1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		572	
GEF Agency project ID		5174	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Tehran Transport Emissions Reduction	
Country/Countries		Iran	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		11 – Sustainable Transport 5 – Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation	
Executing agencies involved		Tehran Municipality through its Air Quality Control Company (AQCC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 1, 1992	
Effectiveness date / project start		January 3, 1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 30, 1996	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 1996	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		$2	$2.1
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	$2 (Tehran municipality)	$2.1 (Tehran municipality)
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		$2	$2.1
Total Co-financing		$2	$2.1
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		$4	$4.2
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 1, 1998	
TE submission date		NA	
Author of TE		Claude Archambault	
TER completion date		February, 2015	
TER prepared by		Erika Hernandez	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Dania Trespalacios; Josh Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	NA	S	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	NA	Likely*	Uncertain*	MU
M&E Design	NA	NA	NA	MU
M&E Implementation	NA	NA	NA	UA
Quality of Implementation	NA	S	S	MS
Quality of Execution	NA	S	S	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	NA	NA	S	MS

*The TE assigns the score of sustainable to the project, which is interpreted as "likely," whereas the IEG review rates sustainability as Uncertain. The WB utilized a 3-point scale for sustainability at the time: Likely, Unlikely, and Uncertain.

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objectives of the project are to reduce emissions of Green House Gases (GHGs) that contribute to climate change. Specifically, the project seeks to reduce emissions from the Tehran transport system The PD states that Tehran was chosen as the site for this pilot project - whose results are intended to inform larger efforts to reduce emissions from urban transport systems in the developing world – because "*the city suffers from severe air pollution for which transport is the primary cause and a strong potential exists for exploiting the joint benefits of local air pollution abatement and GHG emissions reductions, and for examining the trade-offs between them.*" (PD, pg 1). .According to the PD, Tehran's transport systems is responsible for some 6 million tons of annual CO2 emissions, due largely to an insufficient public transport system and excessive reliance on automobiles. As a co-benefit, the project's long-term goals of reducing GHG emissions will have the effect of improving local air quality, with associated health benefits. No GHG targets are stated in the PD, as the project's work is focused on quantifying the costs of various interventions to reduce GHGs and local air pollutant emissions, and is intended to serve as an input to policy decisions.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective is the following [p. 2, PD]:

"With the support of GEF funding, authorities in Tehran will (i) assess measures, including efficient pricing of inputs and urban transport services that would reduce GHG emissions from vehicular traffic, while simultaneously improving local air quality. GHG abatement can be achieved through a variety of measures, all of which will produce some reductions in local air pollution. The GEF project would (ii) identify a schedule of measures to achieve a target air quality improvement, which serve both objectives at the lowest incremental cost for GHG abatement. (iii) Such a schedule of GHG abatement maximizing measures, and the associated incremental costs, (iv) will provide decision makers with the information necessary to design a program of local air pollution abatement that simultaneously, and cost effectively, addresses global warming concerns."

The project hast the following components [p. 3, PD]:

(a) Emissions Inventory & Air Quality Monitoring. Includes: (i) Development of emissions estimates, covering both mobile and stationary sources, for those pollutants (GHG and

conventional) emitted by transport operations; (ii) Specification of the air quality monitoring system to be used in assessments of air quality changes; and (iii) Establishment of baseline air quality data and target air quality standards.

(b) Traffic Management & Restraint. (i) Estimation of an appropriate travel modal shift model, calibrated for Tehran; (ii) Estimation of emission factors associated with various transport modes under various operating conditions; (iii) Development of a transport model for all urban transport modes to assess potential emission reductions; and (iv) Assessment of traffic management strategies, including parking management, with respect to air quality impacts.

(c) Vehicle Fleet & Fuels Improvement. (i) Design of a comprehensive policy for accelerated fleet renewal; (ii) Enhancement of Tehran's Inspection/Maintenance and tune-up program, aimed at establishment of effective emissions tests; (iii) Study of the feasibility of introducing alternative fuels such as natural gas, and higher quality fuels such as reformulated gasoline; and (iv) development of a program to introduce Emission Standards for new vehicles, which take into account target air quality standards.

(d) Strategic Urban Transport Emissions Reduction Planning. (i) Identification of costs and impacts of various pollution abatement measures including economic pricing of energy supplies and transport services and the associated elasticities. Costs will include implementation, user costs, and other public and private costs - "supply curves" showing the costs of various interventions per unit of GHG/local pollutant emission reduction would be developed; (ii) Analysis of institutional and other constraints to implementation of options; (iii) Synthesis of the results in an evaluation framework; and (iv) Preparation of implementation plan.

(e) Project Support and Transport & Air Quality Seminar. Funding of administrative support and of a seminar to present the results and obtain public comment on the measures proposed.

(f) International Panel of Experts (IPE). Funding of fees and travel expenses for a panel of four international experts in the fields of air pollution measurement and impact assessment, transportation fuels, vehicle technology and emission controls, and urban transport planning.

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

There were **no changes** in the Global Environmental or Development Objectives.

4. GEF EO 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 project is relevant to both the GEF and to the Government of Iran. The Government of Iran is a signatory to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (June 14, 1992). More importantly, Tehran's poor air quality was identified as a high priority and environmental issue [p. 6, PD]. This project is particularly important for Iran given that Tehran suffers from high levels of air pollution for which transport is seen at the primary cause. Tehran consumes around 2 million tons of gasoline/diesel per year, which releases nearly 6 million tons of CO_2. The maximum 8-hour average for CO concentrations was 100 ppm (1987) which is 10 times above the WHO guidelines of 9ppm. High level of carbon emissions is attributed to a poor public transportation system [p. 1, Technical Annex, PD]. The GEF observes that there is a strong potential for obtaining joint benefits from reducing local air pollution as well as GHG emissions [p. 1, PD]. The project will assess the different options for the future development of the Tehran transport system that is environmentally sustainable. The project is in line with the priorities of the GEF's Climate Change focal area. It contributes to Operation Program 11 on Sustainable Transport and to Operation Program 5 – Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rated project outcome as *satisfactory* [p. ii & 7, TE]. This TER rates effectiveness as *satisfactory.* The TE finds that most of its objectives were met, including the procurement of equipment. The TE finds that the project largely achieved its "physical and institutional objectives." An analysis of possible measures for mitigating GHG emissions was conducted; an Action Plan to reduce the emissions was produced; and a strategy for the short, medium and long term was created. Although evidence towards the completion of outcomes is presented, a more comprehensive set of indicators that were measurable should have been offered in the PD in order to better assess progress.

The following bullets describe the level of completion for each project objective [p. i-ii, TE]:

(i) Assessment of measures, including efficient pricing of inputs and urban transport services. **(Satisfactory).** Tehran's Air Quality Control Company (AQCC) commissioned an analysis that modeled traffic flows and air quality in Tehran in order to study measures that could reduce GHG emissions from transportation sources. This study included: an emissions inventory; recommendations on traffic management and to improve vehicle fleet; and, preparation of strategic urban transport emissions reduction plan.

(ii) Identify a schedule of measures to achieve a target air quality improvement. (**Satisfactory**). AQCC prepared an Action Plan to reduce PM-10 and GHG, and that describes the measures to be taken to improve air quality in Tehran. The TE indicates that the AQCC staff managed to demonstrate its capability to use a pollution dispersion model to develop cost-effective measures to decrease GHG pollution [p. 4, TE]. Moreover, monitoring station systems for collecting data were established.

(iii) Quantify the costs of various interventions to reduce GHG and local air pollutant emissions from urban transport. **(Satisfactory).** The company also identified actions that the municipality could employ to reduce both PM-10 and GHG by 38% by 2015. Vehicle emissions were also evaluated [p. 27, TE]. A schedule of GHG abatement measures was

designed by AQCC. It prepared a strategy to reduce transport emissions in the short (0-5 years), medium (5-10 years) and long (10-20 years) term.

(iv) Assist the Grant Recipient in defining urban transport policies which are environmentally sustainable. **(Satisfactorily).** A detailed action plan was prepared as a result of part (iii). Conveyed recommendations on drafting appropriate regulations and establishing certification and enforcement mechanisms for emissions regulation, including transferring expertise to Iranian professionals. Assessment of whether training was successful in that Iranian professionals acquired expertise on urban transport policies is unknown. Vehicle fleet renewal was not mentioned in the TE.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The TE does not rate efficiency. TE states that the project experienced several delays due mostly to a miscalculation in the timing of project implementation. The TE does not assess whether the project was cost-effective. The project experienced several delays. The project was expected to be completed by June 30, 1996 but its closing date was extended twice until December 31, 1996 first, and finally until December 31, 1997 [p. iii, TE]. That is, the project completion was extended one year and a half. Other delays were related to a tight schedule that was set to conduct three of the four studies, particularly given the complex mechanism of the international bidding procedure for one of the studies. It took nearly 22 months after the effectiveness of the Grant agreement for the International Joint Venture of Consultants (IJV) to mobilize its staff in Tehran on October 28, 1995 [p. 3, TE]. There were other delays at the end of the project where, when the IJV attempted to present its final report, the presentation had to be postponed due to elections in Iran [p. 3, TE].

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

The TE rates the project as *sustainable* noting that through the work of this project, AQCC staff have demonstrated their ability to collect and analyze pollution data, and to promote pollution abatement actions among the various municipal agencies. However, this TER rated the project's sustainability as *moderately unlikely* based on a number of risks identified in the TE narrative. These include: (1) lack of full cooperation between agencies and lack of interest by the Iranian Department of Environment; lack of National Government support for policy and institutional reforms necessary to address GHG and vehicular pollution; and the ongoing US embargo that limits the ability to maintain pollution measuring equipment (TE, pg 4-5).

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following 4 dimensions [p. 4-5, TE]:

- Financial Sustainability. **(Unable to Assess).** The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess financial risks to sustainability
- Sociopolitical Sustainability. **(Moderately Unlikely).** The National Government demonstrated support for the project overall. However, TE finds that the Department of Environment did not show strong commitment. The National Government's environmental and fuel priorities contradicted with those of Tehran's Municipality. While Tehran's Municipality supported introducing higher prices to gasoline and fuel to influence an improvement in energy efficiency,

the National Government did not. A similar previously adopted policy proved highly unpopular, particularly with high inflation rates [p. 4-5, TE].

- Institutional framework and governance **(Moderately Unlikely.)** According to the TE, the Air Quality Control Company (AQCC) has established systems and awareness on the need to use energy efficient sources. AQCC has also organized national and international seminars to disseminate its findings, although citizen acceptance is not addressed. It created a large campaign in the media to increase awareness on the negative impacts related to transport pollution in Tehran [p. 4, TE]. The TE reports that Tehran acquired pollution measuring equipment, but it is uncertain whether maintenance for this equipment will be possible. Although the TE states that this will not affect the project's sustainability, this TER disagrees with this statement. The inability to measure air pollution in Tehran will impede authorities to make evidence-based policy decisions that can genuinely improve Tehran's air quality. The project has not led to the establishment of any legal or regulatory frameworks that would secure the future functioning of AQCC activities on energy efficiency. In addition, not all government agencies gave a strong support to the project as cooperation among agencies is very weak. AQCC did not receive support by the various ministries and instead received ad hoc advice by university professors. Accordingly, AQCC is highly dependent on the local and national situation.
- Environmental. **(Unable to Assess).** No environmental risks were identified in the TE.

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 TE does not mention whether co-financing was essential in achieving GEF objectives or in the attainment of project outcomes. Expected co-financing was $2 million, materialized co-financing increased slightly to $2.1 million. Co-financing represented 50% of the total funding for this project.

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's expected date of completion was extended twice, from June 1996 to December 31, 1996 and again to December 31, 1997 [p. iii, TE]. The project's tight schedule proved unrealistic, particularly given the complex mechanism of the international bidding procedure for one of the studies. It took nearly 22 months after the effectiveness of the Grant agreement for the International Joint Venture of Consultants (IJV) to mobilize its staff in Tehran on October 28, 1995 [p. 3, TE]. At the end of the project the IJV's presentation of its final report was postponed due to elections in Iran [p. 3, TE]. The effect of delays in outcome completion is not addressed in the TE.

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:

Country ownership heavily influenced project outcomes. The support of the Municipality of Tehran was very important to the success of project activities. Although the national government was closely involved in the project, it did not agree with the policies and activities recommended by the project. Environmental priorities of the national government and Tehran's municipality appeared to be the same in paper but were substantially different once the project was implemented. The National Government's environmental and fuel priorities contradicted each other, negatively impacting project implementation. While the Government of Iran was a signatory to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992) and that stated that reducing Tehran's GHG emissions was a high priority issue, it was unwilling to increase its gasoline and diesel prices to discourage fuel consumption [p. ii, TE]. The TE concluded that the Government of Iran was not ready to introduce environmental policy changes. The Government was more concerned with reducing local pollutants such as particulate matter (PM-10), which it considered more problematic than the reduction of GHG [p. 2, TE]. In contrast, the TE states that AQCC and the municipality of Tehran had a strong commitment to the project [p. ii, TE].

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 Unsatisfactory**

The TE does not rate M&E design at entry. This TER rated the project's sustainability as *moderately unsatisfactory,* based on the PD and assessment presented in the TE narrative. The project did not contain a logical framework matrix, nor did it have indicators that would enable better racing project completion, but it did include expected outputs and detailed baseline data, [p. 7-18 Technical Annex, PD]. Monitoring air pollution mechanisms in Tehran were also identified in the Project Document [see p. 15-16, Technical Annex, PD]. A time frame was provided for the project design, but not for project activities. The PD does not specify budgetary allocations for monitoring and evaluation activities.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The TE does not rate M&E implementation. This TER rated the project's M&E implementation as *unable to assess* given the limited amount of information presented. Despite a weak M&E design lacking a logical framework matrix and indicators, TE states that monitoring systems were established through the construction of small buildings to house newly purchased pollution monitoring equipment [p. 6, TE]. The monitoring equipment was installed and is being maintained by the recipient. AQCC was designated as

the agency responsible for continued monitoring of Tehran's air quality [p. 7, TE]. Monitoring reports like PIRs were not available to the TER reviewer, but they may have been completed. The TE does not state whether the scheduled mid-term review was completed.

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**

The TE rates the World Bank's performance as *satisfactory* on a six-point scale. This TER rates its performance as *Moderately Satisfactory* because of shortcomings in project design. The TE states that the WB provided adequate support throughout project implementation [p. ii, TE]. The Bank's supervisory tasks were fully carried out (a total of 6 supervision missions were expected): (i) 8 missions were executed which allowed to assess progress on data collection on pollution; and, construction of small buildings to house the pollution monitoring equipment; and, (ii) the Bank provided technical and administrative assistance to the International Joint Venture of Consultants (IJV) [p. 6, TE].

However, the TE critiques that the project's design was cumbersome. The project designated three offices from the municipality of Tehran to execute the project, but only one agency, the AQCC (Air Quality Control Company), actually executed the project [p. 5, TE]. It appears that the WB did not plan adequately for sustained commitment after project completion. The TE also critiques the project's design in that there were many components, some of which would not have immediate impact. The World Bank did not consider whether the country was familiar with the WB's procurement procedures, this lack of familiarity proved a "main cause of delays," [p. 6, TE]. The project also experienced delays related to strict and unrealistic timetables [p. 24, Technical Annex, TE].

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates the project management by the recipient as *satisfactory* on a six-point scale. This TER rates its performance as *moderately satisfactory* based on delays related to procurement costs and failure to establish a project advisory group. The implementing agency, the AQCC, had a strong commitment to the project but the Government of Iran did not give full support to the project. According to the TE, AQCC's (Air Quality Control Company of Tehran's municipality) unfamiliarity with World Bank procedures was ameliorated by its commitment throughout the project, which stemmed from the project director's leadership. Delays were related to procurement goods and services, disbursement procedures, among others. Two independent audit reports on transactions were carried out, appointed by the AQCC [p. 6-7, TE]. One major shortcoming is not having established the Project Advisory Group (PAG) composed by

national ministries like the Foreign Affairs; Oil, Industry, Economics and Financial Affairs; the Housing and Urban Development; among others, as the PD had initially directed. It is not clear whether this was the agency's or the national government's responsibility. This TER considers that this was a key action given that the presence and advisory of ministries could have given the project greater leverage and, thus, the capacity to carry out its activities in the future. In addition, AQCC "supervised all phases of the project" by demonstrating its capacity to collect and analyze pollution data, and having highly qualified and competent staff [p. 4, TE].

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.

No environmental impacts were detected at the end of the project.

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.

No socioeconomic changes were detected at the end of 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

Pollution measuring equipment for environmental monitoring was purchased. The project provided training on: advice on a national energy conservation awareness program; strengthening training of selected staff in energy conservation and auditing in the relevant ministries and municipalities [p. 10, Part I of the ICR in TE]. AQCC created a large media campaign to increase awareness on the negative impacts related to transport pollution in Tehran [p. 4, TE]. Technical know-how is set to be instituted by the Operation Plan created after the Air Pollution Conference in Tehran in June 1997.

b) Governance

The most important governance change was having AQCC head energy efficiency efforts in Tehran. Although it is set to lead continued energy efficiency efforts, the central government has not fully backed AQCC neither has it supported long-term change through increasing prices of polluting energy sources. The AQCC has established systems in further anchoring awareness on the need to use energy efficient sources, including software to model pollution dispersion in Tehran.

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 were reported.

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.

No other initiative were documented by in the TE.

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.

Some of the lessons learned as per the TE are the following:

- Strong commitment to reduce GHG is needed at the national level. The reluctance of the GOIRI to increase gasoline and diesel prices means that a large number of recommendations to lower GHG emissions from vehicles will not be implemented. GHG reduction is a long term effort and

it requires a long term commitment from all stakeholders, and particularly by the central government.

- The implementation of the Action Plan based on the recommendations of the TERP study will also require a strong commitment from the part of the Municipality, and a level of collaboration between the different municipal agencies that has not always existed in the past. Finally the municipality's first priority to reduce PM-10 may not agree with the Government's objective to reduce GHG.
- Any modeling effort requires a large amount of data. In the TERP case, there was a need to model both the traffic patterns in the City, and the air pollution dispersion patterns. This data, in the proper format, may not be available in every city. If available it would be disseminated between various agencies that may have different priorities from the reduction of GHG or PM-10.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The project did not contain recommendations per se but they can be obtained from the “lessons learned” section.

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 EO 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 TE contains a general assessment of outcomes but does not report on specific indicator targets. The TE does not include information on impacts was found.*	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	*The TE is internally consistent, provides very general evidence of outcomes. The TE does not provide all necessary ratings like for M&E Implementation and M&E design. TE ratings were not always well substantiated.*	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	*Information regarding institutional and sociopolitical sustainability is provided. However, no information on financial or environmental sustainability is provided.*	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	*Lessons learned are supported by the evidence but are not comprehensive.*	**MU**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	*The TE includes costs but does not include a breakdown per activity. Co-financing figures are also provided.*	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	*The TE does not adequately rate the project' s poor M&E design, and does not provide sufficient information to enable an assessment of the project's M&E systems.*	**MU**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

Overall TE rating: (0.3*(4+4)) + (0.1 * (4+3+4+3)) = 2.4 + 1.4 = 3.8 = MS

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

The documents that were analyzed were the PD and TE.