

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4816	
GEF Agency project ID		GF/CPR/12/001 (100338)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Reduction of mercury emissions and promotion of sound chemical management in zinc smelting operations	
Country/Countries		China	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CHEM-3	
Executing agencies involved		Foreign Economic Cooperation Office, Ministry of Environmental Protection	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		Pilot plants: Shaanxi Zinc Smelting Co., Shangluo; Hunan Shuikoushan Non-ferrous Metals Group Co., Ltd.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		February 23, 2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 16, 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	NA	NA
	Co-financing	NA	NA
GEF Project Grant		0.99	0.96
Co-financing	IA own	0.05	0.05
	Government	1.05	0.92
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.5	0.5
	Private sector	2.4	2.76
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.99	0.96
Total Co-financing		4	4.23
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.99	5.19
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		August 2016	
Author of TE		Heidlore Fiedler & Yu-Feng Li	
TER completion date		February 17, 2017	
TER prepared by		Mathias Einberger	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's stated objective was to "reduce the impacts of mercury on human health and the environment from zinc smelting operations through sound chemical management." (CEO-End p. 1)

Mercury is an environmentally extremely harmful pollutant, due to its toxicity, long range mobility, and persistence. Mercury emissions can not only cause localized harm, to which children and pregnant women are especially vulnerable, through air borne emissions or soil and water contamination, but also travel long distances that can reach around the globe. Mercury is thus a pollutant of global concern. Its potential for bioaccumulation is especially critical in the contamination of worldwide fish stocks. (CEO-End pp. 7-8)

China is considered the world's largest contributor to mercury emissions and non-ferrous metal smelting such as zinc is estimated to constitute the largest industrial source of mercury emissions within China. Targeting mercury emissions from zinc smelting operations in China can therefore conceivably lead to tangible global environmental benefits. In this light, the project was fully aligned with the GEF-5 Focal Area Strategy on Chemicals, particularly its Objective 3: Pilot sound chemicals management and mercury reduction. (CEO-End pp. 6-8)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project was designed to achieve its objective through three interrelated components:

Component 1: Characterization of mercury emissions from zinc smelting operations in China

Component 2: Demonstrate BAT/BEP in two pilot plants and evaluate cost effectiveness, organize public outreach events and share lessons learned with the zinc industry

Component 3: Develop and promote policy reform to reduce mercury emissions from the zinc smelting industry

Furthermore, the project design envisaged to create socio-economic benefits, due to the importance of zinc production for the livelihood of many Chinese people and its potential for creating productivity gains by reducing the adverse health impacts from zinc-related mercury emissions. (TE pp. 1-2, 14)

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

The TE notes that no changes to the project structure occurred during implementation but two no-cost extensions were granted. (TE pp. 48, 57)

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 project relevance as highly satisfactory, because it is both relevant to national environmental and development priorities and strategies, as well as to regional and international agreements. (TE pp. 3, 48-49) The TER agrees with this assessment and rates relevance as Satisfactory on a binary rating scale.

The TE notes that by targeting mercury pollution prevention and control in zinc smelting, the project addressed one of the major concerns of the Minamata Convention. While not directly impacting the development of the convention text, the project provided a concrete example for mercury control in zinc smelting and contributed to the identification of solutions for future provisions and guidance to the convention's implementation. As previously noted, the project was also fully in line with the GEF-5 Focal Area Strategy on Chemicals, particularly its Objective 3: Pilot sound chemicals management and mercury reduction. Lastly, the request for CEO endorsement further highlighted the project's alignment with national priorities, as the Ministry of Environmental Protection had already concluded that the prevention and control of mercury pollution required an investigation into national mercury emission sources. This is reinforced by the State Council's approval of the Twelfth Five-Year Plan on Prevention and Control of Heavy Metal Pollution in February 2011, which listed mercury as one of five key elements and non-ferrous metal smelting as one of five key industries for prevention and control. (TE pp. 3, 48-49; CEO-End p. 7)

Additionally, in its section on project effectiveness, the TE notes that as the first mercury project approved by the GEF, the project was highly relevant and timely, being set at the beginning of the mercury convention negotiations, and provided input for the ongoing BAT/BEP guideline discussions in the Minamata process from a developing country perspective. (TE p. 49)

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

The TE rates project effectiveness as Highly Satisfactory, due to the assessed effectiveness of all project outputs at the national and international level. The TER rates effectiveness as Satisfactory, because the TE did not adequately substantiate its high rating and there seem to have been at least a few minor shortcomings with the project.

The TE notes that on the national level, the project provided Chinese government counterparts, based on international best practices, with the tools to control mercury emissions from zinc smelters, as well as with a detailed inventory of current domestic zinc production. According to the TE, the demonstration sites were further a clear indication of the applicability of the proposed solutions to the Chinese context.

For the international level, although the TE asserts that more than indicative steps or catalytic effects have been achieved in terms of project outputs and outcomes having fed into the Minamata Convention negotiations, this assessment is not well substantiated. The TE notes that it is difficult to identify direct contributions made by the project to the guidance for the implementation of the convention. Although the group of technical experts that worked on the guidance on mercury emissions included a Chinese expert from Tsinghua University, that expert led the work on emissions from coal combustion and the specific guidance on the reduction of mercury from non-ferrous metals did not include specific references to the project. Yet the TE anticipates that the work of the project will contribute to case studies, trainings, and briefing material benefiting China and other countries, as well as revisions of the Minamata Convention guidance documents, in the future. (TE pp. 3-4; 49-50)

The TE further notes that the project has completed all of its activities according to the approved project document. (TE p. 56) The PIRs rated progress towards completion of each of the three project components (Component 1: Characterization of mercury emissions from zinc smelting operations in China; Component 2: Demonstrate BAT/BEP in two pilot plants and evaluate cost effectiveness, organize public outreach events and share lessons learned with the zinc industry; Component 3: Develop and promote policy reform to reduce mercury emissions from the zinc smelting industry) as Highly Satisfactory in 2012 and as Satisfactory in 2013, 2014, and 2015 respectively. Each component was marked as complete by June 2015. (TE p. 58)

Yet in its section on project shortfalls, the TE considers it disappointing that little of the internationally proven technologies for mercury emission control and prevention could be implemented or tested in China, mainly due to financial, technology transfer, and information access limitations. (TE p. 62)

Finally, the TE noted in terms of the project's design, that output 1.4, "FECO [i.e. the executing agency] is able to successfully monitor mercury emissions and *their impact on human health* [emphasis added] and the environment in the zinc sector" was too ambitious a goal for the scope of this project, which indicates that it was not fully achieved. The TE has the following to say about this: "The evaluator is not aware of any defined/proven direct effects on negative impact on the general population that can be attributed to exposure to mercury from non-ferrous metal industry or atmospheric emissions. Further, the impact on human health from chronic exposure to mercury emissions cannot be derived from a one-point in time project." (TE p. 48)

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

The TE rates project efficiency as Satisfactory, but provides little relevant discussion to substantiate that rating. The TER also rates efficiency as Satisfactory, based on the available evidence.

The TE notes that the project components and outputs were designed to efficiently deliver their outcomes and that that project successfully implemented them in this regard. However, the TE also notes that the project could have benefitted from closer collaborating with a UNEP-led initiative in China. (TE pp. 4, 50-51)

What the TE does not consider in its rating are the two no-cost extensions, from an initially planned project closing date in September 2014 to December 2015. (TE p. 37) It should however also be noted, that this was the first mercury project approved by the GEF (TE p. 49) and that its financial discipline was commendable. (TE pp. 38-44)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to Assess
--------------------	--------------------------

The TE rates project sustainability as Moderately Likely, but its discussion of sustainability poorly substantiates this rating and leaves too many questions open for this TER to provide a confident rating.

In terms of **financial** sustainability, the TE notes that the project efficiently disbursed its funds and managed to leverage slightly more co-financing than initially planned. Yet, the TE asserts that no statement can be made about the longevity of the project's interventions, because it had a pilot / demonstration character and project under international attention like this one usually show good ad hoc effectiveness. The TE provides no further evidence about the financial sustainability of project outcomes but rates it as moderately likely.

The TE notes that the project elements did not include a **socio-political** dimension, but rates socio-political sustainability as moderately likely, because good relations between the government and the private sector were established during the project and no major changes to them were identified as having occurred or being needed.

Environmental sustainability is rated as moderately likely by the TE, because the project had only a pilot character by design but a potential for substantial future environmental benefits.

For the **institutional framework and governance**, the TE sees no risks to sustainability. (TE pp. 4-5)

Finally, the TE considers project sustainability at the demonstration sites as quite secure (without further substantiation however), but concedes that their replication relies mostly on the political will of government counterparts to disseminate the results and of regulatory authorities to enforce the control measures. Yet, since the project relates directly to China's obligations under the Minamata Convention on Mercury, the TE concludes that its benefits are likely to continue, especially in light of the commitment China has expressed to the implementation of the convention. (TE pp. 51-52)

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?

It is evident from the TE, that the project managed to mobilize US\$224,000 more in co-financing than originally anticipated in the request for CEO endorsement. Co-financing materialized at 105.6% of the original amount, or US\$4.224 million, constituting 81% of the total actual project budget. (TE pp. 35)

The TE provides a detailed breakdown of materialized co-financing by expenditure item for each year, but no clear breakdown by contributor. It describes the reasons for differences between planned and actual co-financing from different contributors, but open questions remain.

According to the TE, the two pilot plants contributed with US\$1.3 million more co-financing than originally stipulated. However, according to the request for CEO endorsement, each plant committed to US\$700,000 in in-kind contributions. It is not clear from the wording of the TE, whether each plant contributed US\$1.3 million or both of them combined did, but since the total materialized co-financing amount attributed to the private sector was US\$2,756,000, the former seems to have been the case. It is not clear from the TE how the difference (US\$2.756 – US\$2.6 million) is attributable.

The TE notes that co-financing from the Zhuzhou zinc plant that was listed in the CEO endorsement request did not materialize because it was not chosen as a pilot site. This was because of the plant's particular Boliden-Norzink technology, which, according to the Chinese experts, did not have the potential for sufficient mercury emission reductions. Likewise, co-financing from the local government in Guizhou province did not materialize because no plant in this province could be used in the project.

These non-materializations of co-financing were however more than compensated for by higher than expected total private sector contributions (US\$2,756,000 instead of US\$2,400,000) and initially unforeseen contributions from universities of US\$441,000, according to the TE. (TE pp. 5, 39, 42)

Although the TE provides a detailed breakdown of co-financing utilization by expenditure source, it does not provide a breakdown by individual contributor or clearly assign expenditures to project activities. This makes it difficult to make a causal statement about the effect of co-financing materialization. The TE does mention however, that 73% of co-financing was spent on output 2.1 (the pilot sites). (TE p. 54)

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 TE notes that project implementation was planned to take 24 months, or from June 2012 to September 2014. [sic] The project was granted two no-cost extensions. While the first one extended the original timeframe to August 2015, the second one extended it further to December 2015, in order to accommodate the timing of the terminal evaluation. (TE p. 37)

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 does not discuss country ownership, but it seems clear that it was high and conducive to project outcomes, due to the fact that a government entity served as the executing agency and successfully implemented the project. The TE does not provide sufficient evidence to assess the relationship between country ownership and project sustainability.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates both M&E design and M&E implementation as Satisfactory, because the project had a clear M&E plan that was strictly followed with no corrective measures being necessary. The TE does not include the specified project results framework and its indicators in this assessment however. Considering these factors, the TER rates M&E design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory.

The TE notes that the M&E plan included annual and quarterly project reports, annual project implementation reviews, quarterly financial reports, and technical reports according to the work plan. (TE pp. 5, 52)

The TE however does not assess the design of project's results framework or the quality of the indicators specified. A review of the request for CEO endorsement shows, that the indicators were not SMART and there was often no logical relationship between outputs, indicators, baselines, and targets. For example, for *output 1.2: Produce comparative analysis of current Chinese policy and regulations on mercury emissions from zinc smelting sector and those of other country*, the indicator specified is the "number of plants visited on study tour; number of studies researched", the baseline is "no comparative analysis has been performed previously," and the target is "a better understanding of control technologies in China as compared to other countries." For other outputs, the indicators were self-evident and adequate, for example for output 2.1: execute two pilot demonstration projects. (CEO-End pp. 22-23)

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

The TE rates both M&E design and M&E implementation as Satisfactory, because the project had a clear M&E plan that was strictly followed with no corrective measures being necessary. The TE notes that the M&E plan was well implemented. (TE pp. 5, 52) Here the TER agrees.

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 TE rates UNIDO's supervision and backstopping as satisfactory in its rating summary table, referring to its section on UNIDO's positioning in the project. The TE takes note here of UNIDO's experience with mercury reduction projects in different regions of the world and that its field office in China would facilitate interaction with Chinese counterparts on both the national and local level. (TE pp. 46, 59) The TER rates quality of implementation as Satisfactory, based on the available information, which shows that implementation was good but had minor shortcomings.

In its overall ratings table, the TE rates "implementation approach" as highly satisfactory. The TE here references its sections on project design and project implementation arrangements and modalities. It must be noted, that the section on project implementation amounts to an ex ante assessment of how arrangements and modalities were laid out and justified in the project documents, rather than an assessment of how well they performed during implementation.

The TE notes that the project was well designed and adequate to address the problems it was meant to solve, in addition to addressing the need of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, despite the fact that the project was approved before the text of the convention had been concluded. The TE further notes that the project was not only well planned but also well implemented and that no changes to the project structure or corrective measures occurred or were deemed necessary. However, the TE does note that output 1.4: FECO [the executing agency] is able to successfully monitor mercury emissions and their impact on human health and the environment in the zinc sector, was too ambitious a statement for this project. This is because, according to the TE, it is not proven that exposure to mercury from the non-ferrous metal industry or atmospheric mercury emissions has direct negative impacts on the general public and that results in terms of the impact on human health from chronic exposure to mercury emissions cannot be derived from a short pilot project like this one. (TE pp., 48, 59)

Finally, the TE notes that monitoring and self-evaluation were carried out effectively, which was ensured through regular contacts between the implementing agency and the executing agency, complemented by an annual monitoring mission from the implementing agency, and that quality control, technical inputs, and coordination were timely, effective, and efficient. (TE pp. 53-54)

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

The TE provides no rating and no real discussion of project execution. In light of the available information and the project's apparent implementation success, the TER rates quality of execution as Satisfactory.

The TE does note that the project was generally well planned and well implemented and that no changes to its structure or corrective measures occurred or were deemed necessary. (TE pp., 48, 59)

In its recommendations section, the TE makes a similar suggestion to the executing agency as it made to the implementing agency. The TE recommends the Ministry of Environmental Protection / Foreign Economic Cooperation Office to more actively seek out linkages to related projects.

While linkages with other projects from the donors to this project were good, the executing agency should have played a more active role in linking the project to the aforementioned UNEP project, according to the TE, especially since it served as executing agency for both projects. (TE p. 64)

The TE also notes that monitoring and self-evaluation were carried out effectively, which was ensured through regular contacts between the implementing agency and the executing agency, and indicates that financial planning and execution have been smooth and well documented. (TE pp. 53-54)

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The TE notes that through the Hunan pilot, airborne mercury emissions were reduced by approximately 0.15 tons per year by reducing sulfur dioxide emissions by 2,542 tons per year. In terms of waste water management, all of the acid waste water was being recycled and approximately 200,000 tons of water saved per year. Through the Shaanxi pilot, the TE notes that a reduction of 1,169 kg of atmospheric mercury was achieved after installing a desulfurization tower. In addition, approximately 453 kg of mercury was recovered from acid slags. (TE p. 4)

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

contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE notes that no socioeconomic benefits were identified at the national or local levels. (TE p. 54)

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 TE notes that the project provided government counterparts in China with the tools to control mercury emissions from zinc smelters by building on best international practices and providing a detailed inventory of current domestic zinc production. (TE p. 50)

b) Governance

The TE notes that while the new standards and legislation were developed (though some not yet concluded), future compliance mechanisms could not yet be judged at the time of evaluation. (TE p. 52)

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

The TE notes no unintended impacts 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.

The TE repeatedly points out that the project was a pilot by design and while it can be considered a successful one, there is no indication in the TE that its indicatives have been adopted at scale yet.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

- There is a need for a broader approach, as the two plants used as pilot sites for this project produce many metals other than zinc, which are also relevant to the process of reducing mercury emissions.
- Co-benefits with other conventions, such as the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), cannot be realized, because while mercury emissions are mainly associated with primary (zinc) production processes, the unintentional POPs targeted by the Stockholm Convention are associated with recycling processes in ferrous and non-ferrous metal operations.
- The project has shown that from a sustainability standpoint, the long-term implications from in-kind co-finance may have been underestimated, citing the example of co-financing from Norway under the project, which provided useful technical and contextual input, but was discontinued for political reasons.

(TE pp. 64-65)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

General

While collaboration between the government and the zinc smelting sector under the project generated baseline data on mercury, follow-up activities have to be put in place in order to stabilize the collaboration on monitoring and control. Since the project generated an important frame of reference for the MEP to make policy and set standards for mercury control in the zinc sector, these experiences should be scaled-up to include other non-ferrous metal industries, especially lead and copper.

Need for improved information exchange

There is a noted information gap of relevant data from China in international databases such as the World Bank's or Comtrade's. There is a need for better information exchange and it is highly recommended that MEP /FECO, UNIDO, and the BAT/BEP mechanisms under the future Minamata Convention on Mercury collaborate, in order to gather the most up-to-date and complete information zinc production economics and technologies.

UNIDO to take a more active role in cooperating with other GEF implementing agencies

Especially with projects implemented in the same country, UNIDO should take a more active approach in seeking cooperation with other GEF implementing, in this case particularly with the UNEP "Pilot Project on the Development of Mercury Inventory in China."

MEP / FECO to more actively link related projects

MEP/FECO too should have played a more active role in linking the project to the aforementioned UNEP project, especially since it served as executing agency for both projects. The project manager should establish an exchange mechanism between staff at MEP/FECO and external partners.

(TE pp. 62-64)

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 assesses the relevant outcomes in terms of a complete/incomplete dichotomy, but provides almost no discussion about the qualitative extent of their completion, or the respective achievement of impacts and objectives.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is not always internally consistent, the evidence provided appears incomplete at times, and several ratings are not well substantiated.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE does not properly assess project sustainability and does not assess the project's exit strategy.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned provided by the report are not very comprehensive and appear not well substantiated, or at least not clearly enough articulated.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides a very detailed breakdown of actual project costs and co-financing in total and by expenditure item, but not by project activity.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of project M&E systems lack both in quantity and quality of the provided assessment.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MU

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

No additional sources were used.