

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 5505 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | 130124 | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF-5 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | UNIDO | |
| Project name | | Cleantech Programme for SMEs in Turkey | |
| Country/Countries | | Turkey | |
| Region | | ECA | |
| Focal area | | Climate Change | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | CCM-1 | |
| Executing agencies involved | | Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT); TUBITAK; Ministry of Environment and Urbanization; Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources; Ministry of Development | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | Not available | |
| Private sector involvement | | Not available | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | September 9, 2013 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | October 21, 2013 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | October 2016 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | December 31, 2018 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | | |
| | Co-financing | .02 | Not available |
| GEF Project Grant | | .99 | .87 |
| Co-financing | IA own | .1 | |
| | Government | 2.06 | .1 |
| | Other multi-/bi-laterals | | |
| | Private sector | .7 | Not available |
| | NGOs/CSOs | | |
| | Other | .09 | Not available |
| Total GEF funding | | .99 | .87 |
| Total Co-financing | | 2.97 | .1 |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 3.96 | .97 |
| Terminal evaluation/review information | | | |
| TE completion date | | August 2018 | |
| Author of TE | | Joyce Miller and Ümit Ozlale | |
| TER completion date | | 2/12/2020 | |
| TER prepared by | | Laura Nissley | |
| TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review) | | Molly Sohn | |

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's objective was the "Promotion of clean energy technology innovations and innovative clean energy technology entrepreneurship in SMEs [Small and Medium Enterprises] in Turkey through a Clean Energy Technology Innovation Competition and Entrepreneurship Accelerator Programme" (PD pg. 1).

The PD also notes that the project will "result in global environmental benefits, including an improvement in resource efficiency and a reduction of waste and GHG emissions" (PD pg. 12).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not indicate any development objectives beyond the Global Environmental Objective. The PD does note however, that the project will "act as a catalyst for increased innovations in clean energy technologies, as well as more Cleantech enterprises being established, in particular the SMEs, thus creating more jobs and generating more income at the local and national levels. The clean technologies deployed will contribute to the reduction of waste and emissions, and to the improvement of resource efficiency, resulting in environmental improvements, and reducing health risks, in particular for women and children. The project can also improve energy access for people living in rural areas" (PD pg. 14).

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

There were no changes to the project's objectives or activities 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 provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project's expected outcomes are consistent with GEF-5 Climate Change Mitigation Objective 1: *Promote the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies* (PD pg. 18). The TE also notes that the project is aligned with Modality 3 of the GEF Council's Revised Strategy for Enhancing Engagement with the Private Sector, which "provides support to entrepreneurs and innovators seeking to establish commercial ventures in the field of clean technologies aimed at enhancing national competitiveness" (pg. 33). Additionally, the TE indicates that the project's expected outcomes are consistent with Turkey's national policies regarding climate change, energy security, employment creation, and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) competitiveness. Specifically, the project is aligned with Turkey's 10th National Development Plan; National Strategy on Climate Change; National Climate Change Action Plan; National Strategy on Industry; and the Strategy on Energy Efficiency (TE pg. 31).

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| 4.2 Effectiveness | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|-------------------|--|

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project exceeded its targets for organizing national Cleantech Competitions and associated "accelerators," which brought together start-ups to improve their business plans and to look for business partnerships, potential financiers or investors (TE pg. 34; PD pg. 9). However, a national coordinating mechanism had not been achieved by the time of the TE. Additionally, the project was not able to strengthen the policies and frameworks needed to create a conducive policy environment for Cleantech implementation (TE pg. 36). The project's capacity building activities were more successful, resulting in 55 mentors and 4 assistant trainers trained by the project. However, a Clean Energy Technology Development Platform had not been established by the time of the TE (pgs. 37-38).

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

Outcome 1: A coordinating mechanism/platform established at national level to identify, coach, and support clean energy technology innovators

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Two annual national Cleantech Competitions organized; (2) Two associated Accelerators organized, including post-competition support; and (3) Participation in regional and global networking activities. By the time of the TE, four Cleantech competitions were held, with a total of 775 applications received, exceeding the project's targets. Of the 775 applications, 114 semi-finalists underwent the "accelerator" (TE pg. 34). 82%, or 95 start-ups, completed the accelerator. The TE notes that 20 top teams had the "potential to commercialize their products in Turkey or abroad" (pg. 34). National winners from the 4 competitions participated in the 1-week Global Forum in the USA. The TE concluded however, the expected national coordination function had not fully materialized by the time of the TE (pg. 36).

Outcome 2: Policies and institutional framework strengthened to promote Cleantech innovations in SMEs and support the local innovation ecosystem

Under this outcome, it was expected that new policies and regulations were developed to create a conducive policy environment for Cleantech implementation. Additionally, it was expected that 20 policymakers would be trained on policy development. The TE indicates that while the project team tried to encourage a review of existing policies, this aspect of the project was unsuccessful, although some informal discussions were held. The TE also notes that the training for policymakers did not take place (pgs. 36-37).

Outcome 3: National institutional capacity built for the mentoring and training programs as part of the competition and acceleration program

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Capacity of host institution, TÜBITAK, strengthened and a platform for all competition stakeholders established; (2) Experience shared with other countries; and (3) Initiation of a Clean Energy Development Platform. The TE indicates that the capacity of TÜBITAK was strengthened throughout the implementation of the project. Of the 400 registered competition mentors, 55 mentors and 4 assistant trainers were trained by the project. The TE also notes that at least 2 workshops/training activities were organized for competition alumni each year. Additionally, over time, more startup teams participated in international events (Global Forum; Vienna Energy Forum, Communities of Practice in Marrakech and Bonn; and the UNIDO Gernatl Conference 2017). However, the TE indicates that no progress had been made on the establishment of a Clean Energy Technology Development Platform by the time of the TE (pgs. 37-38).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The project's original end date was extended twice, from October 2016 until December

2018, in order for the project to complete activities. The TE indicates that the project experienced delays in the first few years of implementation due to the lack of an effective coordination mechanism for local stakeholders, which affected decision-making (pg. 45). The TE notes that coordination had improved by December 2017, and the “engagement and participation of other national entities” was “reinvigorated” (pg. 42). Overall, the TE indicates that the project was able to use the allocated resources to “deliver substantially more services than initially imagined,” in part because of a favorable USD-Turkish Lira exchange rate (pg. 40). The TE also indicates that housing the Project Management Unit within the executing agency’s offices improved cost-effectiveness as well as facilitated relationships between the executing agency staff and the project (pg. 41).

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4.4 Sustainability | Rating: Moderately Likely |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for the overall sustainability of project benefits, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

The TE indicates that the executing agency, TÜBİTAK, and the General Directorate of Renewable Energy, have committed financial and in-kind resources to continue project activities (pg. 43). In addition to government resources, the TE indicates that other stakeholders have expressed an interest in supporting project activities, such as OSTİM and TBS Investment (a Turkish private sector investment firm), who submitted letters of intent in 2017 (pg. 44). The TE also notes that the 2018 Competition-Accelerator cycle was primarily executed using Turkish resources and funding, which is indicative of the financial sustainability of project activities (pg. 42). Additionally, the TE indicates that a Project Concept Note was developed in 2015 for a second phase of the project, funded in part by the GEF. The second phase of the project would “cover the next stage needs of startups and successful alumni to realize the commercialization of their ventures by drawing on additional funding and services that were to be made available” (TE pg. 53).

Sociopolitical

The TE rates sociopolitical sustainability as **Moderately Likely**. The TE indicates that the project’s activities and outcomes are in line with the strategy documents of the Turkish government, and that the participating government agencies acknowledged the relevance of the project to their goals. The TE does note that the private sector and the public showed little interest in the project early on, but the public awareness strategies employed by the project management unit (PMU) were effective at improving engagement (pg. 45).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE rates the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Moderately Likely**. The TE notes that a clear-cut institutional framework for Cleantech implementation was not in place by the time of the TE (pg. 45). Additionally, a national coordinating mechanism or platform for identifying, coaching, and supporting clean energy technology innovators was not achieved by the time of the TE. The TE does note however, that the transparency and accountability of the project was significant (pg. 45).

Environmental

The TE rates environmental sustainability as **Highly Likely**. The TE notes that the government's emphasis on energy efficiency, environmentally friendly technologies, and SME entrepreneurship supports "the project in delivering positive outcomes on the environmental front" (pg. 46).

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?

Actual co-financing (\$.1 million) was drastically lower than expected (\$2.97 million). The executing agency, TÜBİTAK, was expected to provide an additional \$.1 million in 2018 for the 5th Competition-Accelerator cycle, for a total of \$.2 million by project end (TE pg. 54). The TE indicates that the lack of an effective coordinating mechanism affected the co-financing commitments from other government stakeholders. Additionally, the TE notes that these institutions were "under severe financial scrutiny since 2014 and most of the high-end bureaucrats in these institutions were removed from their offices on a frequent basis." This was compounded by the failed coup attempt in July 2016 (TE pg. 52). Despite the lower than expected co-financing, the TE found that the project was able to deliver more services than originally imagined (pg. 55).

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 the project experienced delays during the first few years of implementation due to the absence of an effective coordination mechanism for local stakeholders, which affected decision-making (pg. 45). The TE notes that coordination improved over time, and these initial delays did not affect the project's outcomes (pg. 40).

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 indicates that the executing agency, TÜBİTAK, demonstrated strong ownership over the project, as evidenced by its commitment to continue implementing and financing project activities (pg. 24). The

TE also notes that the 2018 Competition-Accelerator cycle was primarily executed using Turkish resources and funding, which demonstrates country ownership and contributes toward project sustainability (pg. 42).

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 does not provide a rating for M&E design at entry, however it does provide a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for the logical framework. The TE indicates that the intervention logic was not well articulated in the project's results framework. Specifically, the TE notes that the project's expected outcomes are a "summing up of the underpinning respective outputs" rather than a "discernible change in the target groups' short- to medium-term behavior/performance or system/institutional performance" (pg. 27). Additionally, the TE indicates that the indicators provided in the results framework are of mixed quality. For example, "the extent to which policies and regulations are amended or implemented" is not a SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely) indicator (TE pg. 27). The TE also notes that while baselines and targets are included in the results framework, they are not always operational. For example, the results framework indicated that "no projects have taken a cleantech approach in Turkey" and a target is that "number of clean technologies start-ups increased by 15%" (pg. 28).

On the other hand, the Project Document does include a detailed M&E plan, including M&E activities, responsible parties, and timeframe for implementation. Additionally, the M&E plan provides for a dedicated M&E budget of \$70,000 (PD pg. 19). Taking both the results framework and the M&E plan into consideration, this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE indicates that the project team regularly monitored activities and progress toward achieving outcomes using the project's results framework. The TE notes that the level of detail provided in the annual Project Implementation Reports is "commendable, thereby constituting

an extremely useful monitoring instrument” (pg. 47). However, it does not appear that efforts were taken to amend the results framework, which would have improved its usefulness as a monitoring instrument. Additionally, the TE indicates that a Midterm Evaluation did not take place, although it had been planned for in the Project Document. The TE notes that the value of a “mid-way reflection...was not well understood” and “it is not clear that sufficient cash allocations were reserved within the project’s design to facilitate the mid-term and terminal evaluations” (pgs. 47-48).

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 provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for the performance of the implementing agency, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), and this TER concurs. The TE indicates that the project design was highly relevant to the country context, although there were weaknesses in the project’s results framework. The TE notes that UNIDO effectively oversaw the project’s implementation, including the delivery of outputs and monitoring the achievement of expected outcomes. Additionally, the TE indicates that the technical backstopping provided by UNIDO was highly effective and appreciated by project stakeholders. The TE does indicate some stakeholders expressed disappointment with UNIDO’s support and guidance on the policy dimension of the project, as well as engagement with the private sector. Additionally, some stakeholders wished UNIDO had better leveraged its networks to gain more international exposure for the project and increase its exchange opportunities (TE pgs. 49-50).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for the performance of the national counterparts, in particular the executing agency, the Scientific & Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK), which is situated within the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT). The TE indicates that the Project Management Unit (PMU), housed within TÜBİTAK, promoted local country ownership over the

project, as well as facilitated “ongoing exchange and on-the-job training for staff to develop the capacities to successfully support ongoing organization of the Competition-Accelerator” (pg. 53). The TE also indicates that the PMU did an effective job of identifying, involving, and managing all relevant stakeholders. However, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) did not convene until 15 months into project implementation, which affected the national-level coordination of the Competition-Accelerator. The TE also notes that there was significant turnover of representatives in the PSC, which affected its ability to provide supervision and strategic guidance over the project (pg. 50). Overall, however, this TER assesses the quality of project execution to be **Satisfactory**, given the strong performance of TÜBİTAK as the executing agency.

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 indicate that the project contributed to environmental safeguarding by “supporting the development of cleantech ideas, solutions, and services related to energy efficiency, renewable energy, reduced waste and GHG emissions, improved water sanitation, and increased agricultural productivity” (pg. 23).

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 the project promoted gender mainstreaming by creating more opportunities for women entrepreneurs. The TE indicates that women held 18%-32% of team leader positions, and that the project actively recruited female trainers, mentors, and judges for the Competition-Accelerators. Additionally, a few participating start-ups were from less developed parts of the country, which promoted inclusiveness (pg. 24).

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

By the time of the TE, TÜBİTAK's capacity for mentoring and training energy technology innovators through the Competition-Accelerator model was strengthened. Additionally, 95 start-ups completed the Accelerator, and the 20 top teams had the "potential to commercialize their products in Turkey or abroad" (pg. 34). Of the 400 registered competition mentors, 55 mentors and 4 assistant trainers were also trained by the project (pg. 37).

b) Governance

The TE does not indicate any changes in governance that occurred by the time of the TE.

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 does not indicate any impacts not targeted by 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 does not indicate any adoption of GEF initiatives at scale, although it does highlight the potential for replication, mainstreaming and scaling up of project activities (pg. 24). Additionally, the TE indicates that a Concept Note was developed for a second phase of the project, funded by the GEF (pg. 53).

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 TE provides the following lessons learned (pg. xi):

Lesson #1: A robust Theory of Change (TOC), developed through multi-stakeholder discussion with

attention put on formulations, can strongly guide an intervention towards achieving meaningful transformational impact (ideally within a realistically-assigned timeframe and adequate resources).

Lesson #2: An overall programme framework, with adequate resourcing for management and supervision, can allow for synergies, cross-country fertilization, local adaptation to opportunities and needs, and generate an M&E framework from the outset that facilitates pertinent data-gathering and analysis to identify levers and pitfalls underpinning the sustainability of results and benefits.

Lesson #3: Recognize the importance of supervision in supporting and keeping implementing teams on track and within scope; competences may need to evolve as a project moves from startup to maturity and hand-off; staff, support, develop, and supervise the implementing team accordingly.

Lesson #4: Having a clear exit strategy as part of project design, together with assuring country ownership, funding and support is in place, is key to sustaining the project's results and benefits.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pg. xi):

Recommendation #1: Increase focus on the policy side and aim to make substantive progress towards the originally envisaged outcome in this domain during the current 1-year extension.

Recommendation #2: Draw inspiration from experience and lessons learned within existing institutional collaboration in order to buttress needed competences and strengthen supervisory role.

Recommendation #3: Reinvigorate the project's steering structure through intensifying efforts to strengthen the national-level mechanism's coordination function, backed up by appropriate monitoring to track success, anchor country ownership, and assure exit from project support.

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 satisfactorily assesses the project's outcome and impacts. | S |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | The report is consistent, and the evidence provided is generally convincing. | S |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The report adequately assesses project sustainability and provides an in-depth analysis of the project exit strategy. | S |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | The lessons learned are supported by the evidence provided. | S |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The report includes the actual project costs (by year). The co-financing information provided is vague; the report notes the contributions of the executing agency but only alludes to the contributions of other entities (i.e. UNIDO and other government institutions). | MU |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | The report extensively assessed the quality of the project's results framework, as well as M&E implementation. | S |
| Overall TE Rating | | S |

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