

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		19 Dec 2008
GEF Project ID:	520		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	4.36	4.36
Project Name:	Experimental Validation of Building Codes and Removal of Barriers to Their Adoption	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.00
Country:	Tunisia	Government**:	1.69	1.69
		Other*:	4.63	3.95
		Total Co-financing	6.33	5.64
Operational Program:	OP 5: Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation	Total Project Cost:	\$10.67	\$10.00
IA	UNDP EEG	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Govt. of Tunisia: National Agency of Renewable Energy (ANER); Ministry of Environment and Land-Use Planning (MEAT)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		12 Sept. 2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: September 2005	Actual: December 2007
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 60	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 87	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 27
Author of TE: Rafik Missaoui		TE completion date: September 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 7 months

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

** The Government of Tunisia provided \$1.69 M in cash and 412,000 DT (Tunisian Dinar) in allocated personnel. This is a total of \$1.99 M at the current rate of 1 TND = 0.736440 USD.

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	NA	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MS	NA	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	S	NA	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	HS	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. Overall, the TE report provides a comprehensive assessment of project design, implementation and outcomes, as well as an evaluation of sustainability. However, the evaluation of project finances and the environmental impacts are not well organized. There also appear to be minor inconsistencies in converting between Dollars, Euros, and Tunisian Dinar (DT), which should be clarified. The TE is in French, inconsistent with the guidance provided by the GEF EO

where it has been requested that these documents be prepared in English.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings are mentioned in the terminal evaluation report.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project document, the objective of this project was to remove identified barriers to the adoption and enforcement of regulatory measures imposing *optimal* energy efficient building standards for all new buildings in the Tunisian commercial and residential sectors.

There were no changes in objectives during project implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

The project document lists the following development objectives:

1. Remove the barriers within the architectural and construction industry and within the Ministry of Housing and Public Buildings by demonstrating that the cost of the optimal standard is achievable with a minimum additional construction cost (once the construction techniques become routine);
2. Remove barriers to adoption of the optimal standards by documenting that the standards are technically adequate, cost effective and economically acceptable;
3. Remove barriers in implementation of the optimal standard by improving the capacity of relevant Government agencies to enforce, monitor and update energy efficiency standards in buildings;
4. Remove the barrier of lack of availability of energy efficient materials by creating a sufficient demand for them;
5. Remove the barrier of lack of awareness by launching a promotional campaign to disseminate the existence of the new activity and the results of the demonstration as soon as they become available; and
6. Remove the barrier of lack of sustainability by developing a "pipeline" of design and construction technicians capable of incorporating efficient techniques and equipment into new construction.

There were no changes in objectives during project implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

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)

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?

The outcomes of the project are linked to the Tunisian National Renewable Energy Agency's (ANER) concerted policy

of improving energy efficiency, increasing reliance upon renewable energy sources and reducing deforestation caused by energy consumption.

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

Energy consumption in the buildings sector is expected to surpass the transport sector as the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in Tunisia by 2020. The outcomes of this project are compatible with the Government of Tunisia's broad goal of reducing the consumption of fossil energy in the commercial and residential buildings sectors.

The outcomes are directly tied to the Government of Tunisia's National Energy Conservation Plan, and its 2010 Energy Action Plan, objectives of which include improving the energy efficiency of new construction. The project outcomes are supported by legislative and regulatory measures passed in 1993 and 1994, which provide financial incentives for building energy audits and energy efficient demonstration projects, and reduce import duties on energy efficient and renewable energy equipment.

It is estimated that growth in energy consumption in the building sector will result in its surpassing the transport sector as the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in Tunisia. This project was designed to assist Tunisia in reducing the long-term growth of GHG emissions related to fossil energy consumption in the commercial and residential buildings sectors. The government is committed to implementation of an optimal-efficiency building code for residential and commercial sectors, if it can demonstrate that the codes will provide equivalent or improved comfort levels without adding significantly to overall construction costs.

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

The outcomes of this project are relevant to the GEF's Climate Change Focus Area; OP 5 concerning energy conservation and efficiency.

(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

The project outcomes are tied to Tunisia's obligations under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which Tunisia ratified in the 1993.

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership¹

Although promotion of international cooperation and partnership was not one of the explicit aims of the project, it contributed to the development and dissemination of energy efficient building standards under the Maghreb Regional Project for Thermal Standards for Buildings (RTMB) - a regional partnership Tunisia founded in 1991 to jointly improve thermal standards for new construction in Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

The project was to have been completed by 2004, but because of delays the project continued through the end of 2007. By the end of 2007, most of the expected outputs in the accompanying measures component of the project had been achieved, but the experimental validation component was incomplete.

The project has effectively most of its stated objectives. Most importantly, the passage of the 2004 law on energy efficient building standards has transformed the regulatory environment. Stakeholders have been made well aware of the environmental and economic benefits of energy efficient design. The terminal evaluation praises the project for pulling together the efforts of different government agencies and construction industry organizations, into a concerted effort for more efficient building energy standards.

The construction of demonstration buildings, and the process of competitive solicitation of building designs, has raised awareness of the new energy efficient design and construction techniques throughout the industry. Local capacity and know-how has been reinforced in the participating agencies and in the formal construction industry. Two energy efficient building labels have been well publicized and a niche market for energy efficient building technologies is strong and growing.

To institutionalize the gains made under this project, the Government of Tunisia, in partnership with the French Center for Building Science and Technology, is establishing a new Center for Building Technology. This Center will conduct research on energy efficient building technologies, provide technical assistance and training to builders, and certify new

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

buildings under the CPE (Comfort and Performance Energy) labeling scheme.

The terminal evaluation also notes that the subsidy program for building energy audits and efficiency improvements has been successfully extended to include buildings with an energy consumption level greater than 500tep. Studies and ongoing discussions during the course of the project have highlighted the need for additional financing mechanisms to promote the adoption of energy efficiency improvements, and, as a result, the ANME is putting together a committee to formulate guidelines for such a mechanism.

The project has also fostered growth of a niche market in energy efficient building technologies and services, which is estimated to be 8M DT

Despite these positive outcomes, this project may have limited effectiveness in addressing the key issue of fossil energy consumption in the residential and commercial buildings sector. The terminal evaluation notes that a major drawback of the project design was that the technical manuals and financial subsidies are aimed only to *new* construction, not to existing buildings. This is a significant problem because the residential housing market, for example, is near saturation point. This means few new residential buildings will go up in the near future. Existing buildings are largely energy inefficient. As noted in the original project document, "...an increased purchasing power of the population has resulted in a trend of owners purchasing and installing heating and air conditioning equipment some time after their original construction. The design and envelope of these lower income buildings are not adapted to the use of such equipment." Government subsidies for energy efficient standards targeted only to new constructions will therefore have little impact on total GHG emissions from the buildings sector.

Two other drawbacks noted in the terminal evaluation are: (1) The project only intervenes in the formal construction sector, carrying out training sessions with real estate developers, architects, engineers, or other highly trained technicians. There is little or no intervention targeted to the informal construction sector, comprising small builders, skilled workers, and homeowners. Considering that two out of three homes in Tunisia are realized through the informal construction sector and are largely owner-designed, focus only on the formal construction industry will limit the project's effectiveness. (2) Local governments (communes), who are responsible for inspecting new construction and enforcing building codes, have not been included in this project.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MU

According to the information in the terminal evaluation, by the end of 2007, 27-months after the original termination date, the project had spent the total budgeted \$4.36 M from GEF and \$1.29 M (out of \$1.97 M budgeted) from the FFEM. A balance of 0.57 Euros (\$ 0.68M) from the FFEM funds remained.

Three factors contributed to the delay: (1) bureaucratic obstacles posed by the FFEM, (2) initial understaffing of the project team, (3) underestimation of the time required to prepare plans for demonstration constructions.

Despite, the extra two years allotted, the following outcomes have not been delivered:

- Completion of 23 demonstration buildings
- Experimental validation of energy efficient building standards
- Finalization of the regulatory framework for energy efficiency building standards

According to the TE report, the estimated energy savings achieved so far from the demonstration buildings are 4 ktep annually and the emissions reductions are 11 kTE CO₂ (11,000 tons of CO₂) averted annually. Over a twenty-year period, the cost-per-ton of CO₂ averted would then be \$19.7 in terms of GEF investment. This is inefficient. If the remaining 23 demonstration buildings are finished within budget, it is expected that efficiency of the project would improve.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

Unable to assess.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

The most significant outcome of this project was the development of a set of optimal energy standards and regulations that were passed into national law in 2004. Forty-two energy-efficient demonstration buildings have either been completed or are under construction. The market for energy efficiency technologies and services has grown to an estimated 8M DT. A new national Center for Building Technology is being built. The ANME is exploring additional financing mechanisms to promote energy efficient buildings. In addition, the project has done much to educate the Tunisian construction industry about energy efficient building technology, with the result that some companies are applying the recommendations to activities outside the project. The project has also well publicized the energy efficient labels for new residential and commercial buildings, so the ground is prepared for enforcement of the new regulations.

However, a critical component of the project, the experimental validation of the optimal building standards has not been achieved. There has been no monitoring of the demonstration buildings to gauge their level of energy consumption and the quality of the standards.

(See Annex for detailed worksheet.)

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
The added cost of energy efficiency is low and as these building techniques become widespread, costs will decrease.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: L
Active stakeholder involvement, from the Government of Tunisia, to professional organizations in the construction industry, means there is little risk of losing political support. Energy efficiency standards and labels have been strongly publicized, and well adopted by educated members of the building industry such as architects and engineers.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
The primary risk is that the adopted standards may not be well enforced, as the project only involved government agencies at a national level and did not include the representatives of local Communes who are charged with doing building inspections.	
d. Environmental	Rating: ML
No negative environmental impacts foreseen, but the consequences of adopting the new standards have not been measured.	
e. Technological	Rating: ML
There is a minor risk that the guides and software produced during the project are too technical and will only be understood (and applied) by highly trained members of the construction industry.	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders?
The added costs of energy efficient technologies in the demonstration building projects were subsidized by the Tunisian government. The publicity surrounding the labeling scheme has thus far led to some social pressure for construction companies to be “environmentally friendly.”
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors?
Adoption of the new standards into law has given more authority to the National Energy Conservation Agency (ANME). Some other national ministries, such as Housing, are applying the energy efficiency recommendations in

² 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)

³ Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

outside projects.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
Use of optimal energy efficiency standards in all new construction is now mandated by law. The implementation regime for this new law has not been completely elaborated.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contribute to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
As result of focus group studies during the project, the ANME is considering development of a financial mechanism to further promote energy efficient construction.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have the changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
The terminal evaluation appreciates the ability of the executing agency in mobilizing different actors and capitalizing on synergies with other energy conservation programs. Also, a senior architect recruited to consult on the project is commended for speeding implementation by developing strong connections with the Order of Architects and for identifying potential demonstration projects.

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing (or proposed co-financing) 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?
In the ProDoc, the French Global Fund for the Environment (FFEM) agreed to provide \$1.97 M in co-financing, of which, only \$1.57M had been disbursed by the end of the project in 2007. This co-financing was essential for the initial design phase of the demonstration buildings, and the majority of personnel costs. Because of a 2.5-year delay in the start of disbursement of FFEM funding, the project did not take off until 2002 and by end of the project in 2007 still had not conducted any experimental validation of energy efficiency standards.
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?
There was a 24-month delay in the start of the project due to administrative delays surrounding disbursement of funds from the FFEM. Another reason for delays in the project was the time needed to assemble the appropriate project team by the Government of Tunisia. As a result of these compounded delays, the pilot projects and the experimental validation part of the project were not achieved by the time of the Terminal Evaluation in Sept. 2007.
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 Government of Tunisia staffed the core team for the project and in this aspect country ownership has generally had positive impacts on project outcomes. The executing agency, the National Agency for Renewable Energy (ANER), is also in charge of overall energy policy for the country, so the project had access to highly skilled and experienced personnel. ANER was able to bring numerous Tunisian stakeholders into the project and mobilize them effectively to pass the 2004 law on energy efficiency standards and achieve the construction of demonstration projects. Initially the project team was understaffed by three members and the project director was only assigned to spend 15% of his time on this project, rather than the planned 50%, thus slowing down the start of the project. The Government of Tunisia also agreed to make a financial contribution of \$1,692,800 to the project for design and construction subsidies, which was critical for construction of the demonstration projects. Private sector funding from Tunisian construction firms totaled \$2.66 M. This went directly to the cost of constructing demonstration buildings. This participation was critical for guaranteeing that the constructions would be completed.

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
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

<p>The project document contains a detailed set of objectives, with improvement targets, a list of expected outcomes, and a detailed work plan. The targets and expected outcomes are all appropriate for the given objectives. The terminal evaluation notes that an outside consultant created an M&E plan at the start of the project with specific indicators and targets, but does not provide further detail on the plan.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MS</p>
<p>The terminal evaluation notes that the M&E tool was not utilized during the first half of the project, due to understaffing of the project team. Following the mid-term appraisal in 2004 the project's M&E system and an additional staff person was brought onto the project team to conduct M&E. As a result, monitoring and evaluation was more often used as a management tool with regular project updates and a project dashboard.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?</p> <p>Yes, the project document includes a budget for M&E design.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?</p> <p>Initial understaffing led to a lack of appropriate M&E in first half of the implementation period.</p>
<p>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?</p> <p>Unable to assess.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Unable to assess.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>The terminal evaluation notes several flaws in the project design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - insufficient time allotted for the design phase of constructing demonstration buildings - focus only on new construction - focus only on the formal construction sector - insufficient financial incentives for promoting adoption of energy efficient standards <p>Due to initial understaffing and a two-year delay in disbursement of funds from the FFEM, the terminal evaluation notes that the project moved slowly. Tripartite review meetings were held regularly and the project team followed the recommendations of the 2004 mid-term appraisal to increase personnel and hire outside consultants. By the project's end in 2007, despite an extra two years, the experimental validation component still had not been achieved.</p>
<p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale) S</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The terminal evaluation notes that the project delivered outputs of high quality. The executing agency, the National Agency for Renewable Energy (ANER), followed a participatory approach and implicated a large number of stakeholders from government and industry in the project implementation. The work produced by outside consultants was also judged to be of very high quality. The terminal evaluation does note that the initial management of the project team was ineffective in responding to funding delays, but that the management improved after the 2004 review.</p>

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

⁴ 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.

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<p>a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Coordination.</i> Projects of this nature require a long and complex process involving a host of different actors with different and sometimes conflicting goals. In this case, the coordination between the different actors, and the strong and active participation of stakeholders in the process of implementation, was the key to successful and sustainable outputs. 2. <i>The quality of the executing agency.</i> Holding these stakeholders together for the entire length of the process requires an executing agency of very high quality with experience in coordination and working laterally. In this case, the National Renewable Energy Agency was the best choice. 3. <i>A multidimensional approach.</i> The complexity of this type of project and its multidimensional character requires an understanding of the different disciplines that are linked to the recommendations issuing from the project. An overly technical approach, like the one adopted here in Tunisia, ignores socio-economic aspects and market constraints that reduce the potential diffusion of recommendations. The team assigned to this type of project ought to be a multidisciplinary (including economists, accountants, sociologists, and communications specialists) one from the start, with more than just scientific competence. 4. <i>Incentivize approaches versus coercive approaches.</i> Regulations are definitely one means of promoting the improvement of energy efficiency in buildings. All the same, in the context of developing countries, application of regulations suffers from a number of constraints: the difference between the costs and the ability of consumers to pay; capacities of the implementing agencies; evasion; cost of control; etc. The incentivized approach can prove a more cost-effective and appropriate method than regulation. From conception to implementation, projects must integrate activities jointly promoting these two approaches. 5. <i>Interventions by the funding agencies.</i> The time required for completing projects sometimes surpasses the maximum permissible delays. This is the case with the current project in regards to GEF financing. Funding agencies must show more flexibility and adapt their policies to accommodate particular constraints. 	
<p>b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prolong the duration of the project in order to achieve certain critical activities, particularly monitoring and evaluation of energy efficiency levels in the demonstration constructions. 2. Speed up promulgation of the regulations by addressing the reservations voiced by the Order of Architects. 3. Prepare for the widespread application of the energy efficiency standards and the labeling scheme, by doing some institutional and organizational groundwork. This must include three major components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional trainings and information sessions for Communes and identification of any additional resources required at this level. - Creation of a detailed procedure manual for the practical implementation of the regulations and of the label. - Creation of a manual for the Building Technology Center to pave the way toward operationalization. 4. Revisit the 1978 decree fixing the payscale for consulting engineers in order to optimize the mix of skills on project teams 5. Formulate and put in place financing mechanisms to overcome the additional construction costs posed by the regulations and create a market through incentives rather than coercion. 6. Conduct a training and information session for the skilled trades (masons, carpenters, etc) to better 7. Lance an energy efficiency retrofit program for existing buildings. 8. Give the ANER the resources to monitor, maintain, and adapt the regulations to changing market and environmental needs. 	

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

--	--

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?	S

<p>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 report presents a complete account of progress on the project. More information should have been included on the private sector participants and the financial summary is not sufficiently detailed, but there are no major evidence gaps. There are inconsistencies in converting between the three currencies with the result that reports of amounts spent are inaccurate.</p>	MS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The project reports actual co-financing used, and the amounts spent per project activity in Tunisian Dinar (DT). However, as noted earlier there are inconsistencies in the amounts and currencies reported and the financial report is poorly organized.</p>	MU
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The TE only has a brief description of the project's M&E system.</p>	MS

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)