1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		344	
GEF Agency project ID		n/a	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP and UNEP	
Project name		Lithuania Phase out of Ozone Depleting Substances	
Country/Countries		Lithuania	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Ozone Depleting Substances	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		n/a	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS/UNEP-IE	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		National Refrigeration Association: delivered training programs.	
Private sector involvement		Vilnius Buitine Chemija: beneficiary; Snaige: beneficiary; ARUVA: beneficiary. A few other companies were involved in installing new equipment.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		4/1/1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		12/1/1998	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		7/31/2001	
Actual date of project completion		1/30/2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.12	0 according to the Trustee
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		4.42	4.37
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	3.62	3.60
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	3.32
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		4.54	4.37
Total Co-financing		3.62	6.92
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		8.16	11.29
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2010	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Dr. Tom Batchelor and Mr. Valery Smirnov	
TER completion date		February 2015	
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Dania Trespalacios	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	n/a*	n/a	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	n/a*	n/a	L
M&E Design	n/a	n/a*	n/a	U
M&E Implementation	n/a	n/a*	n/a	U
Quality of Implementation	n/a	n/a*	n/a	MS
Quality of Execution	n/a	n/a*	n/a	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	S

*The TE only gives ratings for individual sub-projects and not the project as a whole.

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This project is part of the international effort to phase out ozone depleting substances, which damage the earth's ozone layer and increase the amount of ultraviolet radiation exposure from the sun. The Montreal Protocol, ratified by Lithuania in 1995, is the basis for phasing out ozone-depleting substances. While Lithuania does not produce ozone-depleting substances, it imports them from Russia. This project would allow Lithuania to transition to other materials and reduce demand for ozone-depleting substances before the production of such substances ends in Russia.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project consisted of the following five subprojects:

1. Institutional Strengthening for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in Lithuania
2. National program for recovery and recycling of ODS refrigerants
3. Phase out of the use of CFCs in the production of aerosols at Vilnius Buitine Chemija
4. Elimination of the use of CFCs in the manufacture of domestic refrigerators and freezers at Snaige
5. Conversion of the manufacturing facility at ORUVA to enable mass production of HFC-134a compressors

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

No changes were mentioned in the TE.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The GEF Operational Strategy of 1995 defines the GEF's ozone depletion portfolio to "support activities to phase out ozone-depleting substances that are committed under the Montreal Protocol, with special emphasis on short-term commitments and enabling activities" (GEF/C.6/3, page 77). This project supports an economy in transition in meeting its Montreal Protocol obligations.

The project is also in line with Lithuania's priorities for meeting its treaty obligations. Lithuania's strategic action plan for the phase-out of ozone depleting substances is: phase out CFCs, halons, HCFCs, and methyl bromide; comply with European Union schedules for phasing out ozone-depleting substances; support Lithuanian industry in adopting new technologies; and implement laws and regulations regarding the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances.

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

This project was divided into five subprojects, detailed below. As described below under M&E Design, the project design did not include performance indicators, a log frame, or targets for certain subprojects. Where indicators and targets are present, they are noted. The project is rated satisfactory because it met its overall objective of phasing out 390 ODP-tons of ozone-depleting substances from Lithuania.

1. Institutional Strengthening for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in Lithuania

The effectiveness of this subproject was rated satisfactory by the TE. The project created a National Ozone Unit, which was responsible for coordinating among various ministries, agencies, and the National Refrigeration Association for all ozone-related activities in Lithuania. In addition, the National Ozone Unit drafted new legislation to harmonize existing law and add new regulations on ozone-depleting substances. The Ozone Unit undertook a three-year awareness campaign including flood-lit posters in major cities, booklets on the ozone layer for children, posting information on a website, and implementing seminars for the private sector. The National Ozone Unit "reported that the awareness campaign was essential for making companies aware of their legal obligations, and government departments and inspectors aware of their enforcement implications," but this could not be verified due to the lack of a baseline or monitoring program (TE, page 452).

2. National program for recovery and recycling of ODS refrigerants

The TE rated the effectiveness of this subproject as satisfactory. The project distributed 50 recovery machines, 3 recovery and recycling machines, and 3 reclamation units. The reclamation units were rarely used due to a variety of factors, but thirteen out of the sixteen companies that received recovery and recycling machines were still using them in 2009. The companies that did not use the machinery had their equipment redistributed. In order to receive the equipment, the companies had to attend a training program, which was coordinated with the National Refrigeration Association. Training was initiated before the project and continued after the project. This subproject in particular initiated two seminars on practical demonstrations of recovery and recycling. Recovery and recycling of ozone-depleting substances is mandated by Lithuanian law. During the subproject's lifespan, 16 tons of CFCs and 7 tons of HCFCs were recovered, which was 17% less than the subproject's target. Halons used for fire protection were replaced by alternatives, as were halons used on ships.

3. Phase out of the use of CFCs in the production of aerosols at Vilnius Buitine Chemija

This subproject was rated highly satisfactory. The project replaced CFCs with hydrocarbon as the aerosol propellant, which eliminated 245.6 ODP-tons of CFCs per year thus meeting the subproject target. Following the change, the number of aerosols sold and exported by the company increased as a result of the modernization of the production line.

4. Elimination of the use of CFCs in the manufacture of domestic refrigerators and freezers at Snaige

This subproject was rated highly satisfactory. The project completely replaced CFCs with alternatives in the production of domestic refrigerators. This eliminated 112 ODP-tons of CFC-11 and CFC-12. The production of refrigerators at the company increased after this change due to improved competitiveness, reduced energy demand, and better environmental compliance.

5. Conversion of the manufacturing facility at ORUVA to enable mass production of HFC-134a compressors

This subproject was rated satisfactory, but information was difficult to obtain because the company was in the midst of bankruptcy proceedings during the project and went bankrupt twice more after CFC-free equipment was installed. CFC-free technology for compressor production was installed and tested. The amount of ozone-depleting substances that were phased out by this subproject was not counted.

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

The TE rates the efficiency of the institutional strengthening subproject as moderately satisfactory. While "a relatively small team in the National Ozone Unit leveraged national resources to coordinate the activities on ozone layer protection in a cost-effective and timely manner," the subproject started three years late because of difficulties integrating the Unit into the Ministry of Environment (TE, page 457).

The cost-effectiveness of the subproject on recovery and recycling was $20.43 ODP-kg per year. This was more than twice as expensive as the average cost-effectiveness of recovery and recycling projects in 25 developing countries. On the other hand, the subproject on aerosol production had a cost-effectiveness of $1.90 ODP-kg per year, which is about half of the average cost-effectiveness of aerosol projects in developing countries. The cost-effectiveness of the subproject on refrigerators was also above average at $17.94 ODP-kg per year.

The cost-effectiveness of the final subproject on compressors was not available. The subproject was completed two and a half years late due to the bankruptcy of the compressor company.

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

Financial: **Likely**; Lithuania's accession to the European Union provided it with access to funds related to development and environment. Ozone-related activities are financed by multiple ministries according to legislative requirements, and "the risk of withdrawal of financial support amongst these ministries and organizations was…assessed as low" (TE, page 449). The recovery and recycling training programs are self-funded. Companies that received recovery and recycling equipment purchased their own spare parts once project funding was depleted. The companies involved in the two subprojects on refrigeration and aerosol production increased their profitability after converting to CFC substitutes. The last subproject involving the compressor company, in contrast, was not financially sustainable. The company went bankrupt twice after the project ended. However, the bankruptcy does not change the likelihood of phasing out ozone-depleting substances in Lithuania.

Sociopolitical: **Likely**; ozone-related activities are supported by a number of government agencies, the private sector, and NGOs: "the government has continued to implement a multi-stakeholder approach that involves different services, administrations and ministries to undertake activities on monitoring and reporting ODS use, and training of technicians on best-practice ODS management. The requirements of the stakeholders are supported by legislation" (TE, page 450). Also, becoming a member state of the European Union commits Lithuania to ozone layer protection activities and annual reporting.

Institutional: **Likely**; prior to and during the project, the Lithuanian government passed legislation regulating imports, exports, usage, and licensing of ozone-depleting substances. In the late 1990s, Lithuania banned the imports of CFCs, which helped motivate the private sector to convert to alternative technology. Technicians are required by law to be trained in ozone-depleting substances recovery and recycling.

Environmental: **Likely**; the TE reports that the environmental risk is low.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

According to the TE, government cofinancing of the institutional strengthening subproject increased its chances of sustainability: "A significant level of in-kind co-finance demonstrated the commitment of Lithuania to the sub-project [on institutional strengthening] and probably increased the Lithuania's 'ownership' of the program," and "the significant level of co-finance by Lithuania was also an acknowledgement to provide long term stability to the program, since the results of the ODS monitoring were required to be submitted annually to the European Commission in accordance with Latvia's responsibilities as a Member State of the EU after May 2004" (TE, page 456).

The subproject on recovery and recycling did not receive cofinancing, which did not affect sustainability because companies that were not included in the equipment distribution were able to purchase their own equipment.

The subprojects on aerosol, refrigerator, and compressor production received cofinancing from the beneficiary companies, but it is unknown what this cofinancing covered. Despite this, the TE states that the provision of cofinancing contributed to project sustainability because "a successful company will usually invest funds only in areas that have the prospects for recovery of investment costs over time, which can only be regained if the operations continue after company funds have been spent on the investment" (TE, page 495).

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 subproject on institutional strengthening started three years late because of difficulties integrating the National Ozone Unit into the Ministry of Environment. The TE states that this did not significantly affect project sustainability because Lithuania had already implemented legislation on ozone-depleting substances and was committed to its obligations for accession to the European Union. The final subproject on compressors was completed two and a half years late due to the bankruptcy of the compressor company. This may have affected the subproject's sustainability: "Because of fierce market competition in the compressor sector, the World Bank recommended that compressor projects should be… finished and put into production as early as possible. This was not the case with Oruva due to the delay, may have been crucial and a significant contributor toward Oruva's bankruptcy and lack of sustainability" (TE, page 495).

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 is high, which had a positive effect on project outcomes and sustainability. According to the TE, "a significant level of in-kind co-finance demonstrated the commitment of Lithuania to the sub-project [on institutional strengthening] and probably increased the Lithuania's 'ownership' of the program" (TE, page 456). The TE states that "the single largest factor that committed and motivated Lithuania to ozone layer protection was the requirement to harmonize legislation on ODS with the EU, and to become compliant with EU phase out requirements for ODS which were more strict than the Montreal Protocol, prior to acceding to the EU on 1 May 2004" (TE, page 455). Lithuania began to pass legislation on ozone-depleting substances prior to the start of the project and continued to update its regulations in subsequent years. The National Ozone Unit made an effort to involve multiple government agencies, NGOs, and the private sector in ozone activities: "the partnerships formed as a result of the involvement of these stakeholders was assessed as creating effective stakeholder participation to progress the work of the National Ozone Unit and the Ministry of Environment in ozone layer protection" (TE, page 455).

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: **Unsatisfactory**

The Project Document only contains three sentences regarding project M&E: "Project monitoring will be performed by UNEP/UNDP and the cost for it is included in the budgets that are indicated in annex 1 and 2. Standard evaluation will be performed, except in the case that an in-depth evaluation is required by the GEF whereby independent consultants would have to be hired and fielded to the country concerned. Consultancy fees and travel costs would need to be obtained in addition to the amounts requested in the project" (PD, page 9). There were no performance indicators or log frame developed for the project. The TE states that "there was no specific design for monitoring and evaluation" (TE, page 454). There is no budget for M&E.

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

Although there was no M&E plan for the project, the TE considers UNEP's use of a Risk Factor Table to assess risks for the institutional strengthening subproject as evidence of M&E implementation. The TE rates the M&E implementation of that subproject as satisfactory, but the reason for a satisfactory rating is not given. For the subprojects on recovery and recycling, aerosol manufacture, and refrigerator manufacture, the TE states that "there was no evidence of the implementation of an M&E plan by UNDP" (TE, page 466). For the subproject on compressor manufacture, the only evidence of M&E implementation was a site visit by UNDP that corrected a problem of disputed equipment ownership. Overall there is little evidence of M&E implementation taking place.

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 did not critique the project design except to say that the Oruva compression manufacturing company should have been assessed prior to funding the compression subproject.

No problems were reported with project supervision, but little information was available in the TE. For all of the subprojects but institutional strengthening, "UNDP took responsibility for tendering and procurement of the equipment, and delegated responsibility for its distribution to the local government. The assessment team assumed UNDP applied the same conditions to Lithuania, as no documents were available that indicated otherwise. On this basis, the evaluation team assessed UNDP supervision and support as satisfactory" (TE, page 467). The meaning of this statement in the TE is unclear, as is the basis for awarding UNDP a satisfactory rating. UNDP did not provide financial reports except for the institutional strengthening subproject, so the TE was unable to assess financial management of the project as a whole.

For the subproject on refrigerator manufacture, "Snaigė expressed satisfaction with the performance of UNDP in this sub-project. Snaigė said that UNDP experts performed very well in all stages including problem identification and solutions, procurement, liaison and coordination" (TE, page 485).

The TE reports one instance of a site visit to the compression subproject in order to resolve a dispute over equipment ownership. However, "there was no evidence of advice from UNDP for Oruva to lower their production cost, ensure product quality, and extend the market, to ensure that the estimated

objective can be achieved. Earlier advice to Oruva, and more precise assessment of their financial situation prior to the funding of the sub-project, may have been useful for either avoiding funding of this project altogether or for stipulating actions that Oruva should take to improve profitability" (TE, page 495).

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

No problems were reported with project execution. According to the TE, "UNEP established a good working relationship with Lithuania that covered work plan implementation, progress reports and financial reporting" (TE, page 456). UNEP reported that project funds were "handled extremely effectively by Lithuania" and that there was timely and good communication on any issues.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The project phased out 390 ODP-tons of ozone-depleting substances from Lithuania (TE, page 452). 91% of these changes came from phasing out ozone-depleting substances in a Lithuanian refrigerator company and a Lithuanian aerosol company.

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

No socioeconomic changes were reported in the TE.

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

activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project distributed 50 recovery machines, 3 recovery and recycling machines, and 3 reclamation units for ozone-depleting substances (TE, page 462). The reclamation units were rarely used due to a variety of factors, but thirteen out of the sixteen companies that received recovery and recycling machines were still using them in 2009. The companies that did not use the machinery had their equipment redistributed. The subproject on recovery and recycling initiated two seminars on practical demonstrations of recovery and recycling. Training was also undertaken in Lithuania before and after the project, and the TE does not distinguish the effects of the training programs that were undertaken by the project alone. The TE states that "the National Refrigeration Association reported that there were no unqualified technicians working in Lithuania" (TE, page 463).

b) Governance

The project created a National Ozone Unit, which was responsible for coordinating among various ministries, agencies, and the National Refrigeration Association for all ozone-related activities in Lithuania (TE, page 451). In addition, the National Ozone Unit drafted new legislation to harmonize existing law and add new regulations on ozone-depleting substances (TE, page 452).

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

No unintended impacts were reported in the TE.

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 project's approach was replicated in several Eurasian countries as part of the GEF's ozone-depleting substances program. Other than applying similar project designs to each country, no scaling up or mainstreaming was mentioned in the TE. The main market change was the replacement of CFCs in Lithuania's largest aerosol company, which prior to the project emitted 63% of Lithuania's CFCs per year, and in Baltic's largest refrigerator company, which emitted 29% of Lithuania's ozone-depleting

substances per year prior to the project. These companies no longer manufacture products with ozone-depleting substances (TE, pages 473 and 482).

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.

There are no lessons learned for the Lithuania project, but the TE states several lessons from the overall ozone-depleting substances program:

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 National Ozone Units 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 National Ozone Units 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.

Governments could consider establishing a centralized unit staffed by specialists that are knowledgeable in engaging with international funding organizations in environmental projects.

UNEP must improve delivery of finance to ensure that there are no gaps in time between projects.

Communications should be between UNEP and the National Ozone Units in the local language, which means that UNEP will need to employ staff with sufficient language skills to be able communicate effectively with project staff many countries, depending on the project.

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.

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.

For refrigeration training, 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.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

There are no recommendations for the Lithuania project, but the TE states several recommendations from the overall ozone-depleting substances program:

Countries should improve the implementation of legislation, policies and standards on all aspects of ozone layer protection.

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.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE is detailed in its assessment of outcomes and impacts. It would have been helpful to have an overall description of the project rather than just the assessments of the individual subprojects. Information on UNDP and UNEP's conduct was somewhat lacking.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The ratings only cover sub-projects and not the project as a whole. The report is repetitive, which made it difficult to discern which outcomes and outputs were original and which were a restatement from a previous section. It was not always clear which changes were a part of the project and which were independent or driven by different forces.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability of the entire project as a whole was not discussed, but the assessment of the sustainability of each individual subproject was adequate.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE does not contain lessons and recommendations related to the Lithuania project. However, it does have lessons and recommendations pertaining to the entire ozone-depleting substances program. These lessons are detailed, comprehensive, and result from project experiences.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes project costs and cofinancing. It lists the funding for each subproject, but not per-activity.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Adequate evaluation of project M&E, although it would have been helpful to have an overall evaluation of project M&E rather than an evaluation of the individual subprojects' M&E.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

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