GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	3/30/09
GEF Project ID:	448		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$) (up to 10/2007)
IA/EA Project ID:	752	**GEF financing:**	7.30	7.17
Project Name:	Malaysian Industrial Energy Efficiency Improvement Project (MIEEIP)	IA/EA own:	0.30	0.23
Country:	Malaysia	Government:	7.93	4.70
		Other*:	5.26	1.12
		Total Cofinancing	13.19	6.05
Operational Program:	5	**Total Project Cost:**	20.79	13.28
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Energy, Water and Telecommunications; and Pusat Tenaga Malaysia (PTM)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		07/30/1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: 07/19/2004	Actual: 12/2007
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 60	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 100	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 40
Author of TE:	Jan van den Akker	TE completion date: Jan 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 3

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

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

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

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?
No. Although the TE presents a concise assessment of project achievements, its use of performance evaluation indicators based on the format in APR reports is confusing, and it does not provide ratings for most performance dimensions. On the other hand, it includes well-reasoned conclusions and recommendations.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
No mention of any such findings.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the ProDoc, MIEEIPs global environmental objective is to mitigate GHG emissions from the industrial sector of Malaysia.

There were no changes during implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The MIEEIP Development Objective is to *"improve energy efficiency in Malaysia's industrial sector, through removing barriers to efficient industrial energy use, and through creating a sustainable institutional capacity to provide energy efficiency sources, and a conducive policy, planning and research framework".*

Main objectives included:

"(1) To assist the industrial sector in adopting and investing in well-proven EE&C technologies and practices; (2) To help industries realize the technical, financial, productivity, and environmental benefits of investing in EE&EC; (3) To address information, technical, financial and institutional barriers in adopting viable EE&C practices in industries; (4) To develop technical and institutional capacity to assist industries in formulating and implementing EE&EC technology projects; and (5) To encourage and catalyze the development of ESCOs for implementation of energy projects by industries".

No changes to the project objectives.

(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
			Project expanded to include more industrial subsectors.[1]

If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
				To promote sustainability of the project

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

Energy efficiency drive at the national level was first stated in the Seventh Malaysia Plan (1996-2000), which actually gave birth to the Malaysia Energy Centre (PTM). Energy efficiency is again explicitly addressed in the Ninth Malaysia Plan (2006-2010).

(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

About one quarter of the total CO2 emissions from fuel combustion in Malaysia comes from manufacturing industries, so improving the EE of this sector is highly relevant to the country goal of reducing CO2 emissions.

(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?

Removing barriers to energy efficiency improvements is highly relevant to GEF OP5, and to the GEF mandate since it is an important contribution to the reduction of GHG.

(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards

[1] MIEEIP focused initially on the following 8 energy-intensive industrial sub-sectors: iron & steel, cement, wood, food, glass, pulp & paper, ceramics and rubber. Later three other sectors were added, namely oleo-chemical, plastics and textiles.

the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

Reduction of GHG emissions and reduction of barriers to EE improvements is a central goal of the UNFCCC.

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership[2]

Not applicable.

b. Effectiveness **Rating: S**

According to the TE, MIEEIP has made important and real contributions to removing some barriers, in particular EE awareness creation and capacity building in important areas such as benchmarking, best practices, audits and demonstration of EE processes and technology. MIEEIP has taken a first step in creating basic skills to understand the factors affecting decision-making concerning energy efficiency by industrial energy users as well as consultancy companies. It has also generated powerful insights into the technical and economic potential for energy efficiency initiatives and the means available to government to realize that potential.

A feedback received by the MIEEIP team from factories covered in the MIEEIP database indicated that over 250 companies have started implementing energy efficiency activities at their sites. Assuming an average energy savings of 12,814 GJ per year per company (based on the estimate of 615.1 GJ per year of energy savings in the 48 audits companies), this would imply *indirect* CO2 savings of 3,778 tCO2 per company. Thus, total energy savings of 250 companies implementing energy saving measures would be around 3.2 million GJ, giving a CO2 reduction of 944.7 kilotonnes of CO2 annually (i.e., 9.45 million tCO2 over a 10-year period).

According to the TE, MIEEIP main achievements include:
• The E-Benchmarking activities have successfully compiled a database of more than 1,500 industries built up from data sourced from the Department of Statistics (DOS), although the use of the tools has some limitations. MIEEIP has developed an Energy Efficiency and Conservation Guidelines for Electrical Equipment (EE&C Guidelines);
• A total of 54 industries have been audited under the project, in the following sub-sectors: cement (3), ceramic (6), iron & steel (4), food (10), glass (3), pulp & paper (6), rubber (9), wood (7), oleo-chemical (2), plastics (2) and textile (2). MIEEIP has produced a useful 56-page document called "Industrial Energy Audit Guidelines – A Handbook for Energy Auditors";
• An energy efficient motor rating and labeling programme has been proposed to the Energy Commission, but is only implemented on a voluntary basis so far. A "Boiler Best Practice" guidebook has been developed;
• Various promotional materials that have been successfully developed and disseminated to stakeholders and beneficiaries, by means of the quarterly newsletter (MIEEIP News), articles in professional publications, newspaper articles and advertorials and by means of numerous workshops and seminars. MIEEIP has also helped to establish the Malaysian Energy Professionals Association (MEPA), and association of energy experts, which is open to energy practitioners of various academic backgrounds. A special booklet "Achieving Industrial Energy Efficiency in Malaysia" was published by UNDP to highlight efforts of the MIEEIP and energy conservation efforts in Malaysia in general;
• A Master Energy Services Agreement (MESA) was drawn up by the MIEEIP Team at PTM as a sample document to assist Energy Services Companies (ESCOs) and industries in the implementation of energy efficiency activities.
• Ten EE technology demonstration projects in energy-intensive industries (pulp and paper, glass, food, steel, palm oil) have been supported as well as three local equipment manufacturers (motor rewinding, fans) by means of technical assistance (feasibility analysis) and investment support (through the Energy Efficiency Projects Lending Scheme, EEPLS);
• One demonstration project (Heveaboard Bhd in Gemas) based on ESCO concept has been successfully implemented based on the MESA.

Despite MIEEIP efforts in ESCO development as well as training and seminars, the ESCO industry in Malaysia has not developed well due to factors that are not under the control of the project.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: MS**

Although the MIEEIP successfully completed most of its activities and achieved many of its expected outputs, it suffered from serious delays which resulted in a considerable extension of the project duration.
The delays were mainly relating to activities (outputs) requiring decisions and agreement from other agencies. For example, lack of regulations on equipment rating has led to the deferment of the installation of the motor test bed, although specifications have been prepared and tenders invited. Delay in the implementation of the Efficient Management of Electrical Energy regulations has affected the attainment of the 10% reduction in energy consumption. The TE also noted that the MIEEIP project document did not realistically considered that Demonstration Projects take long time from the identification phase to the implementation phase, and that further delay is caused by the long period taken for loan processing. Finally, the high turnover of the Executing agency staff affected the progress of the project. When compared to the final project funding, the cost of the direct reduced CO^2 emissions was of $7.34 per ton.

[2] Please consider for regional and global project only

Even though the project took much longer than planned to achieve its results, the final budget was lower. The TE does not provide any explanation for this.
d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated)
No trade-offs mentioned.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts[3] (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

According to the TE, the project achieved cumulative savings of 1.81 million tCO^2 in a 10-yr period.

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

a. Financial resources	**Rating: L**
Although the TE concludes that an upscaled EEPLS fund, or other 'green funding' schemes are needed in order to pursue more ambitious energy efficiency improvements in energy-efficient processes and technologies, it notes that the project was able to attract catalytic financing from the private sector. In addition, 2 private banks have expressed interest in "green funding". Sustainability of EE activities implemented by the companies is likely due to the savings in production costs that result from the reduction of energy use.	
b. Socio-economic / political	**Rating: ML**
The project successfully overcame initial reluctance from industries to have their sites audited, and by the end of the project it was clear that the participating industries understood the importance of the energy audits to identify potential saving accurately. Some MIEEIP activities have had some impact on recent policy formulation that is reflected in the 'energy chapter' of the Ninth Malaysia Plan 2006 – 2010 (NMP 2006-2010) as well as on recommendations made to the energy regulator, i.e. the Energy Commission: On the other hand, the main barrier to improved energy use in Malaysia remains the highly subsidized energy prices. Therefore many companies are still hesitant to pursue energy savings, because the current fuel cost does not reflect the real energy production cost. Also, energy efficiency promotion and implementation needs to be an integral part in the Government's long-term public policy, and so far this is not the case in Malaysia.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	**Rating: ML**
According to the TE, in Malaysia, while most ESCOs are capable of conducting energy audits, currently only a few of them are ready to move further from energy audits to energy performance contracting. Furthermore, many ESCOs have a "poor image", aggravated by the fact that equipment suppliers also identify themselves as ESCOs (as a means to market the equipment they sell); and also the fact that only 1 out of 4 projects earmarked for ESCO execution had been carried out has failed to impress the industrial community of the ESCOs' professional capability. On the other hand, the TE notes that most companies are financially capable to carry out EE projects. If interested, they would prefer to do the EE project on their own rather than do it with an ESCO.	
d. Environmental	**Rating: L**
No environmental risks are mentioned in the TE.	
e. Technological	**Rating: L**
No technological risks are mentioned in the TE.	

4.3 Catalytic role[4]

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders
The project provided technical assistance (feasibility analysis) and investment support (through the Energy Efficiency Projects Lending Scheme, EEPLS) to participating companies.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors
Although the TE does not mention any specific institutional change that resulted from the project, it does conclude that capacities of the governmental organizations involved in the project implementation were strengthened and that the

[3] Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

[4] Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

project has successfully raised awareness of EE issues in the government and private sector.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
Although the MIEEIP has not resulted in any new policies, it has set up an important basis for new EE policies/regulations to be enacted. For example, the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Guidelines report, created under the project, would become the main reference document when the Efficient Management of Electrical Energy Regulation is finally enacted.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
According to the TE, while support from FRIM/SIRIM has not materialized as planned, the private sector has invested or is planning to invest in the demonstration and EE equipment components 6 and 7 of the project. These investments are not included in the ProDoc and are therefore considered catalytic financing. The TE does not provide any specific information on the amount of funds that the private sector is investing (or planning to) or what are these funds being used for.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
No mention of any particular project champions.

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
There was a considerable difference between the planned and actual co-financing of the project (a difference of approx. $6million). The TE does not provide any explanation on why the all the expected government contribution was not forthcoming, or what were the consequences of this decrease in budget. The TE does mention that there was unplanned investment coming from the private sector. Although the private sector financing cannot be counted as GEF cofinancing (since these were not considered in the financial plans as laid down in the GEF Project Brief and UNDP Project Document), TE opines that it should be taken into account as *de facto* cofinancing, compensating for the lack of FRIM/SIRIM and other not forthcoming co-financing.
b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The project was initially meant to be run from 1999 to 2004. In 2004, the NSC decided to extend until 2006 and again was extended until December 2007. Project delays included: -The benchmarking component started with delays, as industry was initially uncooperative. Confidentiality was an issue and in general it was not clear for companies why they should spend time and money on providing data which is not compulsory. -Getting the demonstration projects ready, i.e. acquiring the company management's approval, have ESCOs involved and get the necessary finance arranged. Reportedly, the whole process from initiation to final commissioning of a demonstration site typically took from 2 to 3 years or longer. -PTM (MIEEIP) problems regarding manpower requirement including: Resignation of PTM staff due to low remuneration and benefits as well as PTM's financial uncertainty of the future; over the years PTM has been assigned with more national tasks and projects; and change in management.
c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.
The TE concludes that the project is a good example of government agencies, institutes and private sector organizations working hand-in-hand. For example, MIEEIP has successfully established the E-Benchmarking program in a smart partnership with National Productivity Corporation (NPC) and later involving the Department of Statistics (DOS). On the other hand, the TE mentions that some sectors of the government still believed that EE was a purely commercial decision by the companies involved, and that government should not get involved. The eventual impact of the project depends much on whether the Government decides to put an energy efficiency policy in place with effective policy instruments backed up by substantial resources.

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

a. M&E design at Entry **Rating (six point scale): S**
According to the ProDoc, the project was to be subject to tripartite review (joint review by representatives of the Government, executing agency and UNDP) at least once every 12 months. The ProDoc Annex includes a "Project Planning Matrix" with a list of verifiable indicators and targets. The ProDoc specified that in addition to normal UNDP project monitoring and evaluation activities, long-term impact assessment would be initiated during the course of the project and provisions would be made to continue this assessment activity after the project is completed.

b. M&E plan Implementation **Rating (six point scale): S**
The TE mentions that a National Steering Committee (NSC) was established for general coordination, monitoring and strategy support for the project implementation and met regularly providing relevant feedback to the project management. It also describes that the indicators were reviewed in 2003 and retrofitted back in 2004 defining the annual targets for each, which shows that the M&E system was actively implemented during the duration of the project. In addition, the project established EE benchmarks and trained several staff from PTM to perform energy audits and will therefore will be able to continue performing these services after project completion.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? The Pro Doc did not include a budget with specifications on planned M&E costs.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? There is no indication in the TE that there was a shortage of funding for implementing M&E activities.
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? The TE mentions that adaptive management has been practiced, based on feedback obtained during project implementation. For example, in Component 2, there was a need to form a specialist group for energy auditing for each industrial sector and stationed in the industry association (FMM) but after further consultations, due to highly diversified industry portfolios, the requirement was actually not necessary and the project adjusted itself by establishing a common industry consultation group which covers various "general" utility issues.
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. The TE does not provide sufficient information about the M&E system to determine if it was a good practice or not.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution. According to the TE, the project document provided a clear, logical structure in its eight Components. At the same time, the TE concluded that the project objectives were too ambitious considering the original planned project duration. Also, even though the lack of a conducive policy and planning framework for the promotion and implementation of energy efficiency was one of the main barriers facing the project, a separate component on energy efficiency planning and regulations was not included in the project design. The TE found that the working arrangement between UNDP and PTM was satisfactory and that UNDP has provided an efficient supervision of the project and produced quality APRs. In addition, UNDP contributed to the awareness raising of EE in Malaysia by publishing a special booklet "Achieving Industrial Energy Efficiency in Malaysia" to highlight efforts of the MIEEIP and energy conservation efforts in Malaysia in general.
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[5] (rating on a 6 point scale): S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency. The TE concludes that PTM was a competent executing agency, and that overall, despite the various hurdles, the project has been well managed. The MIEEIP project provided institutional strength to PMT, which has become a recognized energy organization, not only domestically, but also in the ASEAN region. On the other hand PTM has had problems regarding manpower requirement. The staff strength dropped to half (from 16 in the beginning to 8 currently). This is caused by two phenomena in PTM, as described below: • Resignation of PTM staff due to low remuneration and benefits as well as PTM's financial uncertainty of the future, had to some extent affected the performance and smooth implementation of the MIEEIP project; • Over the years PTM has been assigned with more national tasks and projects. Though these projects have engaged personnel and consultants on a contractual basis from outside, PTM is also assigning its own personnel to these later projects. Some previous personnel of the MIEEIP team have since been reassigned to these later projects; • The MIEEIP manager changed in 2004, which reportedly caused some delay in project implementation.

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

PTM successfully practiced adaptive management and appointed two consortiums, providing both local and international consultants, for the implementation of major MIEEIP activities:
• Zet Consortium (consisting of Zet Corporation Sdn Bhd (Malaysia), Fichtner GmbH (Germany), CESI (Italy) and Ecoloner SA (Belgium), providing consultancy services for Components 1,2,4,5,6,7 and 8 (see also section 2.5.1).
• Techno Economist Consortium (consisting of Techno Economist and the Dansk Energi Management), providing consultancy services for Component 3.
The TE concludes that overall, the experience with international consultants seem to have been good, especially in training and capacity building, although the mid-term evaluation reports that in the beginning it looked like there was too much of a parallel structure within the overall setup.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

Care must be taken not to exaggerate the potential of certain energy efficiency promotion instruments, such as ESCOs or certain financial incentives, while other barriers remain in place, such as the practice in Malaysia of substantially subsidizing energy cost. ESCO or financial incentives alone will not able to overcome the barriers discussed and no single measure can provide immediate solution. As such, policy planners must look into bigger perspective when implementing EE.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE has the following recommendations:
• More serious implementation of sustainable energy policies by the Government is a prerequisite to kick-start the industry towards producing more energy-efficient products both for local and overseas market. Leaving such strategy to PTM to lead the industry is an effort beyond the mandate and capability of PTM and will only bring insignificant results;
• Regarding efficiency in industrial processes as well as the local manufacturing of energy efficient equipment, such an EE Action Plan could be formulated by the Government, which could entail the following elements:
- The currently proposed 'energy management regulations' for companies that consume a certain amount of energy;
- Energy standards and labeling as a means of promoting and implementing EE, not only in manufacturing, but for consumer equipment as well;
- Provision of better tax incentives to manufacturing sector to implement EE measures;
- Lowering energy subsidies that presently encourage inefficient rather than rational energy use.
• Main recommendation for PTM, the implementing agency, is to keep the momentum regarding the interest and practice of EE in industry set by MIEEIP project:
- For PTM to continue and expand the MIEEIP activities, the Government has to allocate sufficient funds to enable these roles to be carried out and to have minimum staff strength. Furthermore, capable and experienced staffing is critical in ensuring PTM's success in providing advisory services to the government and the industries.
- The application of E-Benchmarking tools could be expanded to other (sub)sectors or another new activity could be to introduce international benchmarks for similar subsectors;
- PTM should not compete with ESCOs, and should act as an intermediary between the industries and ESCOs. While audits would be have to be undertaken largely by the ESCOs, on commercial terms; PTM should work with the ESCO association (MAESCO) to enhance their professional image and should continue to assist in their capacity building and PTM should also initiate and monitor the ESCO registration;
- PTM should continue with campaigns and promotional activities to increase demand for energy efficiency equipment in the country;
- Talks should be held between PTM, MIDF and MEWC on the continuation of the MIEEIP project's lending scheme into a full-fledged national-level EE promotion fund, while at the same time commercial banks should be encouraged with government support to introduce 'green lending schemes.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

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

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings

a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Relevant outcomes and impacts are assessed; activities and achievements are presented relative to baseline conditions. But although there is an extensive review and discussion on each component, it is not entirely clear how conclusions regarding results were derived.	MS
b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The TE does not include ratings for most of the issues it analyses. Although most of the TE findings are convincing, verification of the status of output and outcome achievements is not explicit, and there are important information gaps regarding co-financing for example.	MU
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE assesses the important policy and financial risks that the project still faces. Assessment of the other criteria is lacking as is an analysis of project exit strategy (or lack of one).	MS
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons included in the TE show comprehensive knowledge of the project.	S
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE includes information on actual project costs (total and per activity) and includes information on co-financing. However it only offers a simple description of why the actual levels of cofinancing from government were so low, with no assessment on the causes and consequences of this reduction in budget.	MS
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? No substantive review of monitoring reports and system is provided. The TE only mentions that there were changes in list of activities, list of indicators and reporting formats but makes no assessment of these.	U

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)
