1Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3215	
GEF Agency project ID		3735	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling in Jordan	
Country/Countries		Jordan	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP-1	
Executing agencies involved		National Energy Research Centre	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Royal Scientific Society	
Private sector involvement		Not given	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 29, 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 28, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.04	.04
	Co-financing	.01	Not given
GEF Project Grant		.97	.94
Co-financing	IA own	.1	.1
	Government	.52	.56
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	.7	.81
Total GEF funding		1.01	.98
Total Co-financing		1.33	1.47
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.34	2.45
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		January 30, 2015	
Author of TE		Dinesh Aggarwal	
TER completion date		2/27/2016	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is to "reduce Jordan's energy-related GHG emissions by removing barriers to the widespread commercialization of energy efficient appliances in the household sector." The Project Document notes that this will be achieved through "the introduction of an energy labeling system and a MEPS [Minimum Energy Performance Standards] program for household appliances in Jordan with an initial focus on air conditioners, refrigerators, freezers and washing machines" (pg. 24).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document notes that the Development Objectives coincide with the National Energy Efficiency Strategy, namely "1) to reduce energy consumption without negatively affecting production or the population's standard of living, to lower the import oil bill at the national level and to reduce the emission of harmful gases to the environment; 2) to improve the nation's standard of living; 3) to achieve an equilibrium between imports and exports; 4) to reduce production costs and improve the competitiveness of local industries and other sectors; and 5) to reduce investments in the equipment used for the production, conversion, transport and distribution of energy" (pg. 24).

The specific project-level objective was to "reduce GHG emissions by supporting a market transformation towards energy efficient new appliances in Jordan" (Project Document pg. 42). The expected programmatic outcomes[1] under this objective included:

- Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities in Government and energy agency units for appliance Energy Efficiency policy development, implementation and market surveillance
- Outcome 2: Structured verification and enforcement of appliance Energy Efficiency labels and standards
- Outcome 3: Consumers' and retailers' awareness raised and improved marketing of appliance

[1] The project design contained a fifth outcome on project management and M&E support.

Energy Efficiency standards and labels, and

- Outcome 4: Increased capacity of manufacturers to produce and market energy efficient appliances

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

The objectives and outcomes of the project remained the same during implementation, however changes were made to some of the project's outputs and activities due to changes in the operating environment. The Jordan Standards and Metrology Organization (JSMO) and the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MoIT) entered into a bilateral agreement with the European Union (EU) to adopt EU standards and labels under the "Twinning Project." Many of the results under Outcome 1 of the GEF-UNDP project therefore became redundant, and the project was redesigned in 2011 to align it with the Twinning Project (TE pg. 39).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory**, which this TER adjusts to **Satisfactory**. The project's objective was to "reduce GHG emissions by supporting a market transformation towards energy efficient new appliances in Jordan," which was consistent with the GEF-4 Climate Change Focal Area (PD pg. 42). In particular, the project outcomes were consistent with Strategy Program 1, *Promoting energy efficiency in residential and commercial buildings*. Additionally, the project outcomes were consistent with Jordan's international commitments as a Non-Annex I Party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (PD pg. 25). At the time of the project design, the Jordanian Government had committed itself to developing a clear policy framework on energy efficiency, producing the 2007-2020 Master Strategy for the Energy Sector. However, the Project Document notes that this policy had not yet been translated into a legal and regulatory framework, largely due to a lack of information and know-how on how to proceed (PD pg. 10). Therefore, the project's focus on enhancing the government's capacity to develop and enforce the necessary legal and institutional frameworks is highly

relevant.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. By project end, the project had achieved many of its key outcomes and contributed to creating an enabling atmosphere for Energy Efficient (EE) appliances (TE pg. 51). However, the project did not achieve its objective of directly reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Jordan, largely because there was not an increase in the production of EE appliances by the end of the project. The TE does note that the project is well placed to contribute to long-term indirect greenhouse gas reduction (TE pg. 51).

A summary of the project's achievements, by programmatic outcome, is provided below. Expected results reflect the 2011 revisions to the project design.

- **Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities in Government and energy agency units for appliance energy efficiency policy development, implementation, and market surveillance:**
  Expected results under this outcome included: (1) improved awareness of EE appliance options among political and policy decision makers, (2) increased government capacity for developing legal and regulatory frameworks for EE appliances, (3) increased government capacity for developing an energy labeling strategy consistent with regional efforts, (4) increased government capacity in EE appliance support program development, implementation, and monitoring, and (5) enhanced data collection on appliance sales and stock and a structured monitoring system. The results under this outcome were largely achieved by project end. In partnership with the Twinning Project, EU regulations were reviewed and equivalent standards were drafted and awaiting approval by the JSMO (TE pg. 76). In 2014, JSMO implemented a mandatory requirement to implement an energy efficiency label on all appliances (2014 PIR pg. 9). Additionally, the JSMO developed an innovative web-based tool and database for monitoring EE appliances, resulting in an increased capacity to carry out market surveillance of EE appliances (TE pg. 44).

- **Outcome 2: Structured verification and enforcement of appliance energy efficiency standards and labels:**
  Expected results under this outcome included: (1) enhanced knowledge of state inspectors to check the compliance of appliance energy efficiency declarations, (2) verification and enforcement plan for retailers developed and implemented, and (3) facilities for project testing developed and implemented. By project end, a laboratory for testing EE appliances was developed and equipped. Additionally, JSMO's market surveillance personnel were trained in checking the compliance of EE appliances to ensure they meet the minimum energy

performance standards. Verification and enforcement procedures were established as part of the draft performance standards, however they were not operational by the end of the project (TE pgs. 44-45).

- **Outcome 3: Increased consumers' and retailers' awareness and improved marketing of appliance energy efficiency standards and labels:**
  Expected results under this outcome included: (1) enhanced consumer awareness of appliance energy efficiency characteristics, standards and labels, and costs and benefits of more efficient products, and (2) enhanced retailer staff awareness of appliance energy efficiency issues and sales rationales. The results under this outcome were largely achieved by project end. The project launched a consumer awareness campaign on the benefits of EE appliances which included informative segments on television and radio, as well as a social media hub and website for engaging consumers (TE pg. 78). A survey taken before the campaign was launched revealed that 22% understood the concept of EE appliances but only 2% were aware of a labeling scheme. After the campaign, 80% of polled consumers were aware of EE appliances, and 35% were aware of EE labeling. Additionally, the project developed a manual on basic knowledge of EE appliances and trained retailers on strategies for marketing EE appliances (TE pg. 79).

- **Outcome 4: Increased capacity of manufacturers to produce and market energy efficient appliances:**
  Expected results under this outcome included: (1) enhanced capacity of manufacturers and suppliers in standards and labeling regulations and related business opportunities, (2) enhanced abilities of manufacturers in the development of more efficient appliances, and (3) manufacturer and supplier participation in end-user standards and labeling campaign. Moreover, it was expected that 50% of local manufacturers would be producing and marketing EE appliances by the end of the project. This was not achieved due to the costs and complexities involved in upgrading production lines. The project produced market assessments and an analysis of manufacturing options, which could help manufacturers upgrade their production lines in the future (TE pg. 45). The TE also notes that while the project assisted some manufacturers in including EE in their own marketing campaigns, other manufacturers did not want to participate in or cooperate with the larger consumer awareness campaign (TE pg. 80).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project experienced moderate delays at project start-up, largely due to the institutional reorganization of the executing agency, National Energy Resource Centre (NERC), and challenges recruiting a project manager. The 2011 PIR also notes that political turbulence in the region played a role in delaying project start-up (IPRating, line 30). Additionally, the project experienced delays

during implementation due to substantial revisions to the project design in 2011. The initial project design did not take into account the EU Twinning Project, the first phase of which was underway when the UNDP-GEF Project Document was elaborated. As the TE notes, delays might have been avoided if synergies were created between the Twinning Project and the UNDP-GEF project at an earlier time (pg. 40). Due to the delays at start-up and implementation, the project experienced low budget utilization (28.6% at midterm). However, overall disbursements were on target by the end of the project (98%) (Midterm Evaluation pg. 11; TE pg. 48). The project end date was ultimately extended to December 31, 2014 (1.5 years) in order to complete project activities.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

The TE provides a rating of **Likely** for project sustainability, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Likely**. By project end, the institutional and regulatory framework was in place for minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) and Energy Efficiency (EE) labeling of appliances, and there were no cited risks to environmental sustainability. Moderate risks to financial and sociopolitical sustainability included uncertain funding for the testing labs and the resistance of local manufacturers and importers to MEPS and EE labels.

Financial Resources

This TER assesses the sustainability of financial resources to be **Moderately Likely**. The TE notes that the testing labs established under the project needed to generate their own funding to sustain their operations. At the time of the TE, the labs were considering charging users a fee for testing their projects, however a financial plan was not yet in place. The TE also notes that the testing labs were seeking funding from USAID to develop a business plan for establishing a regional center of excellence for testing home appliances (TE pg. 13).

Sociopolitical

This TER assesses sociopolitical sustainability to be **Moderately Likely**. The TE notes that the project has contributed to raising consumer and retailer awareness of the EE labeling and the benefits of EE appliances, which should increase demand for EE appliances over time. However, local manufacturers and importers resisted MEPS and labeling of appliances throughout the project, largely due to the costs and complexities involved in upgrading production lines (Midterm Evaluation pg. 12; TE pg. 50). The TE does not note any political risks that could undermine the long-term objectives of the project, and the Jordanian Government was committed to enforcing the standards.

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

This TER assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance to be **Likely**. In partnership with the Twinning Project, the UNDP-GEF project contributed to establishing the

institutional and regulatory framework for MEPS and EE labeling of appliances. The project also contributed to the establishment of a market surveillance system and procedure for enforcing MEPS (TE pg. 50). The required systems are therefore in place to continue project benefits.

Environmental

This TER assesses environmental sustainability to be **Likely**. Although the project didn't result in direct reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, the TE notes that the project is on track to contribute indirectly to a reduction of approximately 730 thousand tons within 10 years of project closure (TE pg. 48). The TE does not cite any environmental risks that could undermine the long-term objectives of the project.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

Actual co-financing exceeded expected co-financing by $140,000, totaling $1.47 million. The 2013 PIR notes that the project would not have been able to achieve its outcomes without co-financing from government institutions, such as the National Energy Research Centre, Jordan Standards and Metrology Organization, Royal Scientific Society, Jordan Customs, Chamber of Industry, etc. (pg. 20). Contributions from non-governmental organizations also exceeded expectations. For example, the Royal Scientific Society provided the building for the washing machine testing lab (2013 PIR pg. 26).

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 delayed at start-up due to reorganization of the executing agency, challenges hiring a project manager, and political turbulence in the region. Additionally, the project design was substantially revised in 2011, which affected the implementation of project activities. The TE does not indicate whether this affected the achievement of project outcomes or sustainability.

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 over the project was significant, with both the government and national stakeholders supporting the implementation of activities throughout the life of the project (TE pg. 49). Additionally, the government and non-governmental organizations such as the Royal Scientific Society contributed co-financing to the project. The TE does note however, that the participation of national stakeholders in the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Project Advisory Board (PB) was weak, largely because the project did not cover the cost of attendance to the meetings (pg. 49).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The results framework outlined in the Project Document is logically sound, however the framework does not include outputs and output-level indicators. Additionally, the quality of the outcome and impact level indicators is mixed. For example, the indicator for Outcome 2, "Verification and enforcement procedures are developed, pilot tested, and implemented…" is a result statement rather than a SMART indicator (specific, measurable, relevant, and timely). Additionally, the indicator for *CO_2 emissions reduction* is the "reduction in energy consumption in the household sector." As the TE notes, electricity consumption can vary over time for a number of reasons, and therefore it is an inappropriate measure of the project's impact (pg. 36). Overall, the results framework is not an adequate tool for monitoring and evaluation.

The Project Document does include a general M&E plan that includes relevant M&E activities, such as a baseline, quarterly and annual monitoring, reporting, a midterm and final evaluation, and a lessons learned session. The M&E plan also includes the responsible parties for each activity, in addition to the associated budget and timeframe. A total budget of $130,000 is provided for M&E activities (PD pg. 54).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The Midterm Evaluation notes that the results framework was not reviewed at the Inception Workshop as intended (pg. 42). Furthermore, new indicators and baseline values were not developed following the substantial revisions to the project design in 2011. As a result, there are gaps in the quality of the project reports, which do not track project performance in key areas. A Midterm Evaluation was conducted in late 2013, and the TE notes that the project did adopt some of the recommendations, including the recalculation of the projected greenhouse gas emissions (TE pg. 41). However the management body responsible for ensuring the quality of the monitoring and evaluation system, the Project Advisory Board (PD), the only met twice throughout the life of the project (TE pg.

43). Overall, M&E implementation for this project had significant shortcomings and was inadequate for tracking project performance.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. As mentioned above, the original project design failed to take into consideration the European Union funded Twinning Project, which was underway when the UNDP-GEF project was being elaborated. The expected outcomes of the Twinning Project overlapped significantly with the UNDP-GEF project, and therefore the UNDP-GEF project had to be substantially revised in 2011. As the TE notes, delays might have been avoided if synergies were created between the Twinning Project and the UNDP-GEF project at an earlier time (pg. 40). The project did eventually develop close partnerships with both the Twinning Project and USAID, which furthered the objectives of the UNDP-GEF project (TE pg. 41).

The TE notes that UNDP fulfilled its oversight and supervision responsibilities, particularly in terms of financial management. UNDP was also a member of both the Project Advisory Board (PB) and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC), which were formed to oversee the management and implementation of the project, respectively. However, the PB only met twice during project implementation, and the PAC only met during the Inception Workshop (TE pg. 43).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for quality of project execution, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The executing agency for the project was the National Energy Research Centre (NERC), which staffed the Project Management Unit (PMU). The project experienced moderate delays at

start-up and implementation, however the project was able to achieve most of its outcomes by project end. Additionally, the PMU was able to adapt to significant revisions to the project's original design. On the other hand, the PMU was responsible for monitoring the outcomes and impacts of the project (TE pg. 9). As mentioned above, M&E implementation was weak, in part because the Project Advisory Board (PD) and the Project Advisory Committee did not provide the necessary oversight. The TE notes that the PMU made an effort to meet informally with PD and PAC members in the absence of formal meetings, however M&E implementation remained weak throughout the life of the project (pg. 12).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

> The TE notes that the project did not reduce greenhouse gas emissions during implementation, largely because it failed to increase the production of Energy Efficient home appliances. However, the TE projects that the project will contribute to long-term indirect emission reductions of approximately 730,000 tons within 10 years of project completion (TE pg. 48).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

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

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

By project end, the capacity of the Jordan Standards and Metrology Organization (JSMO) to carry out market surveillance of Energy Efficient (EE) appliances was enhanced, particularly for fraudulent imports and locally manufactured products (pg. 44). Additionally, Jordan has the capacity to carry out accredited tests of the minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) of EE appliances, due to the establishment of testing facilities for home appliances (TE pg. 44). Consumer and retailer awareness of the costs and benefits of EE appliances and EE labeling has also increased as a result of the project (TE pg. 45).

b) Governance

By project end, MEPS were drafted and awaiting approval by JSMO (TE pg. 76). Jordan's MEPS were aligned with EU regulations under the Twinning Project. The UNDP-GEF project supported the Twinning Project's efforts to established MEPS, in addition to the requirement to implement an energy efficiency label on all appliances, which was implemented in 2014 (2014 PIR pg. 9).

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

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by the end of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE notes that the UNDP-GEF project collaborated closely with the European Union funded Twinning Project and USAID, who funded testing facilities for air conditioners and refrigerators, respectively (TE pg. 54). The Twinning Project and USAID based the specifications for their labs on the UNDP-GEF project's washing machine testing lab (2013 PIR pg. 9).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pg. 53):

- The impacts of the project are to be monitored and the corresponding target values of indicators need to be determined in a manner that eliminates the influence on the value of the indicators as in business as usual scenario.

- The baseline situation and the corresponding value of the indicators need to be established by carrying out a detailed scoping study and quantitative analysis, rather than using the approach of growth rates.

- In order to have larger impacts, the segments of the stakeholders which have larger share needs to be targeted. For example, in the case of present project 80% of the appliances were imported, thus a project activity focused on the importers / trade authorities would have benefited the project.

- In order to keep the government stakeholders interested in the project and to ensure participation of government officials it is necessary to take care of local practices. For example, it is a standard practice at Jordan to provide a small honorarium to the participants in the official meetings. A provision in the project budget to do so would have ensured higher participation in the PAC [Project Advisory Committee] and PB [Project Advisory Board] meetings.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pgs. 15-16):

- Continuation of consumer awareness creation and capacity building of institutions from time to time will help towards continuation and further strengthening of the impacts of project.

- Now that the test labs are in place to enforce the mandate regarding S&L [Standards and Labeling] program and MEPS [Minimum Energy Performance Standards], it is important that these labs continue to operate. Experience shows that the traditional method of government funding for continuation of the operations don't work in most of the cases. There is a proposal to develop a business plan for these labs so that they can sustain their operation at their own. Support for development of the business plan is likely to reinforce the impacts and benefits of the project.

- The main objective of the project was to reduce emission of GHG [greenhouse gas] by transforming the market and by removal of barriers towards the larger uptake of energy

efficient appliances. To support the main objective of reduction in the emission of GHG and to support the country objective of continuing to meet the demand for power, projects for EE for other appliances may be initiated on the lines of the present project after taking care of the lessons learned. Such proposals may be developed for lights, fans, televisions, etc.

- There is already a spinoff impact of the project in term of establishment of MEPS and S&L for a host of products which were not covered under this project. However, market transformation for these products is not likely, in the absence of awareness creation of consumers and capacity building of the institutions. Small incremental efforts in this direction would help to multiply the impacts of the project.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report adequately assesses the outcomes and impacts of the project, however there are some information gaps. The report contains a table indicating which activities were completed by project end, which is useful. However, it leaves questions as to what results or outputs were achieved.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, however the ratings were moderately inflated. Again, more information could have been included regarding the project's outputs.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses project sustainability.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence provided, however they could be more comprehensive. The recommendations essentially say that project activities should continue.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes the actual project costs and co-financing. It would have been helpful if the report had broken down the government and non-governmental contributions by agency/organization.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's assessment of M&E design at entry is satisfactory. More detail could have been provided on the M&E system and overall M&E implementation.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

Midterm Evaluation (2013)