

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3565	
GEF Agency project ID		PIMS 4014	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		United Nations Development Program (UNDP)	
Project name		Market transformation of energy efficient appliances in Turkey	
Country/Countries		Turkey	
Region		Europe	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF-4 Climate Change Strategic Objective	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources (MEMR) - General Directorate of Electrical Power Resources Survey and Development Administration (EIE), Government of Turkey (under NIM modality); Ministry of Industry and Trade (MoIT) – General Directorate of Industry; The Turkish Standards Institute; The Turkish Accreditation Agency (TURKAK).	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		The Association of Turkish White Goods Manufacturers (TURKBESD)	
Private sector involvement		Arcelik	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 30, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 11, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.71	2.56
Co-financing	IA own	0.02	0.16
	Government	0.95	2.80
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.58	0.62
	Private sector	1.4	1.83
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.71	2.71
Total Co-financing		2.95	5.26
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		5.67	7.97
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		January 30, 2017	
Author of TE		Roland Wong	
TER completion date		01/16/2017	
TER prepared by		Maria Elisa Passeri	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Fahey Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Evaluation	Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory		N/A	Satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	Likely (L)		N/A	Likely (L)
M&E Design	N/A	Satisfactory		N/A	Satisfactory
M&E Implementation	N/A	Highly Satisfactory		N/A	Satisfactory
Quality of Implementation	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory		N/A	Satisfactory
Quality of Execution	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory		N/A	Satisfactory
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A		N/A	Highly Satisfactory

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project's Global Environmental Objective, as stated in the project document is to (Prodoc p.1) "reduce the household electricity consumption and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of Turkey by accelerating the market transformation of less energy consuming building appliances". The project had the following targets:

- An indirect target of 1.7 million tonnes CO₂/year (using causality factor of 60%) by appliances sold during the project"; and
- A 2 to 28% reduction of the average unit electricity consumption by 2013 compared to the estimate baseline development.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is "to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions of Turkey by accelerating the market transformation towards more energy efficient building appliances." (Request for CEO endorsement p.1)

This would be achieved through four project components:

- 1: Institutional capacity building
- 2: Enforcement of adopted policies
- 3: Public awareness raising and supply side strengthening to increase the sale of efficient appliances

4: Sustaining the project results, including monitoring, learning adaptive feedback and evaluation

Minimum energy performance standards and energy efficiency labelling are proven instruments to achieve the transformation of markets of energy consuming appliances and equipment. Because of their potential to affect market transformation for a range of products that represents the major part of electricity consumption in various sectors (including the residential, tertiary and industrial sector), and because they require the intervention of a relatively small number of actors, and thus result in limited transaction costs, energy efficiency standards and labeling are among the most cost-effective policy instruments to mitigate global climate change.

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

There were no changes in the Global Environmental Objectives and Development Objectives during implementation. However, surplus funds resulting from efficient management of the project were allocated to additional activities such as: (a) enhancement of outcomes of increased user awareness of energy efficient appliances and (b) the embedding of appliance energy efficiency into the curricula of relevant educational institutes (a small grant programme to 5 universities in Turkey was approved). The inclusion of additional activities required the extension of the project from its original terminal date of December 2014 to the new terminal date of December 2015.

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 rates relevance as Highly Satisfactory (S) for all project components, and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as Satisfactory (S).

The project is in line with the stated energy policy of Turkey to ensure adequate, reliable and cost-effective energy supply to support the targeted economic growth and social developments, while also protecting the environment and public health from pollution arising from energy production and consumption. It also complements the specific provisions of the recently adopted Law on Energy Efficiency and its bylaws to promote the market for more energy efficient appliances. (PD, p.19).

The TE (p.vii) states that “the Project has provided the Government with the necessary focus to accelerate appliance market transformation in Turkey towards EU energy efficiency standards. This included the provision of technical assistance for transposing EU regulations into Turkish legislation, exposure to best practices and technical assistance to implement a market surveillance program, and awareness raising activities in collaboration with the private sector. Without the Project, the Government would have carried on with its business-as-usual activities and market transformation of appliances would have been implemented at a much slower rate due to capacity limitations of the government”. The TE (p.viii) also notes that “the Project has laid a solid foundation for EE appliance market transformation through:

- Accelerating EU regulations into Turkish Energy Labeling and Eco Design regulations. This provided all manufacturers in the Turkish market with minimum energy performance standards for a number of energy intensive white appliances. Moreover, MoSIT is now enabled in the future to more efficiently transpose EU regulations into Turkish legislation;
- Enhancement of the knowledge of MoSIT field inspectors on EU Eco-Design and Energy Labeling Directives, and their increased confidence on implementing an effective proactive market surveillance program (PMSP) that is based on best international practices, and that effectively removes “free riders” or products that do not comply with Turkish eco-design and energy labelling requirements from the Turkish retail market;
- Encouragement of the private sector to manufacture appliances to changing standards. The private sector now perceives this environment to be a more level playing field for the sale of their products;
- TURKBESD reporting sales of EE appliances to a market monitoring database that provides credible reports on market trends for EE appliances as well as estimates of energy consumption and GHG emissions. In effect, this database provides the tools for the Government of Turkey to quantify market transformation of EE appliances, and in future other EE equipment”.

The project complies with GEF’s strategic program #1 -promoting energy-efficient buildings and appliances- within GEF’s Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4.

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

The TE rates effectiveness as Satisfactory (S) for all project components, and this TER also rates effectiveness as Satisfactory (S) due to the high-quality of Project outputs. In its objective of a reduction of household electricity consumption and related greenhouse gas emissions, the project was successful, as reduced unit energy consumption was recorded in 2013 for refrigerators (-12.7%), freezers, (-13.2%), washing machines (-6.7%) and dishwashers (-3%) against baseline levels. (TE p.19) The project surpassed its target for CO₂ emissions reductions, with 2.75 million tons of indirect reduction (up to the end of 2014) on the basis of increased sales of energy efficiency appliances, compared to a target of 1.7 million tons. The TE (p. vii) reports that: “the Project has provided the Government with the necessary focus to accelerate appliance market transformation in Turkey towards EU energy efficiency standards. This included the provision of technical assistance transposing EU regulations into Turkish legislation, exposure to best practices and technical assistance to implement a market surveillance program, and awareness raising activities in collaboration with the private sector. Without the Project, the Government would have carried on with its business-as-usual activities and market transformation of appliances would have been implemented at a much slower rate due to capacity limitations of the Government”.

Achievements under each planned project outcome are presented below:

The project's first planned outcome was to enhance institutional capacities in Turkey to develop and implement effective appliance EE policies. To achieve this, the project developed a market monitoring system and database, where information on the sale of product categories can be tracked, translated EU eco-design and energy labelling regulations into Turkish for a number of appliances, organized a study tour for Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) staff to the National Measurement and Regulations Office in the United Kingdom, and provided technical assistance into the setup of the wet product EE testing laboratory, and an air-conditioning EE testing laboratory, both completed in 2014. Promotional campaigns to accelerate the replacement of inefficient appliances in Turkey was carried out. Surplus funds were used as grants to universities to augment awareness raising of energy efficiency appliances.

The project's second planned outcome was that a structured enforcement and verification program with adequately trained staff and other resources would be established. A proposal for an enforcement scheme was finalized, and used as a basis for the design of a proactive market surveillance program (PMSP) used to check the compliance of appliances for sale with new energy labelling regulations. Procedures were updated and agreed on for organizational arrangements for testing products regarding energy efficiency performance, and enforcement schemes for 6 targeted appliances were adopted. Finally, 3000 Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) personal from 81 branch offices were trained to implement a Proactive Market Surveillance Program, and 24 TSE personnel were trained in conducting equipment testing in the wet appliance and air conditioning laboratories established as part of the project's first outcome.

The project's third outcome was raised awareness of the end-users and the supply chain and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers to develop and implement specific promotional activities to enhance the sale of energy efficient appliances. Evidence of achievements of this outcome include a 2014 consumer awareness survey, in which consumers rated energy efficiency as a top priority, in comparison with a 2012 survey ranking energy efficiency as a third priority. Joint marketing campaigns with manufacturers and retail chains, and 5 universities, were carried out, a web site to support consumer's choices with test results and product information was produced, and retail chain staff were trained on marketing appliances on the basis of energy performance and life cycle costs. Financial incentives originally planned to be introduced were ultimately decided not to be required, due to the success of these campaigns.

The project's fourth outcome was institutionalization of the support provided by the Project, including monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation. As part of this outcome, a baseline study was conducted, and energy efficiency aspects were included into the curricula of five universities which were provided with grants from surplus project funds. This outcome also covers the project mid-term and final evaluations, and a final project report consolidating results and lessons learned. All were completed as planned.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Highly Satisfactory
----------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates efficiency for all project components as highly satisfactory (HS), and this TER also rates efficiency as Highly Satisfactory (HS) as a result of the on-time and on-budget management of the project. The project timeline was extended of one year only because additional activities were added.

The TE (p.13-14) notes that: “The cost effectiveness of the Project has been highly satisfactory in consideration that the intended outcomes of the Project were achieved by late 2013. The remainder of the funds were used to enhance the sustainability of all the Project activities, namely the small scale grant programme to the 5 universities to support EE awareness raising and embedding of EE appliances into university curricula”.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely (L)
--------------------	--------------------

The TE rates overall Project sustainability rating is Likely (L). This TER also rates Project sustainability as Likely (L) because it is deemed that the market transformation supported by the project will contribute over time to the: (a) unlocking of an end-demand through enabling policy frameworks and promotional measures and, (b) control of the compliance of the products offered to customers to their announced performance.

In particular sustainability along the four dimensions is supported below (TE, p.vii):

Institutional Sustainability: Turkish legislation on eco-design and energy labeling requirements is in place to guide both manufacturers and retailers on the energy performance standards and appliances that can be sold on the Turkish market;

Markets surveillance trends indicate increased compliances of appliances on the market to Turkish legislation on eco-design and energy labeling requirements;

Sociopolitical Sustainability: There is high public awareness of EE and their life cycle costs. Curricula on EE appliances is embedded in five prominent universities in Turkey; and appliance manufacturers are undertaking voluntary testing of new equipment prior to market entry.

Financial Sustainability: The project was extended in order to use surplus funds to augment and ensure sustainability of project activities. The Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) has financial support for full-time personnel for oversight of eco-design of Energy Efficient products, and market surveillance activities, and the government has fiscal resources to manage the market monitoring system. Additionally, both the government and private sector have confirmed financing for the continuation of TV spots and promotional activities for Energy Efficient appliances.

Environmental Sustainability: The TE reports that there are no environmental factors that would hinder sustainability.

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 Project co-financing was exceeded by 78% over the ProDoc estimate of USD 2.95 million. Higher co-financing than expected cofinancing materialized due to the contributions from other government partners including DGI under Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology and Turkish Standards Institute with regards to the transposition of EU regulations into Turkish legislation and their contributions to the setup and coordination of the market surveillance system. Additional co-financing facilitated the effective delivery of the Project's outcomes.

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 signed in March 2010 with an assumed 4-year duration. The actual project operations, however, did not commence until December 2010, 8 months later, with the Inception Workshop. The termination date of the Project was the 31st of December 2015.

The Project was extended to utilize surplus funds at the end of 2013 to augment and ensure sustainability of the Project activities. Due to the efficiency with which Project funds were expended up to 213, funds were available to enhance outcomes of increased user awareness of energy efficient appliances and the embedding of appliance energy efficiency into the curricula of relevant educational institutes. The approval of the use of surplus funds for a small grant programme to 5 universities in Turkey to carry out these additional activities required the extension of the project from its original terminal date of December 2014 to the new terminal date of December 2015.

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

The TE (p.28) states that "Government ownership of the MTEEA Project has been very strong. In particular, the implementing entity, DGRE, provided strong leadership on the Project during PSC meetings. In addition, MoSIT used the project as a springboard towards being a more effective government agency in affecting the market transformation of appliances towards energy efficiency".

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE rates M&E Design at entry as Satisfactory (S). This TER rates M&E Design as Satisfactory (HS), due to its overall consistency and broadness of parties involved in the process.

According to the Inception Report of January 2011, M&E was to be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures by the PMU and UNDP Turkey with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Istanbul.

The TE (p.viii) notes that: “M&E design was conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and well integrated to include a full complement of activities that were necessary to transform the appliance market towards energy efficiency equipment. The Logical Framework matrix provided clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The Monitoring and Evaluation Work Plan and Budget provided a detailed and sequential list of activities along with the corresponding responsible parties, Budget in US\$ (by project outcome and financing entity) and Timeframe”. A review of the project’s results framework confirms that indicators and targets are provided at all levels. (ProDoc p.34)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	----------------------

The TE rates M&E Implementation as Highly Satisfactory (HS). This TER rates M&E Implementation as Satisfactory (HS), due to the accuracy and timely delivery of M&E planned activities such as:

- PSC meetings held every 6 months;
- Regular (twice a month) meetings of the PMU to evaluate the progress of the Project
- Regular meetings of the Project Administrator and the UNDP Turkey Office and of the Environmental and Sustainable Development Programme Manager
- The development of a regularly updated system to monitor Project activities.

Project monitoring documentation included PIRs, PSC minutes and AWP with detailed descriptions of Project activities and planned activities. The project PIRs track indicator levels. The mid-term was conducted as planned and resulted in three recommendations, although the TE does not state whether or not these recommendations were implemented.

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: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

The project's implementing agency was UNDP. The TE rates Quality of Project Implementation as Highly Satisfactory (HS). This TER rates the Quality of Project Implementation as Satisfactory (HS) as the overall quality of project supervision had no shortcomings and a good communication among partners and stakeholder was upheld throughout the project duration.

The TE notes that throughout the duration of the Project, UNDP adaptively managed a number of Project issues including:

- Identification of specific EU regulations in 2011 that required transposing into Turkish for national regulations on energy labelling and eco-design requirements;
- The exclusion of financial mechanisms to catalyze market transformation towards energy efficient appliances. This was based on an assessment of the data on market surveillance activities that substantial market transformation was underway;
- The provision of additional training to MoSIT inspection officers to meet the demands for additional market surveillance under the "Proactive Market Surveillance Program" (PMSP);
- The formulation of a small-scale grants programme to universities to utilize surplus Project funds to enhance the sustainability of public awareness raising activities and embedding of energy efficiency appliances in university curricula;
- Preparation of detailed annual work plans with the intent of accelerating earlier achievement of Project targets and objectives.

Stakeholder participation occurred as planned. Most importantly, the planned partnerships formed augmented the intended Project outcomes including:

- The partnership with Arçelik, one of the largest white appliance manufacturers in Turkey. Arçelik were instrumental in working closely with the Project and the Government on the development of eco-design and energy labelling requirements for appliances. In addition, they undertook significant initiatives to raise awareness on energy efficiency in white appliances;
- Five well-known universities in Turkey that were beneficiaries of the small scale grant programme (covered under Outcomes 3 and 4) to provide unique measures on raising awareness of energy efficiency in white appliances.

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

The project's executing agencies was the Directorate General for Renewable Energy (DGRE), with the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) described in the TE as executing partner. The TE rates the performance of both DGRE and MoSIT as highly satisfactory. This TER rates quality of project execution as satisfactory, as the performance of both executing partners appears to have been strong, though noting some institutional inefficiency in having DGRE act as Executing Agency.

The TE (p.11) notes that: "the Project was successfully implemented, primarily due to the strong efforts of the executing agency (DGRE), executing partner the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) and the PMU of the Project". The high level of attention for the project is well demonstrated by the fact that the outcomes at entry were delivered on-scope and ahead of time enabling the expansion of the project's scope. However, the TE (p.11) also notes that: "from an institutional perspective, activities of the MTEEA Project were centered around the definition of energy standards of energy efficient appliances, surveillance of the appliance market, and increased capacity for testing of appliances for compliance to new energy standards. Since all these activities fall under various directorates of MoSIT, implementation efficiency of the MTEEA Project would have improved if MoSIT were the executing agency". This is a source of risk that could have slowed down the project timeline or effectiveness. Nevertheless, a sound collaboration between executing agencies enabled the successful delivery of the project.

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 reports an estimated indirect emission reduction of 2,757,697 tons of CO₂ as a result of the project. The project, focused on policy, institutional and knowledge barriers, thus only indirect emission reductions were generated.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and

qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project contributed to raising awareness of Turkish consumers towards energy-efficient appliances, facilitating a change in consumer behavior.

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.

As a key beneficiary of the Project, the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) was able to demonstrate strengthened capacity to set and implement policies for energy efficient appliances, and to coordinate and enforce these new policies. The TE (p.21) reports that: “a highly satisfactory outcome has been achieved with the enhanced capacity of MoSIT officers to adopt EU eco-design and energy labelling regulations, to use these regulations and to monitor and assess the impact of these new regulations. This was augmented through the development of a market monitoring system and database where information from TURKBESD was entered on the sale of various product categories”.

The project also strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers to develop and implement specific promotional activities to enhance the sale of energy efficient appliances (TE, p. 24).

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 are identified in the TE as having occurred as a result 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.

A replicability approach was included at the project design stage. The Project Document (p. 19) stated that: “Given the current interest of several UNDP/GEF programme countries to develop and implement energy efficiency standards and labeling programs, the materials developed and the results and lessons

learnt in this project are expected to be of direct interest also to other countries". "the project seeks to facilitate continuing contacts and co-operation between the different stakeholder groups at the national and international level by organizing seminars, workshops and other public events, thereby bringing the project proponents, the policy-makers and the potential investors / other donors together.

The TE (p.10) notes that: "The Project design envisaged a replication approach where the lessons learned would be of direct interest to other countries. In addition, the Project design also sought to facilitate continuing contacts and cooperation between different stakeholder groups at the national and international level through organization of seminars, workshops and other public events that would bring together policymakers, potential investors and donors".

In the TE no mention is made of specific replicability initiatives to be carried out in the near term.

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 (p.x) identifies the following key lessons:

- Design of a market transformation project needs to be integrated with all elements required for such a transformation.
- The design phase of a market transformation project needs to include the careful analysis of all relevant stakeholders.
- The key activity in a market transformation project is to bring all stakeholders to the same table in the spirit of understanding the agendas of other stakeholders, and to provide a forum for creating an environment of common interests and compromise.
- Implementing a small-scale grant programme has excellent potential to achieve a multiplier effect and enhance the sustainability of project results. One of the original targets of the MTEEA Project was to have "energy efficiency aspects increasingly included into the curricula of relevant educational institutions" (Output 4.2).
- The importance of early delivery of concrete outputs on a project increases the commitment of all relevant stakeholders on a project.
- The competence and diligence of the Project management personnel is critical in the implementation of project activities.
- Adaptive management of GEF projects can be improved through detailed preparation of one-year work plans.

- Since market transformation usually takes more than 4 years, future GEF projects should be designed with a duration of 5 to 6 years.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE (p.ix) included the following four recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Improve quality of energy and GHG data received from industry associations and other sources.

Recommendation 2: Continue public awareness raising activities to sustain efforts to change consumer behavior.

Recommendation 3: Support appliance re-cycling program so that it expands to all alliance manufacturers.

Recommendation 4: Assess the feasibility of testing of used appliances by TSE for energy performance.

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 assessment of relevant outcomes, impacts and achievements of objectives is both thorough and consistent with the project design. The TE provides a detailed assessment for all project components.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE is highly consistent internally, evidence is presented in a organized and detailed way, and ratings are provided against results/counterfactuals.	S

To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The assessment of sustainability is complete and includes next steps, actors and budget. Project exit strategy is not present.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence and areas of knowledge sharing are identified.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project includes actual total project costs, as well as cost per activity (component and sub-component level).	HS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of Project M&E provides a good assessment of the general M&E framework and a detailed analysis of UNDP's M&E efforts.	HS
Overall TE Rating		HS

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