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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5838	
GEF Agency project ID		CR-T1119	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IADB	
Project name		Sustainable Urban Mobility Program for San Jose	
Country/Countries		Costa Rica	
Region		Central America	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Climate Change Mitigation-4	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment (MINAE) Costa Rica	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not specified	
Private sector involvement		Not specified	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		06/12/2014	
Effectiveness date / project start		08/26/2014	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		02/28/2017	
Actual date of project completion		02/28/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		1.78	1.78
Co-financing	IA own	0.8	0
	Government	7.17	0.17
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.25	0.25
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1.78	1.78
Total Co-financing		8.22	0.42
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		10	2.20
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2018	
Author of TE		Julio Guzman	
TER completion date		March 2019	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
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	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	-	UA
M&E Design		NR	-	S
M&E Implementation		NR	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		NR	-	UA
Quality of Execution		NR	-	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	U

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Global Environmental Objective of the project is to 'support the development of activities that have a transformative impact in helping Costa Rica move towards a low-carbon development path, through a concerted effort to improve land use management, transport planning, and the implementation of an integrated public transport network in the San Jose Metropolitan area' (PD, Pg 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Development Objectives of the project is to 'promote and integrate non-motorized transport and sustainable public transport as a multimodal system which reduces the demand of private motorized travel and greenhouse gas emissions in the city of San Jose' (PD, Pg 28). The project had the following 4 components:

Component 1: Integration of public transport improvements with non-motorized and private motorized modes

Component 2: Development of a Travel Demand Management (TDM) policy and instruments for San Jose

Component 3: Development of land use and transportation policies based on relevant studies

Component 4: Technology improvement of vehicle fleet

Component 5: Development of greenhouse gas emissions baseline calculations & Monitoring Reporting and Verification system

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 and Development Objectives of the project. However, the TE notes that the main products of component 1 were revised to achieve the following: a) The design of the 2-3 intermodal stations prioritized by Ministry of Public Works and Transport. This process would be participatory with municipalities and corresponding autobus entrepreneurs (Pilot

Projects) b) A strategy for funding inter-modal and associated infrastructure, which would study the various plausible options in the context of the country (TE, Pg 21). The reason for these changes is given in the TE (TE, Annex 5) as minutes of a project meeting in Spanish, which could not be translated and referred to for the purpose of this TER.

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 assesses the relevance of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. Based on the information in the available documents, this TER assessed the relevance of the project as 'satisfactory'. The transport sector in Latin America, is the largest and fastest growing contributor of CO_2 emissions from energy consumption, producing 35% of these emissions, with road transport accounting for 90% of transport CO_2. This project responded to the policy initiatives by Costa Rica, which established transport as a strategic area to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its systems and have a great potential to mitigate climate change substantially, in line with their goal to be carbon neutral by the year 2021. The project was specifically designed for metropolitan area of San Jose, where traffic congestion problems have been exacerbated due to rapid increase in the use of private cars, mainly due to lack of urban mobility plans integrating public transport system with other modes of transport; lack of coherent and enforceable travel and management policies (TDM); lack of land-use planning integrated with public transport plans in San Jose and lack of studies and estimation for basic transport related indicators that would support the framework for greenhouse gas emission estimation (baselines and reductions). This project was designed to address these barriers within the context of San Jose.

The project aligned with the GEF strategic program CCM-4: Transport/ Urban: Promote energy efficient, low-carbon transport and urban systems, by incorporating greenhouse gas emissions considerations in mobility strategies and plans of San Jose, Costa Rica. The project also strongly aligned with focal area objective CCM-4, as it focused on activities that could have a transformative impact in helping Costa Rica move towards a low-carbon development path, through a concerted effort to improve land use management, transport planning, and public transit.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately satisfactory**

The TE assesses the effectiveness of the project in two separate sections as achievement of targets and its impact. It assesses the achievement of targets as 'satisfactory' and the impact as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. Based on the narrative in the available reports, this TER has assessed the effectiveness of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project was successful in completing most of the GEF supported outputs that helped in building awareness, developing policy guidelines, collection of data and preparation of project proposals to support a low carbon and sustainable public transport system. However, the project failed to implement the main pilot projects such as 'vehicle technology improvement of 100 cuasirenta vehicles' and 'Multi-modal integration pilot project', which were to be implemented with the support of Ministry of Public Works and Transport. This minimized the immediate environmental impact of the project in terms of directly contributing to the reduction in CO_2 through shift towards technology substitution and more sustainable transport mode. Also, while the project achieved most of the outputs, its impact was restricted due to lack of integration of recommended guidelines/proposal into the government plans and programs. For instance, the TE recommends that efforts must be made at a political level to integrate the proposals related to the development of travel demand management policies and instruments for San Jose into the plans of Ministry of Public Works and Transport.

But it is also worth mentioning that the design of the project was ambitious in terms of its expectations of the impacts and the results. Some of the changes or impacts expected through the project, such as impact indicator of 20% of new public transport trips come from private motorized travel, did not take into account that it implied important changes in the political decisions and finances of private interested groups, which was not possible within the lifetime of a single project (TE, Pg 33). But the project laid the foundation through producing studies and other knowledge products, which could be used to develop a sustainable and low carbon transport system in San Jose in future.

Component 1: Integration of public transport improvements with non-motorized and private motorized modes

All the targets under this component were met satisfactorily. The project organized 5 (target of 5) workshops with the public sector and private transport operators to provide incentives for implementing improvements in the public transport. The guidelines for integration of public transport were also developed. However, these were yet not put into practice by Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MOPT). The pilot project for multi model integration between public transport and NMT (walking and cycling) in San Jose was developed but not implemented by Ministry of Public Works and Transport.

Component 2: Development of a Travel Demand Management (TDM) policy and instruments for San Jose

The project was successful in developing policy guidelines for travel demand management for San Jose. The topic of demand management was discussed with the private sector in 3 workshops (target of 5). The data on travel, demand and transport indicators was also collected successfully. As per the expectation under this component, the guidelines for travel demand management were considered in the development of the pilot project of 'Casco Central' (TE, Pg 23). However, it is not clear if this was

implemented in the city center of San Jose, which was to be followed up later by IDB to analyze its potential to scale up in the adjoining areas.

Component 3: Development of land use and transportation policies based on relevant studies

The study of possible land uses along the future fast traffic corridor for buses was completed successfully. The strategy paper for implementation of policies transport and land use integration in the medium and long term was also developed. The project also supported the data collection of urban development indicators. However, agreement between public and private sectors to implement a pilot project for land use had still not reached a political agreement at the time of the TE.

Component 4: Technology improvement of vehicle fleet

The project completed the data collection and diagnosis of the vehicle fleet in San Jose. The output related to carrying out feasibility for the implementation of clean fuel technologies and development of a pilot project was also completed. Guidelines for vehicle monitoring system were also completed as per the expectation under this component. However, the pilot project for improved condition for clean vehicle (100 cuasirenta vehicles) fleets was not completed as the country still did not have a vehicle scrapping policy, which was also beyond the scope of the current project (TE, Pg 25). The related outputs on considering implementation of financial and economic incentives to promote use of cleaner and newer technologies in the transport sector were also not completed.

Component 5: Development of greenhouse gas baseline calculations & Monitoring Reporting and Verification system

The project completed the review of data and existing studies related to sources of greenhouse gas emissions in the transport sector. Methodology developed by GEF and Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel was also utilized to calculate greenhouse gas emissions. The project also completed baseline studies of current greenhouse gas emissions from transportation in the San José Metropolitan Area. It also led to the development of a model to estimate potential greenhouse gas reductions to be achieved through sustainable urban mobility scenarios in the short, medium and long term. A proposal for a monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) to reach the first phases of a Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) proposal.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately satisfactory**

This TER agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the efficiency with which the project was executed as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project did not face any delays and was completed on time. The financial disbursements were also timely and the project was executed without any budget deviations. The project was executed in synergy with national institutions and municipalities that generated greater ownership of key actors making efficient use of the human and financial resources (TE, Pg 33). However, it seems that the project could have benefitted, with more efficient use of resources, from a better coordination between two main ministries – Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Public Works and Transport. A major part of counterpart funds to be contributed from Ministry of Public Works and Transport did not materialize, which also limited project's replication potential and environmental impact.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Unable to assess**

The TE uses a different scale and assesses the likelihood of the sustainability of the project as 'moderately improbable'. The project helped in building awareness amongst the government and public sector and developed guidelines, proposals and other knowledge products to facilitate the design of a sustainable and low carbon urban mobility strategy. The project also supported the design of project proposals such as 'multi modal integration pilot project for the downtown area in San Jose'. However, as the TE notes, 'it depends on the political will to implement and give continuity to the pilot project proposals, thus there is still uncertainty in this regard', also due to change in the National Government in May 2018 (TE, Pg 21). Since it is difficult to determine if the new government is committed to integrate the policy guidelines and strategies as well as implement the project proposals developed through the project, this TER is 'unable to assess' the likelihood of sustainability of the initiatives taken under the project.

Financial: **Moderately likely**

The TE does not assign a rating. But based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER has assessed the likelihood of sustainability due to risks posed by financial factors as 'moderately likely'. The project failed to achieve the output related to implementation of financial incentives to promote newer technologies. But some of the activities supported by the project under component 1 are likely to continue such as municipalities reportedly using their own funds for development of manuals and guidelines to support the integration of public transport with motorized, non-motorized and private modes. A decree issued by government to eliminate taxes on electric vehicles with a cost of less than $30,000, was a welcoming step to promote the clean fuel technologies promoted under the project. Although the TE does not provide details, it notes that 'Costa Rica is investing many efforts in the development of metrics, especially through the Climate Change Department from Ministry of Environment, which can give continuity to the project proposals' prepared under the project.

Socio-political: **Unable to assess**

The TE does not assign a rating and there is not enough evidence in the available reports to assess and assign a rating to the socio-political factors that could pose risks to the likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes. The TE notes that the project had a change of context due to change in the National Government in May 2018. But it does not elaborate, which was probably too early to determine at the time of the TE, on the political will and ownership from the new government to take the project outputs and outcomes forward.

Institutional: **Moderately unlikely**

The TE does not assign a rating but based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER has assessed it to be 'moderately unlikely'. The project was successful in developing policy guidelines, strategies and pilot project proposals for implementation of various components of a sustainable and low carbon transport system. But these knowledge products still need to be implemented and integrated into government plans and programs. For instance, the travel demand management policies and instruments prepared for San Jose through the project were still not approved by Ministry of Public Works and Transport at the time of the TE. The project did not achieve all the outputs due to lack of coordination and better involvement of Ministry of Public Works and Transport as well as private sector stakeholders, which seemed to be lacking during the implementation of the current project.

Environmental: **Likely**

The TE does not assign a rating to the risk due to environmental factors. But the TE also does not identify any risks from environmental factors that might affect the sustainability.

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?

Against an original co-financing budget of $8,220,000, the project mobilized a total co-financing of $420,000. As per information in the TE, the co-financing from IDB for $800,000 did not materialize. While contribution from Ministry of Environment of $ 170,000 materialized fully, the contribution from Ministry of Public Works and Transport of $ 7,000,000 was not realized. However, the co-financing from the GTZ of $250,000 materialized fully. The lack of realization of full co-financing was one of the main reasons that some of the project activities related to implementation of the pilot projects could not be completed. For instance, the pilot project composed of bus rapid corridor and public transport integration to be supported and implemented by ministry of transport and public works, was not undertaken. This output involved the design of pedestrian facilities and bike parking/facilities, which would have generated the benefits in terms of cleaner air and contributed to reduction in greenhouse gas and CO_2 emissions, but could not be achieved. Lack of adequate involvement of Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MOPT) and need for a better coordination between MOPT and Ministry of the Environment and Energy was one of the reasons that this pilot project was not implemented.

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 did not experience any delays and was completed on time.

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 evidence in the TE and other available reports indicates that the project did not have a full ownership from the government. The changes envisaged in the project depended a great deal on the political will and support to some of the decisions required under the project. For instance, the guidelines for integration of public transport developed through the project were yet not put into practice by Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MOPT). According to the TE, changes in National Government in 2018 as well as some key positions such as Director of Sectoral Planning Secretariat as well as Deputy Minister of Transport, Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MOPT), who participated extensively during the project design and were removed later from their positions, impacted the project execution. Ministry of Public Works and Transport has the jurisdiction over public transport and work and its partnership was crucial to the implementation of some of the project outputs. However, lack of adequate involvement of Ministry of Public Works and Transport and need for a better coordination between MOPT and Ministry of the Environment and Energy led to non-achievement of some of the

project outputs, such as implementation of pilot projects in San Jose, which also had the potential for replication in the adjoining areas. But the project had good ownership from the Municipalities, who are likely to use their own funds in future to support the integration of public transport with motorized non-motorized and private modes (TE, Pg 31).

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**

The TE does not assign a rating to M&E design at entry. Based on the information available in the project document, this TER assesses it to be 'satisfactory'. The project document includes a results framework defining results, objectively verifiable indicators, project targets and sources/means of verification. The project had a separate component and budget allocated to M&E, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined for undertaking various M&E functions.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately satisfactory**

The TE does not assign a rating to the M&E implementation. But based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assesses it to be 'moderately satisfactory'. The project used various instruments such as project implementation reports, tracking tools and various planning tools for regular monitoring of the project. The project carried out baseline studies of greenhouse gas emissions from transport in San Jose Metropolitan Area, reviewed the data and existing studies related to sources of greenhouse gas emissions and developed the methodology to calculate greenhouse gas emissions. But the project did not monitor indicators such as 'reduction of tons of CO_2 emissions', which was measurable in long term after the implementation of the developed proposals. The TE notes that the project formed a technical committee, which was functional at the beginning but lost its validity subsequently. But the implications of a non-functional technical committee are not discussed in the available reports.

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: **Unable to assess**

The project's implementing agency was IADB. The TE does not provide a rating and there is not enough information in the available reports to assign a rating to the quality of project implementation.

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

The TE does not provide a rating to the quality of project execution. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assesses the quality of project execution as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. The project was to be executed by Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE) in partnership with Ministry of Public Works and Transport. The project was executed effectively by the office of the Department of Climate Change-Ministry of Environment and Energy (DCC-MINAE). However, the evidence in the available report suggests that Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MOPT) was not consulted formally and adequately, especially with regards to the approval and implementation of the proposals developed as part of the current project. As per the project document, continual coordination between two ministries was to serve as a basis for the project execution. But lack of adequate coordination and cooperation between MINAE and MOPT seems to have affected the progress of the project in terms of achieving some of the outputs. As the TE notes, 'the headquarters of the project was located in the DCC-MINAE, but the Governing Body and implementer of most of the proposals should be MOPT and its dependencies (Councils), which limited the appropriation of the project' (TE, Pg 20). MOPT was to contribute $ 7,000,000 in the implementation of a Special Bus System (BRE), which was also a major part of overall co-financing, but did not materialize.

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 did not have the environmental impact envisioned during the design of the project for various reasons such as lack of realization of counterpart financing from various sources due to which certain activities could not be undertaken and ambitious targets that would have required important changes in the status quo, political decisions, and commitment from private interested groups, which could not materialize within the lifetime of the project. For instance, the outputs that could have brought environmental impact such as 'an agreement between public and private sectors in order to implement a pilot project for land use and integration of transport' could not be achieved due to lack of political agreements between stakeholders on this subject. Similarly, the output related to 'the pilot project for improved conditions for clean vehicle fleets' was also not implemented as the country did not have a vehicle scrapping policy, which required political support and decisions, which was beyond the scope 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.

The project did not bring any socio-economic changes.

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 did not bring any substantial changes in the capacity that could bring about positive environmental change.

b) Governance

The project developed policy guidelines and strategies for integration of public transport and travel demand management (MDV) but these are yet to be adopted by 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.

The project did not have any positive or negative unintended impacts.

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 project did not lead to any initiatives that were mainstreamed, replicated or scaled up by government or other stakeholders by project end.

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 main lessons listed in the TE are as follows:

1. The appropriation of the governmental or municipal entities that will implement the proposals is necessary
2. Project partners must be clear about their role, duties and responsibilities, and sign an agreement that establishes a clear execution structure
3. In the face of relevant context changes, the project must adapt
4. The design of projects must be carried out more accurately considering the scenarios of the beneficiary countries and the possible scope of the proposed interventions
5. Formal changes (with the approval of the IA) in the results matrix are essential to changes in the context of the project
6. It is essential that the products developed in projects with GEF resources are public and, therefore, are available to society in general
7. Synergies could be achieved and a more efficient use of the "scarce resources" of a project made, through the identification of related initiatives - in accordance with the goals designed
8. Environmental/ecological sustainability does not only depend on the identification of greenhouse gas reduction mechanisms. What is important is to create spaces for dialogue
9. The GEF emissions reduction strategy must take into account the participation of - and the effect on - women and youth of the relevant actors

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations listed in the TE are as follows:

1. It is important to seek political support to do an awareness-raising work, review and joint development of the project proposals so that they can be implemented.
2. There must be a clear structure of appropriation and implementation of the proposals and that the project partners clearly understand their duties and obligations, which should be written in an agreement.
3. The design of the projects must establish adaptation mechanisms, in order to ensure that scarce resources are used in the best way
4. The design of the project must consider the imminent risks of the political action and adequately establish the scope and corresponding indicators
5. Changes in the results matrix, although must be analyzed in depth by the actors, must be proposed in an assertive manner and formally approved
6. All products achieved in this type of project should be published on the web, in order to promote the public use of the information generated
7. Develop a strategy to generate synergies with other institutional actors, projects and initiatives
8. It is very important to continue with the participation processes developed by the project
9. It is necessary to improve the communication strategy in order to reach women and young people more efficiently in all areas of society

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 TE does not provide a comprehensive assessment of the relevant outcome and impacts. It does not provide a detailed account of achievements under various components. It also does not report on all the outputs mentioned in the project document. There is also lack of consistency in statements made in separate sections. For instance, it highlights the changes made in components and resulting outputs by the project. However, it does not report against revised outputs under the effectiveness section.	**U**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence presented was neither complete nor convincing at some places. For instance, the TE does not elaborate on the reasons that pilot proposal developed under the project, were not implemented. Also, it does not elaborate on the effectiveness of the project in involving stakeholders, such as private transport operators and other private sector stakeholders, whose participation was crucial for achievement of some of the outputs expected under the project.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE does not address the issue of sustainability in a comprehensive and adequate manner. This section has given recommendations instead of providing an analysis for the likelihood of sustainability.	**U**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned more or less emerge from the main evidence in the report, although some of the lessons are not discussed in detail in the main report.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes, the TE includes the actual project cost and actual co-financing used.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not assign rating or provides a comprehensive analysis of M&E systems.	**MU**
Overall TE Rating		**U**

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

No additional sources were used.