

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	December 2007
GEF Project ID:	622		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	466	GEF financing:	7.99	7.99
Project Name:	Energy Conservation and GHG Emissions Reduction in Chinese Township and Village Enterprises - Phase II	IA/EA own:		
Country:	People's Republic of China	Government:	1.00 (cash) 1.25 (in-kind)	6.41 1.41
		Other*:	2.00 (Agricultural Bank of China) 6.30 (Beneficiary Enterprises)	17.5 27.3
		Total Cofinancing	10.55	52.62
Operational Program:	5: Conservation and Efficiency	Total Project Cost:	18.54	60.61
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Government of China UNIDO	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		February 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: June 2004	Actual: Not closed at the time of TE completion
Prepared by: Alejandro Imbach	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 41 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): More than 78 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): More than 37 months
Author of TE: Frank Pool Weng Gang		TE completion date: June 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 10 months

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	NA	NA	HS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	NA	NA	NA	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	NA	NA	NA	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation	NA	NA	NA	HS

and Execution				
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	NA	NA	MS	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?
 No. Although the TE provided a thorough review of the project's achievements, evaluated specific project outputs, and examined indications and prospects of project sustainability, some important aspects of the project implementation such as project M&E system, budget execution, activity costs, project implementation delays (delay of 37 months over the original planned 41 months implementation period), etc, were not assessed. It has also not provided ratings on various performance dimensions.

The TE is well written and articulated. In general terms, its content is well supported by evidence and the arguments exposed are coherent. It could have been considered a good practice if the aspects mentioned before were covered.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
 No, based on the information provided by the TE follow-up is not considered necessary.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

To reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in China from the Townships and Villages Enterprises (TVE) sector by increasing the utilization of energy efficient technologies and products in the brick, cement, metal casting and coking sectors. There were no changes during implementation

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The development objective of this project is to reduce the potential adverse social, environmental and economic consequences of global climate change by reducing GHG emissions from TVE-based production and use of building materials, coke and metal-casts. This will also lead to improvements in the quality of life in rural areas.

There were no changes in these objectives during implementation.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance

Rating: S

The relevance of this project is unquestionable. The project outcomes support the climate change mitigation efforts of the GEF.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: HS

The project focused on appropriate energy use sectors and had a generally sound project design. It has been successfully implemented and achieved results in excess of those anticipated. The project leaves a strong post-project sustainability legacy.

The pilot project achieved GHG savings of around 193,192 tons of CO₂/year, compared to the project's design target of 85,000 tons of CO₂/year.

Additionally, formal replication project calculated savings of 714,000 tons/yr CO₂ appear to have already been achieved in the 101 projects known to be implemented from the 118 formal TVE replication projects. This figure is expected to increase by between 129,278 and 537,000 tons/year CO₂ savings as the twelve remaining cement plant formal replications are implemented (as seems likely).

TE findings indicate that "the TVE project was large and complex, but with strong co-operation was successfully implemented in a period of dramatic technological, market and social change in China. As an example of the rapid pace of change in China during the project, most of the proposed pilot projects and

technologies had to be completely updated or changed." This statement implied a challenging context and the project had to make numerous adjustments to adapt to evolving project circumstances and early implementation results.

Based on the TE findings, the TVE project seems to be very suitable for UNDP/ UNIDO and GEF promotion as a world best practice project in the rural industry/SME sector.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: HS

The TE findings indicate that the project was very efficient in terms of cost effectiveness. The project budget was realistic for the projects intended outputs and outcomes. Co-financing exceeded the expectations at project design.

In this respect, the TE indicates that in the eight pilot-demonstration projects implemented, around \$49 million of co-funding were invested, including \$10 million from commercial sources, leveraged from an \$800,000 contribution from GEF.

In addition, 111 out of 118 formal replication projects, with CO₂ reductions of 1.3 million tons/yr are achieved or underway (with 714,000 tons/yr CO₂ savings in 101 projects implemented to date) - with funding provided by GEF and the TVEs, as well as from a range of grants, policies and other support from various levels of the Chinese government. These results are a significant improvement on the project design target of one million tons/yr of CO₂ reductions to be identified and designed in detail in 100 feasibility studies, but not necessarily to be implemented during the project's operation. The GEF's \$2 million allocated for this component of the project has leveraged around \$100 million of co-funding in these 101 replication projects.

4.1.2 Impacts

The main impact is a significant reduction in GHG emissions, as well as positive effects on the Chinese government key interest in improving national and local energy sustainability, pollution reduction, poverty reduction, and TVE competitiveness.

The project has fostered a number of independent energy efficiency self-replications that have been implemented without direct project funding support. These self-replications arose from technical training provided by the project, site visits and training provided by the pilot TVEs, and from the efforts of the LPICs (Local Policy Implementation Committees) to locally disseminate the technologies demonstrated by the project.

There also seem to have been self-replications in Bangladesh, India, and USA but with yet non-quantified results.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources

Rating: L

The TE does not directly indicate secure financial sustainability. The TE does say that "The TVE project has achieved US\$49 million of co-funding for the eight pilot projects, and around US\$100 million of co-funding for the 101 formal replication projects implemented to date. There is clearly a large but as yet un-quantified co-funding level achieved in the self-replication projects in China and in other countries. The more than US\$150 million in co-funding known to be achieved is greatly in excess of the US\$10.55 million co-funding target." This is indicative of a likely financial sustainability as further replication projects are implemented.

b. Socio political

Rating: L

The outcome sought by GEF was to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in China's brick, cement, metal casting and coking TVE sectors. The TVE project was designed to remove key market, policy, technological, management and financial barriers to market transformation in the development and uptake of key energy efficient technologies and products in the four TVE sectors.

The project results also strongly supported the development of China's 11th Five year Plan's 20% energy efficiency target as part of the Chinese government's interest in improving national and local energy sustainability, pollution reduction, poverty reduction, and TVE competitiveness.

c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
<p>The TE reports that: "The national and local Policy Implementation Committees (PIC and LPIC) was a relevant project design element– in particular in China's current stage of social market development. With the pro-active effort of the Project Management Office, these policy co-ordination mechanisms provided strong and effective project leadership and co-ordination. The TE indicates that the project made good use of PMO and PIC links to assist the development of policies to prohibit some outdated and energy inefficient technologies as well as by provincial, city and district authorities. Through its LPIC links, the project then enhanced the local enforcement of such lists of prohibited technologies."</p> <p>"The use of formal co-operation Voluntary Agreements (VAs) between the TVE project, local government agencies (through the LPICs), relevant industry associations and pilot and formal replication sites proved to be very effective in China's TVE sector. The VAs facilitated tangible energy efficiency actions through a formal framework that coordinated global GHG objectives, national objectives and local environmental, employment and competitiveness objectives. "</p> <p>The TE also mentions that: "An issue that accounted for considerable management attention during the project was the evolution of the Production Technology and Product Marketing Consortium (PTPMC) co-operative energy management service delivery concept into the Hongyuan Company. In retrospect, the PTPMC concept was an over-ambitious concept, even at the time of project design. The effort and focus that went into trying to form a "club-ownership", PTPMC was a distraction from a wider post-project sustainability perspective. Although Hongyuan was successfully established instead of the PTPMC, there will be many energy efficiency service providers operating in China who can continue the TVE project's work in various ways. Hongyuan is unlikely to be the dominant contributor to post-project energy efficiency impacts as envisaged for the PTPMC. However, the formation and capacity building of Hongyuan has clearly produced a company with a promising long-term future"</p> <p>In summary, PICs and LPICs and the use of formal co-operation VAs would seem to be valuable elements for post-project sustainability; while the concept of PTPMCs would not.</p>	
d. Environmental	Rating: L
<p>As demonstrated in the eight pilot-demonstration projects implemented, GHG savings of 193,192 tons CO₂/yr have been achieved compared with the 85,000 tons/yr CO₂ savings anticipated in the project's design.</p> <p>As reported in the TE, "with China's ongoing socio-economic development, more and more Chinese people - not just decision makers, scientists and experts - but also entrepreneurs and the wider public, also have a growing awareness regarding environment issues, including climate change issues. People want to contribute individually and collectively to improved local and global environmental conditions. This new trend has proven to be very supportive of the TVE project's activities and outcomes."</p> <p>As energy efficient technologies continue to progress and are implemented in the TVEs, the environmental benefits in reduction of GHG emissions and overall pollution are very likely.</p>	
e. Technological	Rating: L
<p>While, the TE indicates that the rate of technological progress occurring autonomously (in the absence of the project) in China; the project clearly advanced the implementation of energy efficiency technologies in all four TVE sectors (brick, cement, metal casting and coking). While much of the project's energy efficiency development and dissemination would have eventually occurred in the absence of the project. The project probably advanced the uptake of the relevant energy efficient measures by five years.</p>	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
<p>The most relevant public good of this project is the reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in China's brick, cement, metal casting and coking TVE sectors, with impact the effects on national and global level pollution and climate change</p>
b. Demonstration
<p>The project implemented eight pilot-demonstration projects (with GHG savings of 193,192 tons CO₂/yr when only 85,000 tons/yr CO₂ savings were anticipated in the project's design. Additionally 111 formal replication</p>

projects were implemented or are underway with funding provided by GEF and the TVEs, as well as from a range of grants, policies and other support from various levels of the Chinese government.

c.. Replication

The project has fostered a number of independent energy efficiency self-replications. These self-replications are estimated to account for around 30 million tons of lifetime CO₂ savings and an un-quantified but clearly large amount of co-funding. There also seem to have been self-replications in Bangladesh, India, and USA (though the results have not yet been quantified).

These self-replications arose from the extensive technical training provided by the project, site visits and training provided by the pilot TVEs (including on a for-profit basis), project publicity efforts, the interest in energy efficiency arising from the project's pilot and formal replication results, and from the efforts of the LPICs to locally disseminate the technologies demonstrated by the project.

d.. Scaling up

The use and active involvement of the PIC and LPICs – national and local Policy Implementation Committees – was particularly relevant for the project. With the pro-active effort of the Project Management Office, these policy co-ordination mechanisms provided strong and effective project leadership and co-ordination.

Also the use of formal co-operation Voluntary Agreements (VAs) between the TVE project, local government agencies (through the LPICs), relevant industry associations and pilot and formal replication sites proved to be very effective in China's TVE sector. The VAs facilitated tangible energy efficiency actions through a formal framework that coordinated global GHG objectives, national objectives and local environmental, employment and competitiveness objectives.

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Co-financing was undoubtedly essential to the achievement of the project's objectives. Furthermore, co-financing achieved for the eight pilot projects and the 101 formal replication projects implemented to date exceeded by far the US\$10.55 million co-funding target of the project design. There is also a large but as yet un-quantified leveraging achieved in the self-replication projects in China and in other countries.

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

The initial estimated end-of-project date indicated in the TVE Project Document was June 2004, while the actual end date was July 2007. The TE does not provide a clear explanation for this delay and addresses this matter superficially. The justification provided by the TE is: "The project has been implemented in a suitably collaborative, flexible and adaptive way and has successfully overcome a series of major challenges to its original design context in its early implementation phases. The project has been successfully implemented to date in a context where TVEs in China were evolving rapidly with ownership of TVEs moving from collective to private, technologies that often changed completely during the project, state and local administrative rapidly changing management and enforcement of environmental and other desired outcomes, and exposure to competitive forces that meant that many of the proposed pilots had to be changed."

"The delays in the project's implementation appear to be reasonable in terms of having been primarily due to external factors over which the project had no control (e.g. the outbreak of SARS) as well as policy changes that could not have been predicted. Particularly relevant policy changes include the necessary modifications to the RCF when new revolving funds with no clear ownership structure were no longer allowed, and when the envisaged co-operatively owned PTPMC structure had to be changed to a company structure (Hongyuan) with much clearer ownership and accountability, but necessarily a much less ambitious scope. "

c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

A strong sense of country ownership has helped project implementation at various levels and it has also influenced the project sustainability in a very positive way.

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MU

What was considered as the M&E plan in the project design, basically consisted in several performance reviews (Annual TPR, UNDP Quarterly Reports), a mid term evaluation and a final evaluation. The idea was to assign other elements related project implementation monitoring to the mechanisms that the project proposed to create, such as: Policy Implementation Committees, Production Technology and Product Marketing Consortium (which then turned into Hongyuan Co.) and the Revolving Capital Fund. The TE does not provide information whether this was implemented or not.

The Project Document also identified several success criteria (see Annex 2 of Prodoc) to measure the project progress towards the Immediate Objectives but it didn't include a data collection and analysis strategy.

b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): UA

Although the Project design identified some arrangements for the project M&E (see section 4.5.a), based solely on the TE, it is not possible to assess whether these activities were carried out or not. The TE does not make any references or comments about the M&E except for a few references to TRC meetings.

The list of documents reviewed by the TE (which included several annual reviews and a mid term evaluation) allow to infer that some form of M&E did take place, although the TE does not report any finding nor conclusion about this aspect.

b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?

No. According to the Project Documents the M&E budget was \$23,320, which represents 0.13% of the total budget which is low (considering 5-10% as a normal practice).

b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?

The TE does not provide information about the M&E Plan execution. Given the available information, it is not possible at the moment to trace back the funds and time allocation for these activities.

b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?

The TE does directly assess the project M&E system (see section 4.5.b), but there are several references in the TE report about how the Project had to change and adapt some aspects of its implementing strategy due to changes in the project context at different levels (political, institutional, economical and technological). At this point it is not possible to determine if the changes that occurred during the project implementation were a result of the project M&E information analysis (adaptive management). The TE does not mention the systematic use of any analytical tool to provide feedback to the project management.

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.

No, see previous sections.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): HS

b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): HS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

The TE conclusions regarding this point are clear and concise:

“Positive Overall Assessment and Results - the project evaluators’ overall assessment is that the TVE II project focused on appropriate energy use sectors, had a generally sound project design, has been very successfully implemented, has achieved results greatly in excess of those anticipated, and leaves a strong post-project sustainability legacy.”

Appropriate Project Design and Adjustments – the project was appropriately designed and its implementation was suitably adjusted for changing circumstances.”

The TE does assess the performance of the Implementing Agency (UNDP), Executing Agency (UNIDO) and the domestic Executing Agency (Ministry of Agriculture) separately but as one single implementation arrangement. According to the TE the implementation was carried in a “suitably collaborative, flexible and adaptive way and has successfully overcome a series of major challenges to its original design context in its early implementation phases.”

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): HS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The TE does assess the performance of the Implementing Agency (UNDP) and Executing Agency (UNIDO) separately but as single implementation arrangement (see section 4.6.b).

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

Under the title of "Positive Overall Assessment and Results ", the TE highlights the following lessons, good practice or approaches that could have application for other GEF projects:

- The TVE II project focused on appropriate energy use sectors, had a generally sound project design, has been very successfully implemented, has achieved results greatly in excess of those anticipated, and leaves a strong post-project sustainability legacy
- Formal replication projects and large Independent or Self-replication Impacts.
- Simple Electricity Grid Access a Critical Success Factor – The rapid uptake of cement waste heat recovery electricity generation, and the lack of uptake of coking waste heat recovery electricity generation, seems to be strongly linked to the promulgation and enforcement of simple and fair technical and financial grid export electricity access and the ability to use self-generated power directly.
- Replication Also Achieved in Other Developing Countries – the TVE project has attracted considerable interest in a number of developing countries. For example, in brick making, Bangladesh is in the process of adopting the tri-arch Energy Efficient Hoffman kiln proven by the TVE pilot.
- More Than US\$150 million Co-funding Achieved – The TVE project has achieved US\$49 million of co-funding for the eight pilot projects, and around US\$100 million of co-funding for the 101 formal replication projects implemented to date. There is clearly a large but as yet un-quantified co-funding level achieved in the self-replication projects in China and in other countries.
- Appropriate Project Design and Adjustments – the project was appropriately designed and its implementation was suitably adjusted for changing circumstances.
- Realistic Project Budgets – the project budget was realistic for the project outputs and outcomes sought. Co-financing greatly exceeded the project design targets.
- RCF Recommended for Updates and Continuation Post-Project – the overall intent (outcome) of the RCF was achieved with ABC now showing considerable interest in funding energy efficiency measures in TVEs, and other financial institutions also set to start operating in this area. TA fund such as the RCF can be very useful on an ongoing basis to remove the lack of available finance argument for not implementing energy efficiency, even if the funds are small and are hard to disburse.
- Promising Prospects for Continuation of Hongyuan Co – in retrospect, the intent to establish a “club-owned” PTPMC co-operative venture to manage project energy efficiency activities, and continue all such activities post-project under one exclusive organizational umbrella, was overly ambitious. However, suitable adjustments were made and the PTPMC co-operative concept was successfully changed to Hongyuan Co, which has operated effectively in place of the proposed PTPMC in terms of managing the project’s energy efficiency activities. In the short term Hongyuan has a suitable learning-by-doing commercial focus. Its long-term prospects are also promising. However, more emphasis would seem to be indicated for its medium term business planning. It is recommended that this be addressed as a matter of some urgency.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The main recommendations given in the TE (referred to as "Lessons Identified") are:

- **Need for improved focus on project impact modalities** –The project in its design was intended to select appropriate energy efficient technologies, demonstrate the technologies in eight pilot projects, then trigger their widespread implementation through feasibility studies and detailed designs undertaken in 100 formal replication projects – all to push the energy consuming industrial systems in the huge number of TVE in the four sectors to a higher state of energy efficiency and hence to a lower GHG emissions state. However, the project design did not make it clear what the links were supposed to be between implementing the demonstrations, undertaking the formal replication feasibility studies and detailed designs, and the ultimate project goal of fostering mass self-replications in the wider TVE sectors involved. The result was that there was no focus on quantifying the underlying project objective of motivating large numbers of self -replications, and there was no systematic evaluation of the project’s self-replication impacts achieved.
- **Electricity Grid Access is a Key Success Factor** – A key factor in the uptake and rapid spread of technologies that involve the export of electricity, or even self use of generated electricity, is for TVE to be able to access the local electricity grid in a simple, fair and transparent manner. This is a wider issue of huge importance to China and other countries as they seek to utilize the enormous renewable energy and waste heat recovery for power generation potentials that are widely distributed in small plants at the local level.
- **Need for clear understanding of the socio-economic development of the host country** – The project design under-estimated the positive project impacts that were likely from China’s strong socio-economic development and from the change in ownership of TVEs from primarily collective to primarily private. This lack of consideration of the underlying and evolving socio-economic situation also contributed to the project design not considering that positive project results would feed back to

national, provincial, district and county policy development and implementation that would in turn strongly support the achievement of the project's overall goals. This negatively impacted on the project's implementation and in particular on the monitoring of self-replications.

- **Clear understanding of the socio-economic development of the host country of a GEF project** – This is as important as the details of a project design in terms of the technical environment, capacity building, and demonstration and financing mechanisms. This evaluation has placed great importance on socio-economic development aspects. This understanding is needed to underpin the estimates developed of project lifetime GHG savings and hence the cost-effectiveness of the GEF funding support of the project. This aspect is also important for GEF host country focal points and GEF itself as they undertake their own evaluations of project outcomes and the means to improve project impacts and effectiveness.
- **Need for improved understanding of common barrier removal instruments** – it would be useful for there to be formal GEF guidance as to the experience of such popular barrier removal mechanisms as the use of revolving funds, pilot demonstrations, and enhanced energy efficiency policy implementation.
- **Replications beyond host country also need to be tracked** – The project has clearly positively impacted on the design of a brick making GEF project in Bangladesh that is now underway, as well as apparently in Kyrgyzstan and Sri Lanka. It is also likely that Chinese brick making equipment manufacturers are selling more energy efficient brick making equipment in countries beyond China. The project has also fostered paid training for Indian coking plant operators in the clean-type coking technology, and may have fostered replications in Australia, Brazil, Germany, Iran, Japan, Ukraine, and the US. The cement waste heat recovery power generation without using extra fuel technology appears to have been replicated in other countries, possibly including Germany, Pakistan, Turkey, and Vietnam. However, none of these replications in other countries seems to have been documented, let alone systematically looked for impact that can reasonably be attributed to the TVE project.
- **Actual as well as calculated savings need to be tracked** – It is recommended that in future projects actual energy savings be evaluated once the projects are fully implemented and GHG emissions can then be calculated in a transparent manner to add credibility to the results achieved.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. 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 presents a thorough analysis of all relevant outcomes and achievements of the project objectives and assessed them based on document reviews, field visits and interviews. The information is adequately organized. However, it does not rate the project outcome performance.</p>	MS
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The report is consistent; the evidence presented is complete and convincing. The logic sequence linking the findings, the conclusions and the recommendations is generally clear and consistent. A more comprehensive explanation of the causes of the project implementation delays would have been helpful (total delay of 37 months over the original planned 41 months implementation period).</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? While the report does not present a specific section or chapter with an assessment of the project sustainability, the analysis of project achievements, outcomes and impacts do provide a positive overall assessment of sustainability. Furthermore the TE presents sound arguments to allow readers to infer that the project achievements and benefits are very likely to endure.</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Throughout the report several relevant lessons were identified and listed under "Conclusions and Recommendations". These lessons and recommendations are supported by the evidence presented in the document and are relevant to this project and future projects.</p>	HS
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The overall figures of the project costs and co-financing were discussed. The discussion includes co-funding known to be achieved in excess of the US\$10.55 million co-funding target. The costs of each of the eight pilot-demonstrations are also presented in an annex. However, a more detailed analysis including the cost for each activity would have been useful. This information could have allowed the reader to track down the budget expenditure with greater accuracy.</p>	MS
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? Although the project design identified some arrangements for the project M&E, the TE failed to provide any assessment whether these activities were carried out or not. The TE does not make any references or comments about the M&E except for a few references to TRC meetings.</p>	HU

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

None