

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3901	
GEF Agency project ID		4244	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		LGGE: Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (EEPb)	
Country/Countries		El Salvador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CC-SP1, Global :LGGE Framework for Promoting Low Greenhouse Gas emission Buildings	
Executing agencies involved		CNE, Consejo Nacional de Energia (National Energy Council)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As co-financiers	
Private sector involvement		As co-financiers	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		July 29 th , 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		December 10 th , 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.03	0.03
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.98	0.98
Co-financing	IA own	0.05	0.05
	Government	3	2.08
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	0.13	0.19
	NGOs/CSOs	0.15	0.08
Total GEF funding		1	1
Total Co-financing		3.33	2.48
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.33	3.48
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2014	
Author of TE		Mr. Jan van den Akker	
TER completion date		3/7/2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Caroline Laroche	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	HS ¹	NR	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	NR	L
M&E Design		S	NR	S
M&E Implementation		HS	NR	S
Quality of Implementation		HS	NR	S
Quality of Execution		HS	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	NR	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective is "to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from fossil-based electricity generation in El Salvador by removing the barriers presently impeding the implementation of EE measures in public buildings." (Project Document p.16) This is a child project under the umbrella project "LGGE Framework for Promoting Low Greenhouse Gas Emission Buildings." (GEF ID 3787) which aims to promote buildings with a low generation rate of greenhouse gas emissions. (Project document 3787, p.2) Urbanization in El Salvador has been both rapid and unplanned, which has resulted in the construction of buildings which require a high consumption of electricity and petroleum products. (TE p.18) This project was developed to promote energy efficiency in the public sector.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective was "to introduce energy efficiency (EE) measures in existing and new public buildings by creating a conducive policy environment, increasing user awareness, developing performance criteria and standards, and implementing a broad EE pilot within selected public entities." (PD p.1) The project would achieve this by working towards three main outcomes:

- 1) Effective policies and regulation regarding energy efficiency (EE) in buildings have been developed and applied to the public sector.
- 2) Technical capacity concerning the design and integration of EE measures in public buildings has been strengthened
- 3) An energy efficiency programme has been designed and implemented within public buildings.

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, or development objectives of the project. The 2013 PIR notes that as mid-term evaluations are no longer required by the GEF for medium

¹ This is the score for results

size projects, and the project performed well from its first year, the planned mid-term evaluation was not conducted. (PIR-2013, p.2)

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 ‘relevant’. This TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as “Satisfactory.” The project was aligned with the priorities of El Salvador, and with El Salvador’s National Energy Council in particular, as project activities have been an integral part of the National Energy Council’s energy efficiency program. The TE notes that some projects activities have supported activities which the National Energy Council had already planned to undertake as part of their energy efficiency program. (TE p.30) The project is aligned with El Salvador’s National Energy Policy (2010-2014), Public Sector Savings and Austerity Policy, and the country’s National Strategy on Climate Change. (2012) p.30

The project is also relevant to GEF’s Climate Change Strategy Long-term objective 1: “To promote energy-efficient technologies and practices in the appliance and building sectors”, specifically Strategic Program 1: promoting energy efficiency in residential and commercial buildings.

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

The TE rates the project’s effectiveness as highly satisfactory. This TER rates project effectiveness as Satisfactory. The project has introduced energy efficiency measures in public buildings, notably in hospitals, and has developed advocacy tools, such as a manual of procurement with energy efficiency criteria. The project has also succeeded in creating 112 Energy Efficiency Committees, as well as helping these committees develop investments plans in energy efficient technology, with great potential for further reduction of greenhouse gases. Several public institutions are already implementing energy saving measures introduced by the project. Based on figures presented in the terminal evaluation, the project has resulted in avoided emissions of roughly 37,000 tons of CO₂ coming fairly close to the estimated results provided in the project document of 42,000 tons of CO₂ avoided.

Achievements of the project under its three planned outcomes are below:

- 1) **Effective policies and regulation regarding energy efficiency (EE) in buildings have been developed and applied to the public sector.** The project has produced a ‘Manual for Procurement with Energy Efficiency Criteria’ together with the National Procurement Unit of

Public Administration (UNAC), as well as technical norms for building energy performance. The manual has been formally incorporated into public procurement procedures and manuals. A strategy for energy efficiency in the government sector was formulated. The project has also supported additional activities to those originally planned, by assisting in the preparation, consultation and presentation of the draft “Energy Efficiency Act” to the Assembly.

- 2) **Technical capacity concerning the design and integration of EE measures in public buildings has been strengthened.** The project achieved this outcome through its support to the establishment and operations of 112 Institutional Energy Efficiency Committees in public institutions, which have analyzed energy-saving opportunities and elaborated investment plans. These “are interdisciplinary working groups within public institutions responsible for supervising energy management” These groups were set up as an initiative of the National Energy Council, the project’s executing agency, and have been strengthened through the project through investment in their technical capacity. The project’s support has enabled these Energy Efficiency Committees “to identify and implement energy savings measures at a value of USD 2.1 million, resulting in the greenhouse gas emission reduction of 33,434 tons of CO₂ (over the measures’ lifetime of 10 years).” (TE p.14) The project supported the development of an online information system for the committees.
- 3) **An energy efficiency programme has been designed and implemented within public buildings.** The project conducted energy consumption assessments and feasibility studies of 12 hospitals and health centers. 26 energy saving and budget saving measures were implemented, leading to the following changes in equipment and technologies:
 - Replacements for efficient lighting
 - Replacements for high-efficiency motors
 - Heat isolation of boilers and steam pipes and ducts
 - Installation of efficient air conditioning equipment
 - Modernization of water pumping equipment
 - Use of solar thermal energy for water heating

According to the TE these changes have led to savings of over 125,000 annually and 584 MWh per year, which would implicate potential greenhouse gas reductions of 3,544 tons of CO₂ over the useful life of the measures. Additionally, the project has set up a course in energy efficiency intended for public officials, in which 72 representatives from public institutions have participated. (TE p.15)

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

The TE rates efficiency/cost effectiveness as **highly satisfactory**. (TE p.10) 99% of all GEF funds were utilized. Total co-financing was lower than expected, and the TE notes that it appears some of the in-kind co-financing reported is slightly inflated (for instance, in-kind co-financing from the executing agency appears to include the staff time of staff dedicated to executing the project.) The project was extended for four months but for the most part activities were completed on time, achieving targets set in the logical framework. (TE p.50) Thus this slight delay does not appear to have affected the project’s

cost effectiveness. No management issues are noted in the TE. The TE estimates that one component of the project has enabled energy savings measures at a value of USD 2.1 million, and greenhouse gas emission reductions of 33,434 tons of CO₂, while another project component enabled an estimate 125,000 USD savings per year. These impacts, when considered in relation to the project's final budget of 3.48 million USD, appear to make the project quite cost effective. Considering the cost and energy savings generated by the project a rating of **Satisfactory** for Efficiency is justified.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
--------------------	----------------

The TE considers overall Sustainability of benefits after the project is completed to be likely.

Financial Resources: Sustainability of financial resources is rated likely by both the TE and this TER. Under the "Savings and Austerity Public Sector Policy" public institutions have begun investing significant amounts of money in energy efficiency measures. Additionally the "Energy Efficiency Strategy for the Government Sector" provides for the establishment of a Fund for Energy Efficiency. (TE p.54-55) These are positive indicators of sustainability of financial resources.

Sociopolitical: Sociopolitical sustainability is rated likely by both the TE and this TER. The project has worked to develop a promotional plan which aims to raise awareness among the general public as well as users of energy consuming equipment of the measures implemented by the project. The government will continue to raise energy efficiency awareness with the public with an "El Salvador Saves Energy" program. Sociopolitical sustainability of the continuation of project benefits will require a long term culture change, however it is a positive indicator that the project's exit strategy takes this into account.

Institutional framework and governance: Sustainability in terms of institutional framework and governance is rated as likely by the TE and this TER, largely due to the fact that this project was extremely well integrated with the ongoing work of the National Energy Council, the project's executing agency. By working with the National Unit for Procurement and Contracting (UNAC) of the Ministry of Finance, the project has succeeded in influencing institutional policy considerations in purchases of energy-consuming equipment. The project's executing agency will continue to advocate for the adoption of the Draft Energy Efficiency Act, tags and minimum energy performance standards, and energy performance codes for buildings. The National Energy council will also continue to work with the energy efficiency committees supported by this project.

Environmental: The TE rates environmental sustainability as likely. A threat to continuation of benefits comes for the fact that providers of energy efficiency equipment are not fully prepared to supply all the produced needed for future planned efficiency projects. However, the government is working to promote coordination of actions between all sectors, which could help address this issue.

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?

Total co-financing was lower than expected, at 2.48 million USD compared to a planned 3.33 million USD, and the TE notes that it appears some of the in-kind co-financing reported is slightly inflated (for instance, in-kind co-financing from the executing agency appears to include the time of staff dedicated to executing the project.) It represented 71% of the project's total co-financing, and thus would have been essential to achieving the project's outcomes and sustainability.

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?

At the beginning of 2014 the project was extended by four months to complete the project's terminal evaluation. (TE p.50) This delay does not appear to have affected the project's 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 was high in the case of this project, which was executed by a national organization, the National Energy Council, and which worked closely with other government agencies such as the National Unit for Procurement and Contracting (UNAC) of the Ministry of Finance. The TE notes that "One factor explaining the success of the project is that it was not executed as an isolated activity in the CNE [National Council of Energy], but was an integral part of its program "El Salvador Saves Energy". It is worth mentioning that the CNE itself is not a proper ministry, but a state agency whose board consists of representatives from various ministries. Perhaps, this structure has allowed in a flexible way EEPB to disseminate information to various state project participants." (TE p.54) The participation of government agencies affected outcomes and sustainability because the project was well integrated with strategies already being supported by the National Energy Council. The majority of co-financing was provided by the government of El Salvador.

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, and this TER is in agreement with that rating. (TE p.10) The M&E Budget for the project was USD 85,000. The M&E plan included in the project document includes provisions and budgets for an inception workshop, both a mid-term and final external evaluation, and dissemination of lessons learnt. The TE notes that indicators generally met the criteria of Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time Bound, or SMART, but that a broader list of indicators could have been beneficial, and that in some cases the targets could be better defined. (TE p.33, 55) In reviewing the project results framework this TER finds indicators to be adequate and sufficient. (Project document p.23)

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as highly satisfactory, and this TER rates M&E implementation as Satisfactory (TE p.10) The 2013 PIR notes that as mid-term evaluations are no longer required by the GEF for medium size projects, and the project performed well from its first year, the planned mid-term evaluation was not conducted. (PIR-2013, p.2) This omission seems justified as the project appears to have been completed on track, and does not seem to have suffered from the lack of a mid-term evaluation. Otherwise, M&E activities were carried out as planned, and included meetings of the project steering committee, as well as meetings on an ad hoc basis with UNDP and other entities as well as:

- Five annual meetings with the Directive Committee
- Three PIRs for the years 2012, 2013, & 2014
- Four Annual Operating Plans, for 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 respectively
- Eleven Quarterly Progress Reports

The PIRs report on progress towards achieving indicators with the appropriate level of detail. Overall the project appears to have had a functioning M&E system throughout project implementation.

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 UNDP's quality of project implementation as highly satisfactory. The TE does not have a section dedicated to discussion of quality of project implementation, but notes that it considers their level of supervision to be adequate- "UNDP has taken

an appropriate approach, providing the administrative and technical support necessary for timely delivery of products.”(TE p.51) PNUD met with the project management unit as needed on an ad-hoc basis, and there was a UNDP program officer on the project’s steering committee. (Project Document p.29) In terms of project design UNDP has created a focused project which has proved achievable in the time frame. Based on these factor this TER considers UNDP’s quality of project implementation to be **Satisfactory**.

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

The project’s executing agency was the National Council of Energy. The TE rates the National Council of Energy’s quality of project execution as highly satisfactory. “It is noteworthy that the National Energy Council has implemented the project with good achievements and with only a small team of professionals.”(TE p.51) It is evident that the National Council of Energy has performed their role effectively, collaborating well with other government agencies and supplying the original concept for the Energy Efficiency Committees which this project supported.

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.

Energy savings measures implemented by the Institutional Energy Efficiency Committees set up by the project have led to an estimated 33,434 tons of CO₂ saved (over the measures’ lifetime of 10 years). The project’s energy consumption assessments and feasibility studies in hospitals have led to a potential GHG reduction of 3,544 tons of CO₂ over the life of the measures. (TE p.14)

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 energy saving measures implemented as a result of the project have corresponding cost savings implications. For example, the energy consumption assessment and feasibility studies in hospitals have led to 125,000 USD in savings, while the Energy Efficiency Committees have implemented measures with an estimated 2.1 million in savings. (TE p.14)

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 has invested in the technical capacity of 112 Institutional Energy Efficiency Committees, and put in place an online information system for them to monitor energy consumption and identify energy savings opportunities. (TE p.14)

b) Governance

The project has supported the approval of a new “Energy Efficiency Law” and has elaborated the National Energy Efficiency Strategy for the Governmental Sector, which will help with the establishment of energy consumption reduction targets in governmental institutions. The project also developed a “Manual for Procurement with Energy Efficiency Criteria”, which will serve as a guideline for the procurement of efficient equipment that will allow energy consumption reduction in public buildings. (TE p.14)

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 recorded for this 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 other private clinics have expressed interest in the results of the 12 public hospitals involved in the project, and that other donors have expressed interest in replicating project methods. For example, based on interviews conducted by the TE author with representatives of the German Federal Enterprise for International Cooperation, GIZ, this organization would like to copy the Energy Efficiency Committees (COEEs) model in other energy efficiency projects in the region. (TE p.50)

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.

It is important to set up an organizational basis within institutions for the introduction of measures on rational use of energy. Formation of the Energy Efficiency Committees (COEEs) is a concept that has been promoted by CNE with the help of the Project. The COEEs, with multidisciplinary participation in each institution (of which the participants and other interested staff were trained on-the-job and in specialized courses) have facilitated the sustainability of the implemented measures. Technical studies, undertaken prior to the investment plans, have permitted the orientation of these investments towards more efficient equipment and measures. The methodology to identify EE measures and institutionalizing these (through the COEEs) has an important value added in terms of allowing replication in both public institutions and private companies, not only in El Salvador, but in other countries in the region as well.

One institutional barrier often encountered is that the persons that make a decision on investments are not the same people that are responsible for operational expenses, such as the energy bill. The project has managed to formalize the incorporation of energy efficiency considerations in procurement in the government sector. Most investments tend to have short payback periods, and in many cases, the COEE managed to convince management without the need for financial adjustments. However, in other cases the initial cost can be relatively high, e.g. in the case of solar water heating, although total cost (initial cost and operating cost over the equipment's lifetime) can be less than the fossil fuel alternative. For this reason, an adequate long-term financing programming model, that takes into account energy efficiency and lifecycle costs, permits the institution to give continuity to the process of substitution of inefficient equipment and purchase of new efficient equipment.

One factor contributing to the Project's success has been that its execution has not been as an isolated activity within CNE, but that it has been an integral part of the national program El Salvador Ahorra Energía, executed by staff already employed by CNE. Since its conception, the Project formed an integral part of CNE's energy efficiency policy and plans. The role of the Project was to strengthen the initiatives already existing or contemplated and this has guaranteed the sustainability and replicability of its achievements.

Apart from raising the awareness of users of energy consuming equipment, both public and private, it is important to develop the sector of providers of equipment (importers, retail) and services. During the project's execution it was found that the capacity of the country to supply the most advanced technology is limited; this can be a limiting factor in developing the market of efficient products. (TE p.15-16)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendations to the National Energy Council:

Continue with the strategy of training the COEEs:

- In other subsectors and extend at local level (i.e. with the municipalities) in order to obtain higher investments in energy efficiency measures;

- Similarly, support the procurement units in public institutions by training them on using the manual for procurement with energy efficiency considerations and its application in investment planning (refurbishing and maintenance of installations and equipment). Special attention could be given to large consumers of energy, i.e. the sectors covered by ISSS (social security and health) and ANDA (water and waste);
- Further motivate the COEEs through a 'Reward' program that provides incentives to those COEEs that implement creative or innovative projects.

2. Continue with supporting the efforts to:

- Approve the 'Energy Efficiency Law', which will guarantee the full development of the COEEs in governmental institutions as well as the introduction of financing mechanisms and a standards and labelling program;
- Initiate raising resources for energy efficiency funds as defined in the 'Energy Efficiency Strategy for the Government Sector' and for the pilot projects mentioned in the proposed NAMA (covering the subsectors of public lighting, public buildings and transportation) in cooperation with donors and Salvadorian banks (e.g. BANDESAL);

3. One barrier encountered has been the limited availability of high-efficiency equipment and of companies dedicated to energy efficiency, which at times made procurement in the pilot projects more difficult. One recommendation is to strengthen those actors that have not been involved in the Project, but play an important role in energy efficiency, i.e. the equipment suppliers. It will be important to empower this market segment by strengthening the technical capacity of these companies and link them with credit lines as well as potential clients, in order to improve technical and economic market conditions.

Recommendations (for UNDP):

4. The new GEF programming cycle (GEF-6, from 01-06-2014 to 30-06-2018) offers opportunities to continue supporting the Government of El Salvador in the area of energy efficiency, for example, to extend support to lower levels of the public sector (departments and municipalities) and promote the rational use of energy in the private sector (see also the previous point 3.). The presentation of PIFs (project concepts) could be considered within the framework of the new 'programs' of the GEF Climate Change focal area, such as Program 3 "Promote integrated low-emission urban systems" or as part of the new IPAs (Integrated Pilot Approach), such as the IPA on 'sustainable cities'.

5. The EEPB Project gives important lessons learned both in terms of achieved results and its implementation and strategies chosen. It would be interesting to carry out a comparative evaluation of various UNDP/GEF projects in the area of 'energy efficiency in buildings' in order to be able to compare results, methodologies used, strategies developed and to distill lessons learned for future initiatives in the area of energy efficiency in the buildings or the public sector.

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 contains a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project, as well as achievement of the project's objectives.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and evidence is complete, however in some cases ratings are given without explanation, specifically in regards to quality of implementation and execution, for which evidence is scattered throughout the report, and the discussion of implementation and execution is combined.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The discussion of sustainability is proper and complete, and some information on the project's exit strategy is provided.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are both supported by the evidence presented and comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs, both total and per activity.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The evaluation of the project's M&E system is adequate.	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).

Project Document for Parent Project 3787 "LGGE Framework for Promoting Low Greenhouse Gas Emission Buildings"