tonnes of ozone-depleting substances at the Yerevan and Vilnius aerosol producers for a funding of \$696,000, the cost-effectiveness was \$2.64 ODP-kg per year. The cost-effectiveness of the installation of CFC-free technology for aerosol production was compared with the cost-effectiveness of similar projects carried out in developing countries. The MLF reported no clear correlation between the size of an aerosol project and its cost-effectiveness, neither in relation to the volume of funding nor the CFC consumption phased out. The MLF also reported a rather wide range of values for the actual cost-effectiveness, from less than \$1.00 to almost \$9.00 ODP-kg per year. The average was approximately \$3.00 ODP-kg per year, for quantities phased out up to about 100 ODP-tonnes per year. The 35 projects evaluated by the MLF were 45% of all 77 aerosol projects that had been completed by the end of 2001, and 32% of 108 aerosol projects approved by the MLF’s Executive Committee by July of 2002. The overall cost-effectiveness of \$2.64 ODP-kg per year in the <i>ODS portfolio</i> for aerosol producers was therefore less than the average cost-effectiveness of the phase out of ODS in aerosol projects financed by the MLF in developing countries.” According to the TE, “the cost-effectiveness of the project to replace CFCs with methylene chloride at the PCC was \$17.82 ODP-kg per year, based on a project cost of \$106,920 to phase out the consumption of 6 ODP tonnes of CFCs per year. The MLF (2001) reported the average actual cost-effectiveness of nine solvent projects completed in developing countries was \$14.92 ODP-kg per year. The cost-effectiveness of the sub-project to phase out the use of CFCs at PCC was assessed as about 20% more expensive than the average 	

actual cost-effectiveness of the conversion to CFC-free technology for projects financed in developing countries by the MLF. The cost-effectiveness of the project was, however, within the MLF cost-effectiveness threshold for project funding of \$19.73 ODP-kg per year. If the costs of certification had been included in the project, the cost-effectiveness of the project would have exceeded the reported average cost-effectiveness of projects on the replacement of ODS solvents in developing countries.”

- Considering the analysis provided by the TE with regard to cost-effectiveness, particularly the standard conclusions that were inferred, demonstrating similarity between cost-effectiveness of projects in the CEITs and projects in other regions, this criterion is rated as satisfactory.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: 4
Moderately Satisfactory:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TE mentions that “[regarding budget], these vary by country and are specified in the relevant project documents. Project monies for IS and/or training projects range from about US\$ 114,000 to US\$ 1 million. GEF funding in investment sub-projects varies from US \$40,000 to US \$2.85 million. The total cost of the investment component in 10 CEITs amounts to about US \$24 million.” • The TE also mentions that “participating countries considered further funding essential for continuing to implement new alternatives and to refine the existing ones. Parties were concerned with the review of fumigants selected as alternatives to methyl bromide, which questioned their sustainability in the longer term. Despite these concerns, the prospects of returning to methyl bromide were assessed as remote.” • Considering the TE positive remarks, but noting that detailed information about the overall financial sustainability is missing, this criterion is rated as moderately satisfactory. 	
b. Socio political	Rating: 4
Moderately Satisfactory:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TE found that “legislative and policy changes to initially restrict and later ban the import and export of ODS; mandate the recovery and recycling of ODS; and that promoted the training of technicians in the refrigeration sector; all played a critical role in providing relevant signals to the private sector and individual consumers to adopt more environmentally-friendly alternative chemicals and technologies.” • According to the TE, “legislative and policy changes were observed to be most successful in the EU-CEITs in both the <i>ODS Portfolio</i> and <i>Methyl Bromide Regional Project</i>. These countries tended to have legislation in place before or soon after the beginning of the GEF project intervention and all of them continued to update their legislation after joining the EU, which has led to further reductions in ODS and more restrictive measures than those required by the Montreal Protocol. In the case of the <i>Regional Project</i>, the legislation to restrict the use of methyl bromide had been in place for several years largely as a result of an earlier GEF project that raised awareness of alternatives to methyl bromide, and because of the need to conform to EU legislation that was more strict than the Montreal Protocol on methyl bromide.” • In contrast, “in the non-EU CEITs many of the projects were slow to develop and the countries were slow to implement legislative and policy changes because the institutional infrastructure necessary to carry out such changes was not in place. The lack of legislation and policy led to problems in controlling ODS, particularly in relation to trade and customs controls. This resulted in consumption of ODS exceeding Montreal Protocol limits for many years. Since projects have been completed in the non-EU-CEITs, institutional capacities have been reduced, with insufficient focus on updating of legislation to address emerging issues such as the HCFC phase-out which was recently accelerated in 2007 by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.” • Considering that satisfactory results, including the involvement of the private sector and individual consumers, were founded in the EU-CEITs, but not in the non-EU-CEITs, socio-political sustainability is rated as moderately satisfactory. 	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 4
Moderately Satisfactory:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National and EU legislation that existed at the time of the project severely restricted the use of methyl bromide and required significant resources from NOUs at the time to report activities that used methyl bromide. The EU legislation that was in force at the time of the project has since been superseded by revised 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> legislation that has eliminated the use of methyl bromide altogether. The GEF financing of the non-investment activities was important for the development and implementation of policy and legislation to phase out consumption and promote ODS-free alternatives; government institutional capacity to manage the ODS phase-out; government customs and border security measures to curtail illegal trade in ODS; and the implementation of ODS recovery, recycle and reclamation programs that allowed servicing of existing equipment without imported ODS. The government commitment to the ODS phase out was in general better in EU-CEITs than in non-EU-CEITs. The commitment by EU-CEITs was largely driven by EU accession which required them to harmonize national legislation on ODS with more stringent EU legislation. It also contributed to regular updates of legislation and policy on ODS reduction and phase out, compelled reporting on many aspects of the ODS phase out, and vigilance on illegal trade in ODS. By contrast, the government commitment in non-EU-CEITs was much weaker as shown by the lack of ratification of key amendments to the Montreal Protocol, lack of centralized budget funding for NOUs, and insufficient legislation and policies to restrict ODS and to promote alternatives. In these countries, illegal trade in ODS undermined their ODS reductions and is a significant challenge to phase-out. Considering the positive results, especially regarding the progressive improvement and harmonization of EU- and non-EU-CEITs legislation with regard to ODS phase-out, but remarking that the improvements in non-EU-CEITs has presented shortcomings, institutional framework is rated as moderately satisfactory. 	
d. Environmental	Rating: U/A
<p>Unable to Assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having remarked that no clear reference to overall effectiveness was provided in the TE, environmental sustainability is then unable to be assessed. 	

4.3 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p>a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>
<p>Co-financing might be considered relevant to the ODS phase out, especially in the EU-CEITs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TE clarified that The total budget was US\$ 7,295,329 with US\$ 5,000,000 funded by the GEF Trust Fund and in kind co-funding from; Bulgaria US\$515,187, Hungary US\$ 541,064, Latvia US\$120,800, Lithuania US\$150,200, Poland 918,078 and FAO (in kind) US\$ 50,000. This excludes the PDF B financing of US\$ 175,500.” According to the TE, regarding budget, “these vary by country and are specified in the relevant project documents. Project monies for IS and/or training projects range from about US\$ 114,000 to US\$ 1 million.” Regarding the financing and co-financing of investment and non-investment activities, the TE explains the following: “The GEF financing of the non-investment activities was important for the development and implementation of policy and legislation to phase out consumption and promote ODS-free alternatives; government institutional capacity to manage the ODS phase-out; government customs and border security measures to curtail illegal trade in ODS; and the implementation of ODS recovery, recycle and reclamation programs that allowed servicing of existing equipment without imported ODS. The government commitment to the ODS phase out was in general better in EU-CEITs than Non-EU-CEITs. The commitment by EU-CEITs was largely driven by EU accession which required them to harmonize national legislation on ODS with more stringent EU legislation. It also contributed to regular updates of legislation and policy on ODS reduction and phase out, compelled reporting on many aspects of the ODS phase out, and vigilance on illegal trade in ODS. By contrast, the government commitment in Non-EU-CEITs was much weaker as shown by the lack of ratification of key amendments to the Montreal Protocol, lack of centralized budget funding for NOUs, and insufficient legislation and policies to restrict ODS and to promote alternatives. In these countries, illegal trade in ODS undermined their ODS reductions and is a significant challenge to phase-out. The GEF financing of investment activities resulted in a commitment from the industry to the phase out of ozone-depleting substances. The GEF budgeted about \$2.5 million to fund the transition to ODS-free technology in 19 investment projects in diverse sectors: refrigeration production, foam, aerosol, solvent, refrigeration & air conditioning servicing, and agriculture. This funding provided for important technological and production changes that enabled enterprises to comply with the Montreal Protocol and to maintain and / or gain market share and thus make profits. Of the 19 enterprises visited, 13 were fully operational in 2009 and one was partially operational as it produced ODS-free aerosols by

campaign production according to customer demand. **Some governments** had decided to not fund the NOU from the central budget. For example, Kazakhstan established the Climate Change Coordination Center that depended on external contracts (UNEP, others) for its existence. The situation was similar in Poland where the NOU had to compete with other private contractors to become the preferred contractor to undertake tasks on ODS for the Ministry of the Environment. The success of the NOUs in both circumstances depended on the qualifications and ability of the staff to undertake the work, and in having sufficient funds available for the work. Out-sourcing activities by the government are a modern approach that has been shown to operate so far in these projects, and might open up opportunities for other governments to consider the same as centralized budgets come under more pressure for reductions.”

- Having considered the TE remarks regarding governmental involvement, counterpart financing might be considered relevant to the ODS phase out, especially in the EU-CEITs. However, GEF funding represented the bulk of the projects’ financial structure.

b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Delays in funding, among other issues, are said to have hampered the development and implementation of new programs:

- According to the TE, “[delays are] leading to increased threats or risks to the successful phase out of the remaining ODS and in particular HCFCs, and to actions to address destruction of banks of unwanted ODS stockpiles. [...] The financial administration of the projects was not always timely. [...] Lost time on the project meant more emissions of ODS to the atmosphere and environmental damage. Financial delays occurred mainly in the Institutional Strengthening projects and the training projects. Therefore administrative delays are not only demoralizing and destabilizing for the NOU but they also incur an environmental cost. The lesson learnt is that UNEP must improve delivery of finance to ensure that there are no gaps in time between projects.”
- Although delays in funding, communication difficulties and administrative burdens are said to have hampered the development and implementation of new programs, they were not necessarily significant, since project impacts were mostly considered positive in the TE.

c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

The TE refers to country ownership with regard to ratifications, legislation and cooperation between National Ozone Units (NOUs) and other stakeholders:

- **Ratification:** The CEITs ratified, acceded, accepted or approved up to 6 legislative instruments: The Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol; followed by the London, Copenhagen, Montreal and Beijing Amendments. According to the TE, “most countries in this evaluation had by 2009 ratified all six amendments to the Montreal Protocol, except for Kazakhstan that had ratified three and Azerbaijan that had ratified five.”

Legislation: In the ODS portfolio, the ban on the import of CFCs is an important legislative indicator of the focus by governments in reducing ongoing demand for ODS and also to encourage use of alternatives. CEITs that banned CFC imports more than a year before the end of the Project in each country were considered to have implemented legislation that targeted the ODS reduction and phase out, as they used the legislation to drive the reductions. The EU-CEITs banned the import of CFCs much earlier (from 1994 to 2001) than the Non-EU-CEITs. The survey questionnaire showed that the NOUs in the EU-CEITs (Estonia and Lithuania) ‘*strongly agreed*’ that sufficient legal and policy instruments were currently in place to address the reduction and phase out of ODS, compared to NOUs from Latvia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan in the Non-EU-CEITs that ‘*slightly disagreed*’ that that sufficient legal and policy instruments were currently in place. The positive response from Estonia and Lithuania suggested that the regional EU legislation had assisted with the implementation of national policies and measures to promote the phase out of ozone-depleting substances in those countries. All countries except Turkmenistan had intended to put in place legislation during the project. **Methyl Bromide:** According to the TE, “in regard to the Regional Project that phased out methyl bromide, all of the countries involved in the program had put in place legislation that had restricted imports of methyl bromide for all uses except QPS. Permitting or licensing systems were required to import methyl bromide, import quotas were in place, and in some cases new uses were banned. This legislation was implemented prior to the commencement of this project in late 2004 and 2005 as a result of the countries’ involvement in the project Initiating early phase out of methyl bromide in CEITs through awareness raising, policy development and demonstration/training activities, which started in 2000 and concluded in 2002. Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland also had to harmonize their national legislation with the EU legislation prior to acceding to the EU on 1 May 2004 (for the last 4 countries) and on

1 January 2007 for Bulgaria.”

- **Cooperation between the NOU and other stakeholders:** The Customs service is one of the most important collaborators with the NOU because of its responsibility for intercepting illegal trade in ODS and ODS-containing equipment. The Customs service can be a strong determinant in enforcing legislation and policies on ODS. The degree of cooperation between the NOU and the Customs service, and the extent of the training of the Customs officers in detecting ODS and ODS-containing equipment was used as an indicator of the extent to which the NOU has been strengthened by the Institutional Strengthening project. One of measures of the cooperation is the frequency of reports of illegal interceptions between the Customs service / Inspectorate and the Ministry of Environment or the NOU. This was reported to be 3-12 months for all countries in the *Portfolio* except for Azerbaijan, Latvia, Poland and Kazakhstan where the information was not available. Some countries such as Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan reported that they focused more on imports from some countries than others, based on their experiences with illegal trade in the past, which assisted them to intercept illegal trade in ODS more effectively.
- Considering these remarks in the TE, achievements regarding ratification, legislation and cooperation between the NOUs and other stakeholders might be considered a demonstration of country ownership, especially from the EU-CEITs.

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): 5

Satisfactory:

- Regarding M&E methods, the PAD for **Project 2118** explained that “in the participating countries, independent bodies have been identified to take on M&E duties within the country. This decision was taken in view of the importance of streamlining the implementation process almost immediately, given the fact that countries must urgently phase out methyl bromide in time for the deadline. As such, there is a pressing need to “get it right the first time”, and so the M&E body will act as a continuous management tool, visiting MB users, identifying success and failure factors, and providing information to the PCU (particularly feedback to the Steering Committee and TC), consultants, and Implementing Agencies. [There will be an] interaction of the in-country M&E body with the Implementing Agencies, PCU, highlighting their role as a management tool. As such, M&E will help to refine the implementation process in a continuous manner, from the management level to the in-field technical implementation level. The M&E unit will focus on any problems associated with the adoption of the alternative technologies, whether technical or socio-economic. [...] The M&E reports will be submitted to the national PCU, Regional/International Project Steering Committee Implementing Agencies, Donors (if not part of the Steering Committees), Information Dissemination bodies and European Network. It is anticipated that there will be one review in mid 2005, one at the end of 2005, one in early/mid 2006 and one at the end of 2006 when most project activities will have been completed.”
- The Project Document for **Project 3185** with regard to Report, Format and Content, Timing and Responsibility, M&E was structured the following: In-Country Progress Reports (Conducted half-yearly, within 30 days of end of each reporting period, under the responsibility of NOU/NSC): Document the completion of planned activities, and describe progress in relation to the annual operating/work plan. Review any implementation problems that impact on performance. Summary of problems and proposed action to resolve problems. Highlights of achievements. Reports will use standard UNEP Progress Report format (will mirror Annex 1D & E formats of this project document). The project logframe will be attached to each report and progress reported against outcome and output indicators. → Self-Evaluation Reports Per GEFSEC format will be conducted yearly (after project has been under implementation for one year, under responsibility of UNEP Task Manager with input from UNEP DTIE). Consolidated Annual Summary Progress Reports (Conducted yearly, within 45 days of end of the reporting period, under responsibility of UNEP DTIE Officers/UNEP GEF Task Manager Ozone): Presents a consolidated summary review of progress in the project as a whole, in each of its activities and in each output. Provides summary review and assessment of progress under each activity set out in the annual work plan, highlighting significant results and progress toward achievement of the overall work program. Provides a general source of information, used in all general project reporting. Reports will use a standard format to be developed following the UNEP GEF Progress Report model. The project logframe will be used as a reference for the progress reporting so that in essence there is a constant check of progress made against outcome and output indicators. A consolidated summary of the half-yearly reports. Summary of progress and of all project activities. Description of progress under each activity and in each output. Review of delays and problems, and of action proposed to deal with these. Review of plans for the following period, with report on progress under each heading. Financial reports: Report on any cofinancing that has been provided to project. Use UNEP GEF format for reporting and documentation of realized co-financing. To be conducted annually, under responsibility of the NOU. →

wrote a letter to each of the NOUs informing them of the pending Evaluation and introducing the contractors that were undertaking the Evaluation. The letter identified the need for the NOU to facilitate meetings of the consultants with stakeholders and beneficiaries that had been involved in the sub-projects in order to obtain information on the results, its sustainability, strengths and weaknesses. The **meetings with the NOUs** were undertaken at the same time as an Impact Evaluation was being undertaken for the GEF in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, in order to share the costs of the Evaluations for both UNEP and the GEF. The letter from UNEP/EOU was followed by a request from the consultant to the NOU for a three day meeting at a mutually agreeable time in which the relevant information could be obtained and analyzed. The consultant requested the NOU to arrange meetings with beneficiaries of the equipment so that the impact of the project could be determined from firsthand accounts. **Interviews and telephone interviews** were held with stakeholders involved in the sub-projects, Additional information and opinions were obtained from representatives of the GEF, UNEP, UNDP and the MLF that had experience in these or similar projects. The interviews were combined with a questionnaire that was sent by the NOU to commercial stakeholders. When necessary there was follow up with the stakeholders in order to obtain new information or to clarify draft information. The consultants engaged the services of a local interpreter when interpretation became necessary for communication. The information obtained from the sources described above was transcribed for each project into the UNEP template using the format provided in the Terms of Reference. The consultants conducted in-depth interviews using **standardized, semi-structured guides and questionnaire surveys** with government, research institutes and private sector enterprises. The questionnaire survey was devised about half way through the completion of the missions in order to validate and confirm key issues arising out of the qualitative data collection. In these ways, the approach adopted conformed to current practices in impact evaluation that is to use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods.”

- → The UNEP/EOU was kept informed of progress on the GEF Evaluation Report and this evaluation report. In the format for the report, the UNEP Terms of Reference required no more than 50 pages for the executive summary, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. **The main substantive part of the report in Section 8 followed these 50 pages and described the “Project Performance, Impact Evaluations and Ratings” for each project implemented in each country.** In these project assessments, Mr Valery Smirnov was assigned the four Russian-speaking countries of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan; and Dr Tom Batchelor was assigned responsibility for the remaining countries that were in Europe (Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland) and Central Asia (Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan).
- There were some limitations that constrained the evaluation. Firstly, annual data relating to the consumption of ozone-depleting substances by CEITs was not always submitted by these countries for every year and for each class of ozone-depleting substances. Data gaps resulted in a focus on this evaluation only on CFC and halon across CEITs, as the consumption of these classes of substances were reported more consistently than others. This limitation was not serious because CFC and halon are amongst the most important of the ODS in terms of being among the most ozone depleting, and they were required to be the main focus of the evaluation as required by the Terms of Reference. Secondly, financial information always included a budget but a report on expenditure was not available in many cases. Data on GEF funding across CEITs and co-financing available in the GEF database were not always consistent with data obtained from implementation completion reports. These financial limitations were not serious as the evaluation required more emphasis on the outcomes and impact of the project rather than on the financial aspects.
- *Considering the shortcomings* regarding limitations and irregularity of information availability, *and noting particularly the structure of the terminal evaluation*, whose main substantive part (section 8) referred to project performance, impact evaluations and ratings “for each project implemented in each country”, not in a unified form for the overall project analysis, M&E implementation is rated as unsatisfactory.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): U/A

b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): U/A

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

Unable to Assess:

- Regarding the implementation arrangements, the TE explains that “UNEP implemented the non-investment components of the project, while UNDP implemented the investment components. UNEP appointed a full-time Project Coordinator and Project Assistant, and organized the regional activities listed in the project document. Much of the co-ordination and execution arrangements for the project lay in the hands of the countries and stakeholders, with the national Project Co-ordination Units ensuring that on-the-ground activities ran smoothly. They were to be monitored by national M&E groups, who were to give feedback to

the national PCU Steering Committees, as well as the Regional/International Project Steering Committee upon which implementing agencies sit.”

- **National implementation of projects:** the TE explains that “UNEP specializes in strengthening the institutional capacity of the country to put in place effective actions to help with the phase out of ozone-depleting substances. These actions include awareness raising, training, development of policies and measures, and demonstration on the use of more benign alternatives to ozone depleting substances. UNDP focuses on so-called ‘investment’ activities that substitute ODS-dependent with ODS-free technology.”
- **UNEP sub-project implementation:** “The sub-projects designated for UNEP were implemented by UNEP-DTIE in Paris, which has the mandate for information clearing-house activities, as well as training and policy setting under the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol. UNDP’s sub-projects were executed by UNDP’s Montreal Protocol Unit in close coordination with UNDP’s GEF unit, and in conjunction with the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) with the help of their respective UNDP Country Offices, as is the case for most of its Multilateral Fund activities. UNEP, as the GEF Implementing Agency, was responsible for overall project supervision to ensure consistency with GEF and UNEP policies and procedures. UNEP also provided guidance on linkages with related UNEP and GEF-funded activities. Most activities in the sub-projects that involved UNEP were to be completed within 3 years. These involved Institutional Strengthening that aimed to improve the expertise and operational competency of staff in the NOU and other relevant organizations, training of refrigeration technicians in best-practice management of ozone-depleting substances, and training of Customs officials in the identification of ozone-depleting substances and detection of illegal imports.”
- **UNDP role in sub-project activities:** UNDP implemented investment sub-projects in these CEITs, which include aerosol, foam, solvent, refrigeration manufacturing and refrigerant and halon recovery/recycling and agricultural projects (see the list of projects and sub-projects in Annex 1). UNDP was responsible for procuring equipment, installing it, on-the-job training, testing and trials, and commissioning the equipment.
- Except for the descriptions above, which explain expectations about what the agencies were responsible for and how the project implementation was carried out, *the TE does not provide any assessment of IAs’ overall performance*. As in other criteria, the TE provides evaluation of IAs performance “per each project per country”, which makes this reviewer unable to assess this criterion.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): U/A

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

Unable to Assess:

- **National Ozone Units (NOUs):** To analyze the institutional strengthening, the TE explains that “the NOU was usually assisted by a deputy, several national experts engaged on a short term basis for various activities such as ODS data collection, ODS legislation drafting, delivery of training workshops, and officials in other relevant ministries and organizations. UNEP provided policy support for development of sustainable ODS phase-out structures and mechanisms. The NOU was involved in a range of activities. A Work Plan was developed that addressed the national ODS phase-out plan. The NOU was involved in the drafting of the ODS licensing legislation for ODS import/export control and in the establishment of quota system for ODS imports. Other activities included: a) Establishing requirements for labeling ODS and ODS-dependent equipment and products; b) Elaborating the procedures for ODS emission regulation, including changes/revisions; c) Public awareness campaigns, including preparing and distributing leaflets and posters aimed at the public awareness on ozone issues; media articles and interviews on ozone related issues; public seminars on ozone issues; and organizing the commemoration of the ozone-day activities; d) Collecting and analyzing data on ODS import/export, recovered and recycled ODS and submitting consumption data to the Ozone Secretariat annually; e) Developing the national ODS phase-out schedule, including sector specific restrictions; and f) Submitting progress and financial reports to UNEP/DTIE on the Institutional Strengthening sub-project.”
- **Training for Refrigeration Technicians:** the NOU was responsible for: a) Preparing and organizing workshops for refrigeration technicians; b) preparing equipment for the training workshops and training centers, consistent with the procurement rules; c) Preparing and publishing the workshop report. UNDP procured the recovery-recycling equipment. This was typically followed by training in its use. The NOU was usually responsible for distributing the equipment to the service technicians and servicing facilities, but

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

- sometimes the distribution of equipment was managed by the local refrigeration association or similar body.
- **Training for Customs Officials:** the NOU was responsible for: a) Coordinating the second phase workshop(s); b) Obtaining equipment for the training workshops and training centers, consistent with the procurement rules; c) Preparing and publishing the workshop report.
- *As for the IAs, EAs were not evaluated in the TE in a unified overall manner.* Except for the descriptions above, which basically explained expectations about what the agencies were responsible for and how the project execution was carried out, the TE does not provide any assessment of EAs' overall performance. As in other criteria, the TE provides evaluation of EAs performance "per each project per country", making this review unable to assess this criterion.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?
 Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts / GEB
UNDP To implement sub-projects in the refrigeration and air-conditioning, foam blowing, solvent and aerosol sectors, and in the halon sector containing ODS phase-out targets UNEP To Promote Institutional strengthening, UNEP To Train customs officials and refrigeration technicians	Air-conditioners, foam blowers, solvents and aerosols were converted, reducing CFCs and halon significantly NOUs developed and strengthened knowledge and practice regarding ODS phasing out Customs Officials and Refrigeration Technicians were trained Equipment was provided for the recovery, recycling and reclamation of ODS 7,879 technicians trained in the nine CEITs, 64% from Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, showing the importance these countries attached to having ODS recovered and recycled Twenty five percent of CEITs delivered training on reducing illegal trade in ODS to Customs officers in the past 3 years, after the Project was completed Many skilful employees of companies, governments and agencies demonstrated the technical and economic feasibility of the alternatives that were involved in this Regional Project	ODS and Methyl Bromide consumption significantly reduced Staff were assigned to ozone layer protection activities within the NOUs Most countries ratified all six amendments to the Montreal Protocol Import of CFCs was banned All of the domestic refrigerator, compressor and aerosol companies achieved their phase out reduction targets that were stated in the Project Documents The program to eliminate methyl bromide contributed to a general program that aimed to produce food with minimal chemical input	Ozone layer protection improved

b. What are the actual (intended or unintended) impacts of the project?
 Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts and to impact drivers (Impact drivers are the **significant factors** that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

- Following is a summary of impacts listed in the TE with regard to projects' activities:
- **ODS and Methyl Bromide consumption significantly reduced:** The impact of the projects to phase out ozone-depleting substances was determined by examination of the consumption data officially submitted to the Ozone Secretariat in the mandatory annual reports provided to the Montreal Protocol by governments that

had ratified this treaty. For this impact evaluation, the reductions in CFCs and halon were the most important since these were required to be phased out in seven of the nine countries that were categorized as developed in the Montreal Protocol and that were evaluated in this project. The consumption did not reach zero because of the consumption only in Armenia and Turkmenistan who are developing countries. The Montreal Protocol allowed developing countries to consume CFCs in 2007. In 2005, the CFC and halon consumption was mostly due to consumption in Armenia and Turkmenistan (101.9 ODP-tonnes), and some consumption by Azerbaijan (21.9 ODP-tonnes) which was categorized as a developed country in the Montreal Protocol. UNEP stated that the aim of the project was to phase-out about 167 tonnes of non-exempted uses of methyl bromide in specific Countries with Economies in Transition: Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland. Elimination of methyl bromide would enable these countries to comply with the requirement in the Montreal Protocol of zero consumption of methyl bromide by 31 December 2004, excluding quarantine and pre-shipment and other exempted uses. Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan were permitted to participate as observers, even though they reported no consumption in methyl bromide, as they wanted to improve their knowledge of alternatives and to avoid any need for methyl bromide in the future. Methyl bromide consumption was reduced from about 80 tonnes at the start of the project to zero from 1 January 2009.

- **Institutional framework and governance strengthened:** The number of staff that was assigned to ozone layer protection activities within the NOU in each country varied from 0.25 FTE in Latvia to six staff in the Climate Change Coordination Centre in Kazakhstan. In general, EU-CEITs had fewer staff working on ozone layer protection and the staff that was present tended to work on other gases such as F-gases at the same time. NOU in EU CEITs also shared the workload with other ministries, organizations and services based on legislation that officially designated these other bodies with specific responsibilities. Most countries in this evaluation had by 2009 ratified all six amendments to the Montreal Protocol, except for Kazakhstan that had ratified three and Azerbaijan that had ratified five. In the ODS portfolio, the ban on the import of CFCs is an important legislative indicator of the focus by governments in reducing ongoing demand for ODS and also to encourage use of alternatives.
- **ODS recovered, recycled and reclaimed:** The recovery, recycling and reclamation (“3R”) consisted of equipment that was provided for these activities, and training in the use of the equipment. The expected outcomes from the project were tools and equipment delivered to servicing facilities, reports on the amounts recovered and recycled-reclaimed and consequently reduced emissions, training providers that developed training modules for delivery to trainees, and reductions in the imports of ODS. One of the benefits was the cost of premature CFC-equipment retirement could be avoided by cost-effectively using recovered and recycled CFCs. In addition, the demand for illegal imports of CFCs could also be reduced by using recovered and recycled CFCs. About 64% (5,013 technicians) of the total number of technicians trained (7,879 technicians) in the nine CEITs were from Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. The large number trained relative to other countries in the project showed the importance that Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan attached to having ODS recovered and recycled. Halon was recovered during the project in Estonia and Kazakhstan, and continued after the project finished in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania
- **Enhanced control of illegal trade in ozone-depleting substances:** The large volume of legitimate ODS trade that takes place for exempted and legal uses provides cover for illegal trade. One study calculated that more than 24,000 legitimate trans-boundary shipments of ODS occurred in 2004, so Customs officers face a complex task of differentiating legal from illegal shipments. The expected outcomes from the Customs training sub-project included a border that was made sufficiently secure against illegal trade in ODS due to the training of sufficient customs officers in the detection of ODS and ODS-containing equipment; equipment provided to officers to detect ODS; records of illegal imports being intercepted; and penalties in place for illegal trade that would discourage smugglers. Twenty five percent of CEITs delivered training on reducing illegal trade in ODS to Customs officers in the past 3 years, after the Project was completed.
- **Technology that eliminate ODS received investments:** The expected outcomes from the investment in non-ODS technology included a phase out of ozone-depleting substances by the various users according to targets specified in project documents; conversion of facilities consuming ODSs to non-ODS technologies with equipment and know-how; and, if possible, improved profitability for the company involved as well as downstream suppliers. All of the domestic refrigerator and compressor producers achieved their phase out reduction targets that were stated in the Project Documents, resulting in overall 275.6 ODP-tonnes of ODS being phased out from 1998 to 2007. The two compressor companies (Sumgait in Azerbaijan and Oruva in Lithuania) were not subject to ODP phase out targets as by convention their targets were excluded to avoid double-counting of ODP phase out with refrigerator manufacturers. All of the aerosol companies achieved their phase out reduction targets that were stated in the Project Documents, resulting in overall 265.3 ODP-tonnes of ODS being phased out from 1997 to 2009. Two of the foam companies achieved their phase out reduction targets that were stated in the Project Documents, resulting in an estimated 139 ODP-tonnes of ODS being phased out from 1997 to 2007, instead of the target of 148 ODP-tonnes. The program to eliminate methyl bromide contributed to a general program that aimed to produce food with minimal chemical input. There were many skilful employees of companies, governments and agencies that demonstrated the technical

and economic feasibility of the alternatives that were involved in this <i>Regional Project</i> .			
c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?			
<p>The apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of Fumigants as alternatives to methyl bromide has questionable sustainability in the long term, according to some parties: The TE also mentions that “Participating countries considered further funding essential for continuing to implement new alternatives and to refine the existing ones. Parties were concerned with the review of fumigants selected as alternatives to methyl bromide that questioned their sustainability in the longer term. Despite these concerns, the prospects of returning to methyl bromide were assessed as remote.” • Non-EU CEITs slow adoption of projects’ goals: According to the TE, “many of the projects were slow to develop and in the non-EU CEITs were slow to implement legislative and policy changes because the institutional infrastructure necessary to carry out such changes was not in place. The lack of legislation and policy led to problems in controlling ozone-depleting substances, particularly in relation to trade and customs controls. This resulted in consumption of ozone-depleting substances exceeding Montreal Protocol limits for many years. Since projects have been completed in the non-EU-CEITs institutional capacities have been reduced, with insufficient focus on updating of legislation to address emerging issues such as the HCFC phase-out which was recently accelerated in 2007 by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.” 			
d. Evidence of Impact			
Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?	X		
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP has implemented 28 investment sub-projects in each country that include aerosol, foam, solvent, refrigeration manufacturing and refrigerant and halon recovery/recycling projects. 			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?			X
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)			X
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?			X
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?			X
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?	X		
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A socioeconomic change was noted in the context of the economy in transition, not particularly related to the projects. According to the TE, “The CEITs in the <i>Ozone-Depleting Substances Portfolio</i> had a consumption of almost 18,000 ODP-tonnes of ozone-depleting substances in 1986, which was about one percent of the global consumption at that time. Much of this consumption was reduced significantly in the 			

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

<p>early 1990s because of the poor economic conditions following independence from the Soviet Union and the introduction of free market economies. GEF funding was provided at the time CEIT economies were recovering in the mid-1990s and aimed to prevent a return to ‘business as usual’ with regard to use of ODS.”</p>			
<p>xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?</p> <p>The negative impacts noted in the TE were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding Institutional Strengthening, and ODS Recovered and Recycled refrigerants in Tajikistan, moderate shortcomings were noted in flow of funds that had some negative impact on timely delivery of outputs. The delays in provision of IS funds by UNEP in 2003 had a negative impact on organizing R&R monitoring activities. Regarding preparation and readiness for ODS Recovered and Recycled refrigerants in Turkmenistan, the approval of quota system was delayed for 3 years that had negative impact on the efficiency of the R&R program. 			
<p>e. Monitoring of impacts</p>			
<p>i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?</p>	X		
<p>ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?</p>	X		

6. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

Following is the summary of lessons learned listed in the TE:

- The funding bodies should be much clearer on their expectations of governments to continue funding and staffing of work on ODS after the project finished. Governments should use the funds to enhance institutional capacity and to put in place justification for continued funding while the project is underway and the environmental benefits are becoming evident.
- The success of the NOUs in both circumstances depended on the qualifications and ability of the staff to undertake the work, and in having sufficient funds available for the work. Out-sourcing activities by the government is a modern approach which has been shown to operate so far in these projects, and might open up opportunities for other governments to consider the same as centralized budgets come under more pressure for reductions.
- It is important that the NOUs are staffed by some well qualified and senior people that can gain access to key government officials in order to ensure that programs and legislation on the phase out of ODS are progressed in a timely and effective manner. This works best in many countries where the some staff in the NOU are partially paid by the government and partially from international programs. In this way, the staff members have the ability to rub shoulders with those in the government on a regular basis, which improves government knowledge and confidence in the programs being carried out by the NOU.
- Governments could consider establishing a centralized unit staffed by specialists that are knowledgeable in engaging with international funding organizations in environmental projects. In many countries, staff members are contracted for the short term that is required to operationalize the projects. At the end of the project, their contract may be terminated and they may not be available for work in a later project. Since there are some common and ongoing features to many of these programs, a core team of specialized staff could be very efficient and effective in getting many diverse environmental projects operational.
- The participatory approach by UNEP was more effective in managing the projects than the completion of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) forms which too often looked like a copy-and-paste of the same or similar information from one year to the next.
- Direct UNEP-UNDP participation in regional projects and workshops is useful for the effective implementation of the projects; and that these workshops should allow sufficient time for discussions (plenary and break out groups), which benefit not only the participating countries but also the Implementing Agencies involved in the projects.

- UNEP must improve delivery of finance to ensure that there are no gaps in time between projects.
- The project and task managers must pay more attention to the M&E elements that are developed in the Project Document to ensure that appropriate baseline and performance indicators are carefully checked and are present from the beginning for the project.
- To review the work that was undertaken in the past and design new projects that avoid the pitfalls of past projects.
- Financial appraisals should be part of the risk assessment for deciding on which enterprises to fund within a sector.
- Investment projects should be based on a realistic assessment of the baseline data as a basis for determining the extent of the funding that is required to promote the transition to ODS-free technology.
- The Implementing Agencies must engage international experts in these projects at an early stage to establish the basic conditions for halon decommissioning and banking operations; and Governments should be more active in establishing legislation supportive of the Halon Management Plan and the involvement of private enterprise. This was regarded by the evaluation team as a missed opportunity in many countries.
- The training programs need to be short (two days maximum, preferably one day); focused mainly on the practical aspects and alternatives and less on the theory; be delivered by or in collaboration with a Refrigeration Association so the training becomes self-funding; UNEP/UNDP need to ensure equipment is available before the training starts; and the government needs to have enabling legislation in place that ensures R&R activities are undertaken and enforced.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Following is the summary of recommendations listed in the TE:

- Countries should improve the implementation of legislation, policies and standards on all aspects of ozone layer protection;
- The implementing countries' existing efforts to prevent illegal trade need to be further strengthened;
- Countries need to take further action to manage and bank halon;
- UNEP/UNDP should consider further investment and capacity development to assist countries with economies in transition to address the remaining threats to the ozone layer;
- UNEP/UNDP should learn from the positive private sector engagement in the reduction of Ozone Layer Depletion focal area and incorporate similar approaches into its efforts to engage the private sector in other focal areas.

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

7.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

No other sources were used.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The report does not provide unified overall assessment of outcomes' effectiveness, only per project. Relevance and efficiency are well reported.</p>	4
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</p>	U/A
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>Sustainability assessments are not properly reported. They are not unified, but divided per project.</p>	2

d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	U/A
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	U/A
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The TE satisfactory outlines the M&E plan at entry, explaining its appropriate data analysis system to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. However, considering the TE's assessment of M&E (and of many other criteria) was done "for each project implemented in each country", not in a unified form for the overall project analysis.	2

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

No other sources were used.