

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5466	
GEF Agency project ID		120623	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Reducing greenhouse gases and Ozone Depleting Substance (ODS) emissions through technology transfer in the industrial Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (RAC) sector	
Country/Countries		The Gambia	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Climate Change Mitigation CCM -1: Promote the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies	
Executing agencies involved		National Environment Agency and the Gambia Technical Training Institute (GTTI)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Gambia Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Service Support (GRACSS)	
Private sector involvement		Shecco and other private sector technology suppliers	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		09/11/2013	
Effectiveness date / project start		2/13/2014	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2017	
Actual date of project completion		UA	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	UA	
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.49	0.49
Co-financing	IA own	0.26	0.034
	Government	1.79	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	0.43	0
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		0.49	0.49
Total Co-financing		2.48	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.97	UA ¹
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2018	
Author of TE		José Bettencourt	
TER completion date		January 2019	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	

¹ The actual project costs are not reported in the TE or other documents.

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Cody Parker
----------------------------------------	-------------

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Global Development Objective of the project was ‘to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with industrial RAC (Refrigeration and Air Conditioning) facilities in the Gambia’ (PD, Pg 2).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to ‘reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with industrial refrigeration facilities in The Gambia by removing barriers to increased energy efficiency and establishing the enabling environment for the introduction of low global warming potential alternatives to HCFC- 22’ (CEO Endorsement, Pg 4). The project had three components as described below:

Component 1: Policy and regulatory support – Gap analysis carried out in the national policy, legal and regulatory frameworks and relevant recommendations are drafted into the national laws/regulations/guidance

Component 2: Technology transfer support - Refrigeration and air conditioning support mechanisms established and piloted and Incentive mechanism piloted

Component 3: Awareness raising - Lessons learnt and information on technology solutions is disseminated to policy makers, companies and technicians

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

There were no changes in the objectives of the project during implementation.

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 assessed the relevance of the project as ‘highly satisfactory’. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER revises the rating to ‘satisfactory’. The project was in line with the goal of the national Gambia Environmental Action Plan to ensure sustainable development, including strengthening of the regulatory framework and enforcement of the environmental regulations and codes. The Gambia’s National Environment Agency also issued a National Portfolio Formulation Document to guide the implementation of the GEF programs and projects that target climate change mitigation projects and associated enforcement of regulations. The Gambia signed the UNFCCC and identified priority to mitigation technologies under its Second National Communication to the UNFCCC (2012). Also, as a signatory to other relevant environmental conventions such as Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the current project was designed to contribute to the Gambia’s commitment to the phase out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) through the Hydrofluorocarbon Phase-Out Management Plan (HPMP).

The project was directly in line with the GEF 5 Focal Area Strategy for climate change mitigation, ‘to support developing countries and economies in transition toward a low-carbon development path’, namely with objective 2 ‘Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector’. The project design was also consistent with GEF strategy of building synergies across Conventions, namely by supporting the phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) used in industry and buildings such as chillers, air conditioners, and refrigerators, and promote use of equipment that both operates more efficiently and uses chemicals with lower global warming potential.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
--------------------------	------------------------------------------

The TE assessed the effectiveness of the project as ‘moderately satisfactory’. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assesses the effectiveness to be ‘moderately unsatisfactory’. The evidence in the TE indicates that the project failed to establish some of the financial, technical and regulatory

mechanisms required to facilitate technology transfer and contribute to reduction in the Green House Gas (GHG) Reductions, as originally envisaged in the project document. The project was successful in generating quality outputs under component 1 in terms of gap analysis with policy and regulatory measures recommended but these were still not integrated and adopted by the government. The overall objective of component 2 was also not achieved fully. The project enhanced the capacity of refrigeration and air conditioning technicians as well as building the capacity of national stakeholders- Gambia Technical Training Institute and Gambia Refrigeration and Air-conditioning Service Support regarding use and handling of Hydrocarbon (HC) refrigerants. But the TE notes that all the conditions were still not met to allow the establishment of the Certified Gambian Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Support Service as envisaged in the project document. The Financial Incentive Mechanism could also not be established. At the time of the evaluation mission, only about one third of the funds were committed to the incentive mechanism. The TE notes that some of the financial and technical barriers hindering the adoption of the conversion technologies were beyond the control of the project. The project helped in generating awareness amongst entrepreneurs. However, no targeted outreach was planned to generate awareness amongst the policy makers, which was crucial for sustainability of the project interventions after project closure. Details on the achievement of all three components is given below:

Component 1: Policy and regulatory support - The project completed the preparation of gap analysis and drafted relevant recommendations. However, despite following all the procedures and efforts from the project, the recommendations were not adopted by the government at the time of the TE. According to the discussions of the evaluators with the National Environment Agency the recommendations were to be incorporated after the awaited amendment to the Ozone Depleting Substances legislation to include the Kigali amendments to the Montreal Protocol. However, no definitive timeframe was provided for the inclusion of the recommendations.

Component 2: Technology transfer support – As the TE notes, the delivery of outputs for this outcome at the time of evaluation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory. The project failed to establish refrigeration and air-conditioning technical support mechanism under this component. However, according to the TE, the trainings through the project helped increase the capacity of refrigeration and air conditioning technicians regarding use and handling of hydrocarbon (HC) refrigerants and also enhanced the level of awareness regarding impacts of Ozone Depleting Substances and Global Warming Potential refrigerants. The outputs related to the development of a quality assurance approach for refrigerants (the labels were produced but not yet in use) was not achieved. The Financial Incentive mechanism could not be established with only about one third of the funds available to the incentive mechanism being committed at the time of the completion of evaluation mission. According to the TE, potential beneficiaries identified during the project for incentive mechanisms had either closed their operations or improved on their system. Moreover, barriers like lack of availability of alternative Hydrocarbons (HC) refrigerant R-290 in the market and the cost of conversion to new equipment using low Global Warming Potential refrigerants proved to be a deterrent for end-users due to which there were very few takers for the incentive mechanism.

Component 3: Awareness raising - Delivery of outputs under this component was moderately satisfactory. The project adopted a systematic awareness raising plan adjusted in line with the recommendations of international experts hired in FY 2016 to make the awareness raising activities more efficient. Trainings for entrepreneurs were also organized to brief them about technology options and the incentive mechanism. However, the TE notes that even the selected beneficiaries of the incentive mechanism were not ready to do a conversion unless the availability of R-290 was ensured (as

they couldn't risk stopping their operations), and its use became cost-effective. The planned activity of targeted outreach to policymakers on the benefits of low Global Warming Potential refrigerants and linking improvements in energy efficiency in industrial refrigeration with national industrial development could also not be developed. The project also didn't use the websites (particularly National Environment Agency or Gambia Technical Training Institute websites) for dissemination of project results.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
-----------------------	------------------------------------------

This TER concurs with the rating assigned to the efficiency of the project as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. The project was delayed by two years during the initial stages due to late delivery of training and demonstration equipment. According to the TE, this resulted in delay of activities under component 2 which couldn't achieve its goals. A significant amount of co-financing allocated towards providing the incentive mechanism also didn't materialize as most of the plants that were identified as potential beneficiaries had either closed or improved their systems. The project didn't make efforts to identify new beneficiaries. The TE notes that the project was managed remotely by the Project Manager at the UNIDO Headquarters; although available for supervision and backstopping, [his/her] distance from the project area is likely to have had an impact on day to day functioning of the project. The project also failed to create a Project Steering Committee as envisaged in the project document for providing overall supervision and guidance.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

This TER concurs with the rating assigned to sustainability of 'moderately likely'. The project helped in building awareness amongst refrigeration and air conditioner technicians and national stakeholders - Gambia Technical Training Institute and The Gambian Association of refrigeration and air conditioning Practitioners to adhere to good practices and use/handling of natural refrigerants and who had already started to adopt some of the techniques they were trained on. But the TE also identified financial and market risks regarding demand for low Global Warming Potential refrigerants for air conditioning and cooling system as well as uncertainty regarding the adoption of policy/regulatory measures recommended through the project, by the government, the overall likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes seems 'moderately likely'.

Financial resources – **Moderately unlikely**

This TER agrees with the financial risks identified during the evaluation with the rating of likelihood of sustainability to be 'moderately unlikely'. The TE identified the low cost of HCFC-22 as one of the main barriers for the introduction of alternative to HCFC-22 with low Global Warming Potential. Moreover, lack of alternatives such as R-290 (an alternative HC refrigerant) in the market and the cost of conversions to new equipment using low Global Warming Potential refrigerants proved to be another deterrent for end-users. These were some of the main reasons that the project was unable to increase the demand for the incentive mechanism and entrepreneurs were not yet ready to invest in alternative HC refrigerants (as R-290) for industry. Besides, as the TE notes that The Gambian market was starting to offer new energy efficient air-conditioners marketed as reducing 70% of energy consumption, but using HFC 407 and 410 with high Global Warming Potential but it was likely to have high demand in the market.

Socio-political – **Moderately likely**

As per the TE, the government of The Gambia was committed to phasing out Hydrochlorofluorocarbons-HCFCs by 2030. There is now a roadmap for the adoption of policy, legal and regulatory measures, that National Environment Agency states will be incorporated when legislation is amended. Reportedly, this will occur when The Gambia adapts its legislation to the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol. Entrepreneurs are currently more aware of the need to adopt new technologies and save money. TE also notes that the current National Environmental Agency was committed to adopting the measures established by the project. However, there is still no definite timeframe and uncertainty regarding the adoption of policy/regulatory measures recommended through the project; consequently, this TER downgrades the likelihood of sustainability due to socio-political factors from 'likely' to 'moderately likely'.

Institutional – **Moderately likely**

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE as 'moderately likely'. According to the TE, the project enhanced the capacity of national stakeholders - Gambia Technical Training Institute and The Gambian Association of refrigeration and air conditioning Practitioners to adhere to good practices and use/handling of natural refrigerants and who had already started to adopt some of the techniques they were trained on. However, the overall objective under component 2 of creating an enabling environment for cost effective mitigation and developing support mechanisms for technology transfer was not fully achieved. The project was not able to set up the certified refrigeration and support service, but as the TE notes, 'the base was set up'. The refrigeration and air conditioning technicians trained through the project had a better knowledge on good practices to test quality of refrigerants, collect gas, use equipment to clean gases, etc. The awareness/sensitization programs envisaged for decision makers of the government and the national assembly of the potential benefits of the low-global warming potential technologies could not be organized. The adoption by the government of the regulatory measures recommended under component 1 was also uncertain and pending. But the TE confirms that National Environment Agency was working towards a more direct link with the environmental inspectors, customs and Gambia Refrigeration and Air-conditioning Service Support to set up better management of refrigerants. This shows that the project has generated some capacities that National Environment Agency, if willing, could use to sustain the initiatives under the project.

Environmental - **Likely**

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE as 'likely' since no environmental risks were identified that could hamper the likelihood of sustainability of the project interventions.

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?

The status of co-financing is not clear from the available reports. As per the TE, the information related to co-financing from the technology partners (Shecco and Centro Studi Galileo) was not made available to the evaluation mission. The TE also doesn't include information related to co-financing from the national government. The information provided to the TE related to UNIDO co-financing contribution (USD 49,182) didn't match with the Prodoc (USD 263,000). According to the details provided by the UNIDO to the evaluation mission, the project received USD 34,011 towards co-financing from UNIDO against a commitment of USD 49,182 (TE, Pg 65). As per the TE, this difference was explained by UNIDO Project Manager as around USD 70,000 spent towards concept preparation of the MSP project proposals in Vietnam and Gambia (TE, Pg 25). But according to the Prodoc, the full UNIDO contribution of USD 263,000 was to be used for supporting activities during project implementation and not for proposal preparation. Hence, there is still no valid explanation of the discrepancy between the original commitment from UNIDO (USD 263,000) and the amount communicated (USD 49,182) to the evaluation mission. The TE doesn't provide details on impact of co-financing on the achievement of project outcomes or its sustainability.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced delays in the execution of certain activities. For instance, the project started in February, 2014 but the trainings and capacity building under component 2 were started in June 2016, mainly due to late delivery of training and demonstration equipment. As a result, some of the activities under component 2 were not completed. Although the TE doesn't discuss the details, it is likely that the project failed to set up the certified refrigeration and air conditioner support service due to the delays. The TE records the expected project end date as 12/31/2017. But as per the CEO endorsement document, the project was supposed to end on 9/11/2016. It seems that the project was granted extension for a year, but the TE doesn't discuss this extension nor does it provide the approved/actual end date of the project.

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 project seems to have a moderate level of country ownership. The TE notes that the project had active involvement of national stakeholders in all the project outputs. However, evidence in the TE points towards a 'moderate' level of support and ownership by the government. For instance, the approval by the government of recommendations provided by the TE under component 1 was still uncertain at the time of the TE. Also, the approach originally adopted for the project implementation through constitution of a National Project Steering Committee, was not followed. Moreover, the TE notes that 'the project has been driven from UNIDO and with the changes of leadership at National Ozone Unit and National Environmental Agency, part of component 2 has not been achieved' (TE Pg 24),

indicating a mixed level of support and ownership from the government. The TE doesn't provide details on the co-financing realized from the national government.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
<p>This TE doesn't assign a rating to the M&E design separately and it provides one rating (moderately satisfactory) to the entire monitoring and evaluation section, including implementation. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assesses the M&E implementation to be 'satisfactory'. The project document included a comprehensive Project Results Framework (PRF) (annex A of the project document) indicating the proposed indicators and sources of verification for monitoring the progress against the project objective, outputs and outcomes. As the TE also notes, most of the proposed indicators were specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, timely (SMART) and could be easily verified. The proposed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan specified responsibilities, various types of monitoring reports/outputs to be prepared during the course of the project as well as the costs associated with the various activities.</p>	
6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory

As mentioned in the previous section, the TE assigned a combined rating of 'moderately satisfactory' to M&E design and implementation. But based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER revised the rating to M& E implementation as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. It seems that the mechanisms proposed in the project for regular monitoring and enabling adaptive management were not established. For instance, the proposed Project Steering Committee to monitor and review the progress of the project was not created. Although the Progress Implementation Reports were available, the TE notes that the reports from the executing agency, Gambia Technical Training Institute, were not regular, and those from the National Environment Agency were not made available during the evaluation mission. The evaluation team was also not provided with the 'Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators' that was supposed to be conducted during the start, mid and end of the project. The monitoring of results of information and awareness intervention was not performed in a systematic manner. The long-term changes (monitor actual performance of new technology or improvements made; monitor performance of mobile testing service and labeling system) as specified in the project document, were also not carried out, since most of the associated activities were either not carried out or were incomplete at the time of the evaluation.

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: Moderately satisfactory
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the quality of project implementation as 'moderately satisfactory'. The guidance and supervision provided by the project manager nominated from the Department of Environment, UNIDO Headquarters, Vienna was appreciated by the national counterparts. According to the TE, the project manager supported the project with networking at the international level and involvement of the international consultants, and maintained regular contact with executing agencies (National Environment Agency and Gambia Technical Training Institute), providing them support and guidance whenever required. The project proposal had envisaged the project manager leading the Project Executing Body (PEB) to be the field extension of the UNIDO-Project Manager and responsible for executing the quarterly work plans, day to day management, monitoring and evaluation of project activities. However, it seems that the Project Manager (PM) from UNIDO was managing the project remotely as the TE confirms 'that there was no country extension of UNIDO-PM'. The project also failed to create a Project Steering Committee (with members from National Environment Agency, government and other stakeholders) that was to perform as an apex body responsible for overall guidance and making policy decisions. According to the TE, the absence of a country extension of UNIDO-PM and a steering committee had an 'impact on the delivery of the project in an integrated manner, in particular for component 2' (TE, Pg 23).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to assess
-----------------------------------------	---------------------------------

At the national level, the project management and coordination were done by the Project Execution Body constituted by National Ozone Unit of the National Environment Agency and Gambia technical Training Institute. The TE doesn't highlight any issues related to the quality of project execution but at the same time mentions that project coordination and management was 'moderately unsatisfactory', without providing any evidence to substantiate this statement, due to which this TER is 'unable to assess' the quality of the project execution.

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 project was designed to contribute to up to 5,800 tonnes of CO₂ reduction with around 60 facilities involved in intervention of various scales. However, as per the TE, the project failed to establish a technical and financial mechanism to facilitate the adoption of low global warming potential and energy efficient technologies and bring about the environmental benefits envisaged in the project document. For instance, the development of a quality assurance approach for refrigerants was not achieved (the labels were produced but not yet in use) and a Certified Gambian Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Support Service as envisaged in the project document could also not be established. Although the project helped in generating awareness amongst the entrepreneurs, there were still very few takers of the incentive mechanism designed to support the owners/operators to carry out the technology improvements. Moreover, the policy and regulatory measures recommended by the project are still pending approval from the government.

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 doesn't provide details on any socio-economic improvements brought about by the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project was able to develop widespread awareness and understanding among refrigeration and air Conditioning technicians and entrepreneurs of the benefits of adhering to energy efficient and climate-friendly technology. The TE notes that entrepreneurs were more aware of the coming phase out of R-22 and of the need to adopt new technologies and save money, with many of them ready to do so when the costs become acceptable and equipment and refrigerants available. By project closure, the majority of the refrigeration and air conditioning technicians in the country were reported to be aware of low Global Warming Potential gases and how to work with them, about the benefits and energy efficiency associated with their use. The refrigeration and air conditioning technicians had better knowledge on good practices to test quality of refrigerants, collect gas, use equipment to clean gases, etc. Although a base was set up through trainings of the refrigeration and air conditioning, the project failed to set up the Certified Refrigeration and Air Conditioning support service, as envisioned in the project document.

b) Governance

The recommendations related to standards, measures and technical regulations for moving towards greater energy efficiency and away from HCFC-22 prepared through the project are still pending approval from the government.

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

No unintended impacts reported in the TE.

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.

None. The project closed without delivering the incentive mechanism. The TE recommends that the project speed up the process of delivering the incentive, and assess the potential benefit of these interventions, that will also help in demonstrating its impact and broader adoption in future.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The lessons listed in the TE are as below:

1. Quantitative objectives and goals of the projects should be set on issues the project can control to a certain extent, and not be solely dependent on external factors.
2. A deep assessment of implementation partners' capacities should be undertaken in order to seek realistic objectives, goals and sub-activities within the time-frame and resources of the project, with responsibilities of each participating institution fully owned through formal institutional commitment.
3. Projects should include approaches that combine formal instruments to involve stakeholders (such as steering committees and consultations), effective coordination and information sharing and proactive involvement in project activities.
4. It is important to generate awareness amongst end-users, such as owners of the units (supermarkets, hospitals, hotels, etc.) and also architects, engineers, etc., to make them aware of the technology options and their benefits.
5. When introducing new technology amongst entrepreneurs, it is important to set conditions for the availability of consumable goods and technical assistance. Besides, the proposed solutions need to be perceived as being within reach of the targeted sectors (technologically and financially), useful (namely regarding competitiveness and compliance), and relevant (return of investment, added value).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Main recommendations listed in the TE are as below:

1. Need for Gambia Technical Training Institute to actively promote the use by the Gambia Refrigeration and Air-conditioning Service Support of the equipment provided by the project that the refrigeration and air conditioning technicians cannot afford, but need to adhere to best practices.
2. National Environment Agency should take quick action to review the roadmap of policy/legal/institutional recommendations and guidance in line with the current national governance framework, and start implementation. This includes sensitization to policy makers and decision-makers of several departments of the government and the national assembly, and also enhance the capacity of environmental inspectors on Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) monitoring.
3. Future projects should take the lessons from this project, define in consultation with the stakeholders what support mechanisms would be desirable and possible to develop and within what time-frame given the real capacities of the country.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a comprehensive assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent but some of aspects could have more details. For instance, the TE doesn't discuss the quality of the project execution and the impact of the project being managed remotely from UNIDO headquarters in adequate detail.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE provides sufficient details to assess the project sustainability.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned were supported by the evidence in the main report	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The information on the project cost and co-financing is not presented in a comprehensive manner. There is no mention in the TE on the amount of co-financing committed by the national government and its realization. There is also lack of clarity on the discrepancy in the co-financing commitment from UNIDO in the project document (USD263,000) and the commitment conveyed to the evaluators (USD49,000) by the UNIDO.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE assessed the M&E system of the project in adequate detail.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.