Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		632	
GEF Agency project ID		12631	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Fiji Renewable Energy Hybrid Power Systems	
Country/Countries		Fiji	
Region		ASIA	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 6: Promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs	
Executing agencies involved		Fiji Department of Energy (DOE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		February 1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 2001	
Actual date of project completion		2008	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.01449	
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.74	
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.07	0.113 (PIR 2007)
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.6	0.6
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.75449	TE does not provide this information
Total Co-financing		0.67	0.713 (PIR 2007)
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.42449	
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		October 2010	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Denise Chand	
TER completion date		February 2015	
TER prepared by		Aditi Poddar	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Dania Trespalacios	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	Unable to Assess
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of this project, as mentioned in the Project Brief (PB, pg. 4), is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by establishing a sustainable institutional framework that would accelerate the commercial use of renewable energy hybrid power systems, and substitute the diesel generators currently used for electric power generation. The project would be launched in Nabouwalu, Fiji, and hopes to replicate these activities throughout Fiji.

Most of Fiji's energy supply comes from non-renewable energy sources. Imported petroleum products provide 43% of Fiji's energy supply, industrial residues account for 34%, fuel wood accounts for 17%. For power generation, petroleum products account for about 50% of the nation's total installed capacity; the remaining electricity is provided by hydropower (40%) and bagasse (10%). Fiji has the resources to develop renewable energy power systems, including excellent solar conditions (PB pg. 6-7), but it has limited wind resource data. Nabouwalu has good wind and solar resources. However, several barriers have prevented the wide adoption of renewable energy systems in Fiji, including the lack of a sustainable institutional framework to support commercial renewable energy systems, lack of financing, lack of awareness among consumers, and lack of technical expertise.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PB (pgs. 8-9), the project will have the following Development Objectives:

1. **Setting up a commercial and sustainable Rural Energy Service Company (RESCO) to run the Nabouwalu system**. The RESCO will own the Nabouwalu system and collect fees to recover their full economic costs, including the capital recovery charge. . Thus, the RESCO can increase the operational efficiency and reduce the maintenance costs. The fees collected can be used to set up a revolving fund to facilitate future financing for replication in other parts of Fiji. The RESCO should be capable of providing reliable installation and maintenance service to the community, and of operating and managing the company on a commercial business basis. The RESCO will also be tasked with finding additional financing sources to invest in renewable energy systems

for replication in the other parts of Fiji.

2. **Establishing a sustainable legal and regulatory framework for the RESCO** - A regulation Charter to establish the commercial RESCO will be drafted and submitted to the Cabinet for approval. It will define the Department of Energy's role as a technical regulator to oversee the technical quality of the procured renewable systems, and an independent economic regulator to oversee the fiscal accountability of the RESCO. It will also define the government's role in facilitating access to affordable financing for the RESCO and to enable local community participation in photovoltaic dissemination.

3. **Increased information and awareness of renewable energy systems** - Public demand for the renewable energy systems will be increased. This will be a result of the project's awareness and information campaigns through the Rural Electrification Unit (REU). The local villagers' level of awareness about renewable energy and the benefits of using it for electrification will be raised; and key government decision-makers will be exposed to the success of the RESCO operation of the renewable energy systems for rural electrification.

4. **Improved assessment of renewable energy resources -** Solar radiation maps and adequate solar/wind resource information will become available. Department of Energy staff will be capable of carrying out data analysis, site selection, and feasibility studies. This will provide an information foundation for future investment in renewable energy technologies after the project is completed.

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

No, there were no changes to the Global Environment Objectives or the Development Objectives. However, the Rural Energy Service Company (RESCO) demonstration site was moved from the Nabouwalu hybrid system to the Vunivau Solar Home Systems (SHS) project in 2002 (PIR 2007, pg. 9). PIR 2003 (pg. 3) reports that the lack of interest by Shell Oil and the Fiji Electricity Authority (FEA) was one of the reasons for changing the demonstration site, since their participation were crucial to the management of the Nabouwalu system. The other reason was that the identified potential RESCOs were incapable of financing installations of renewable energy-based systems - they could only provide rural electrification services (e.g., installation, operation and maintenance) of renewable energy-based systems that are financed either by the Government or other donors.

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 aligned with Fiji's social, economic, and energy priorities. Increased use and production of renewable energy would reduce the need for imported petroleum products, reducing the need to use Fiji's foreign reserves. The resulting reduction in emissions would reduce health and environmental hazards. Additionally, this new source of energy would enable the extension of non-diesel energy services to rural areas. In 1993, a revised Rural Electrification Policy (RE Policy) was endorsed by the Cabinet, under which every rural resident would be entitled to request government assistance for electrification of their village. A Rural Electrification Unit (REU) was set up within the Department of Energy (DOE) to facilitate the implementation of the RE Policy. This new policy gave three energy options to consumers - diesel generators; extension of the Fiji Electricity Authority grid government station; or renewable energy (solar lighting/small hydro). The project will also support DOE priorities of developing private sector capability in the energy sector and involving the private sector in project implementation (PB pgs. 4-5).

The initiative is consistent with GEF Operational Programme 6, which focuses on promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs. This project aims to remove institutional barriers and strengthen capacity in the management of the existing hybrid power system. This is expected to lead to wide-scale commercial operation of renewable energy systems replacing current diesel generators in the government stations and to the electrification of the 900 villages without electricity. The result will be a reduction in diesel imports for rural electrification and a reduction in Fiji's carbon emissions.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for program effectiveness. The TE (pg. 29) notes that the general opinion is that the RESCO concept failed in Fiji, and that the project design was too ambitious for the short implementation time frame. However, most of the project activities were completed and some of the project objectives were achieved. Thus, this TER rates the effectiveness as 'Moderately Satisfactory'.

For objective 1, developing a regulatory and financial framework for rural energy service companies (RESCOs), most of the activities were carried out successfully. The TE reports that the business plan

documents, the Charter, and the report on financial feasibility of renewable energy were all completed. (TE pgs. 21-25) However, it finds that the Charter does not include the required coverage for rural electrification in Fiji. (TE pg. 34) Furthermore, neither the Charter nor the rural electrification policy was being strictly followed. For example, the DOE was setting and collecting the tariff, and procuring and disseminating spare parts – all tasks that should have been done by RESCO. In terms of setting up a financial framework, although the Charter specifies that the government should only be providing capital subsidies for technology, the government was still subsidizing the services provided by RESCO. The RESCO was to collect a monthly fee but at the time of the TE's writing the DOE was still collecting this fee and the RESCO was being paid a fixed amount per household that it serviced. Additionally, the framework does not clearly specify how the fee amount was determined (TE, pg. 34).

Objective 2, enhancing technical and financial capacities and investment opportunities of RESCO staff, had several challenges. 156 people were trained in installation, maintenance, design and finance of renewable energy technology, but it is difficult to gauge the success of this activity, since the indicator for this component does not specify a target number of people to train (TE pgs. 26-29). The TE states that it would have been more beneficial to include training on hybrid systems, as this would have been useful for the future. It also points out that maintenance services were reliable when the number of solar home systems (SHS) was small, but the timeliness of service dropped as the number increased. Customer satisfaction was also quite low when the TE was written. 14 participants were trained business management and finance in 2002 and 2003, but these trainings did not include sufficient feedback from the sessions and selected participants improperly. While the quality of training conducted is reported to be of a high standard, its impact on RESCO operations has not been measured. Additionally, funding sources for RESCOs have not been finalized despite the preparation of a business plan and meetings with potential investors.

Under objective 3, carrying out a public awareness program on renewable energy, the TE (pg. 30) reports that while there was an increase in the dissemination of information on renewable energy in 2001-2003, the demand for renewable energy systems only increased in 2008-2010, which is reflected by the fact that community projects proposed during this period stated renewable energy systems as their preferred choice. However, it is not obvious that the increase in demand was caused by the public awareness program. The TE finds that one of the main reasons for this increase was the rise in conventional fuel costs.

The effectiveness of objective 4, improving FDOE staff capacity in renewable energy assessment and equipment testing, was moderately satisfactory. While staff was trained on an on-going basis, the proposed renewable energy resource database was not complete at the time of the TE's writing. Thus, the data gathered from the assessments had not been documented, archived and used further.

The project completed its planned activities in 2003-04 and introduced supplementary activities that were carried out in 2005. These were aimed at further enhancing the project outputs, thereby

contributing further to the achievement of the objective and enhancing the impacts of removing barriers to private renewable energy-based power generation systems in Fiji. Some outputs which could not be completed during the project, such as the setting up of a renewable energy resource database, were also added to the supplementary activities. However, these activities were discontinued after lengthy delays in implementation. PIR 2007 rates the progress towards objectives for the supplementary activities as 'Moderately Satisfactory' (pg. 5).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE does not provide much information about the project's efficiency in the use of its resources. But it can be gathered that the project was delayed and the closing date was extended. The project was to start in 1999 and end after two years (2001), but the project did not start implementation until 2001 and most activities were completed in 2003. The TE does not report on the reasons for the delay. The supplementary activities started in 2005 experienced lengthy delays and only partially delivered the required outputs. The executing and implementing agencies then decided to discontinue the implementation of these activities (PIR 2007, pg. 5).

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The TE does not provide ratings for the four different dimensions of project sustainability. However, some of the project's risks were assessed in a PIR from 2007:

Financial sustainability (**MU**) – The PIR from 2007 (pg. 8) reports that multiple risks were identified in 2005 to the financial sustainability of the project, but some mitigation measures were taken. There was a risk that there would be inadequate sources of funding for the project, but the DOE was in conversation with donors to leverage funds at the time the PIR was written. Several funding proposals had also been submitted. Additionally, the consumers' willingness to pay is very low in rural areas and thus the economic costs of the RESCOs cannot be covered with these payments. While there is a continuing advocacy program to promote the benefits of renewable energy, it is difficult to raise their willingness to pay. The investment in renewable energy is low and the awareness raising program is insufficient to increase investment. However, the Fiji Electricity Authority actively promotes renewable energy and provides information and forges partnerships with renewable energy producers.

Socio-political sustainability (**U/A**) – The TE does not assess the risks to the socio-political sustainability of program outcomes.

Institutional sustainability (**U/A**) - The TE does not address the institutional risks to sustainability of program outcomes.

Environmental sustainability (**U/A**) – The TE does not address the environmental risks to sustainability of program outcomes.

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?

Committed co-financing from the governments of Fiji and Japan comprised a little less than 50% of total project funding. The Fijian government increased its contribution from USD 70,000 to USD 113,000, all of it in the form of in-kind contributions (PIR 2007, pg.10). The PIR from 2007 reports that by June 2007 all of the committed co-financing had been disbursed. Since co-financing was a substantial part of the project funding and all of it was materialized, it is highly probable that co-financing positively affected the project's outcomes.

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?

As mentioned in the 'Efficiency' section, the program was delayed at start-up but the reasons are not mentioned in the TE. The supplementary project activities that were started in 2005 also faced lengthy delays and were thus discontinued. The delays, and the cancellation of supplementary project activities, may have affected the project's achievement of outputs

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

The TE does not provide information about country ownership of the project.

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 M&E framework for the project has some shortcomings. (PB pg. 15) The Project Brief states that the project will be evaluated and monitored in line with UNDP regulations, but it does not lay out reporting structures or assign roles to specific teams or individuals to clarify M&E responsibilities. The PB does not provide specific time frames for producing reports other than the Annual Performance Reports. It allocates USD 20,000 for the final evaluation but does not provide a budget estimate for all M&E activities. The PB (pgs. 22-23) lays out a project-planning matrix, which presents the objectives, expected outputs, indicators and sources of information. However, it does not present baseline and target values for these indicators. The indicators only measure whether certain reports and documents that were planned under project activities had been produced. They do not focus on monitoring the establishment and institutionalization of the new approaches recommended by the project. Additionally, the PB does not include the measurement of carbon emissions as an indicator, which might be expected in a project where emissions reduction is a major objective.

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

M&E implementation was not satisfactory, which the TE (pg. 4) attributes to a weak monitoring and evaluation framework. Sub-par M&E implementation lead to a lack of control over the project, which affected outcome achievement negatively. While the PB does not include targets, the PIR from 2007 (pg. 3) compares project progress to targets, so these were probably set during implementation. The TE reports that a mid-term review was completed that highlighted the issues affecting the project, however only limited corrective measures were undertaken. Timely action on all the recommendations by the mid-term review might have improved the service delivery of the project (TE pg. 12). It is evident that some amount of M&E was carried out, since the PIRs provide information on the progress of all project activities. However, M&E implementation had several shortcomings, and is rated moderately satisfactory.

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 Unsatisfactory**

The TE does not assess the quality of project implementation by UNDP. However, it does mention (pg. 12) that administrative problems formed the bulk of the issues discussed in the mid-term review, indicating a lack of coordination among the project management unit, the implementing and executing agencies and the consultants. It also recommends that changes to the activities or approaches over the implementation phase of the project should be reflected in a revised project document which indicates that this was not done. As mentioned in the 'M&E design' section, the M&E framework lacked target values and baseline data. It also did not include indicators to measure institutional impact. Furthermore, the project was delayed at start-up. Thus, project implementation is rated 'Moderately Unsatisfactory' considering all of these issues.

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

The TE does not assess the quality of project execution by the Fiji Department of Energy. The TE reports (pg. 12) that there might have been a lack of coordination among the project management unit, the implementing and executing agencies and the consultants, because a majority of the issues pointed out in the mid-term review were related to project administration. Unsatisfactory project execution is also indicated by the lack of corrective measures following issues raised during reviews and steering committee meetings.

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 PIR of 2007 (pg. 14) reports that the project avoided 47 tons of carbon emissions per year, a total of 224 tons of carbon emissions by the time the PIR was written.

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 socio-economic impact is reported for this 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

Two of the program's achievements related to improving the skills and capacities of various stakeholders. 156 people from RESCOs were trained in installation, maintenance, design and finance of renewable energy technology. The project provided training in business management and finance was also carried out in 2002 and 2003 for 14 participants, but their impact on the management of RESCOs has not been measured.

b) Governance

The project helped create the Charter and the Rural Electrification policy, and set up the financial framework for RESCOs. Despite their shortcomings, these policies and frameworks may now be improved and implemented more effectively.

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 are reported in the TE.

8.5 ***Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale***. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE does not report the adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE lists the following lessons (pgs. 35-36):

1. *National policy, regulations and legislation* – There is a need to carefully and strategically consider various approaches especially where project activities will be considering new policies. Normally, the best approach is to start by looking at how existing policy /regulations /legislation can be reviewed to accommodate the proposed changes.
2. *Activities* – a phased approach or logical flow of activities is required for such projects – e.g. get the framework and accompanying regulations and legislation endorsed prior to the implementation of the demonstration component. Also, the educational and awareness activities have to be executed from the beginning of the project.
3. *Reports* – The project produced a number of invaluable and very comprehensive reports on and for rural electrification in Fiji (and the region), however, these have not been consolidated to provide an overview on how they all contributed to the overarching objective of the project – e.g. against the incremental cost and project planning matrices.
4. *Impacts* – the actual difference made by the project has been difficult to measure as many indicators are not quantitative and impact oriented. Also, the indicators tend to focus on the production of reports, sheets, and criteria and, not on the establishing and institutionalizing the intended approaches to address the barriers. There should have also been some socio-economic impact indicators such as "number of students progressing to higher education" to measure how the project has affected livelihoods.
5. *Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)* – a rigorous M&E framework would have guided and re-organized the activities and indicators at the earlier stages of the project. Immediate action on corrective measures in response to project reviews is an important feature during the course of the implementation phase and for the success of a project. Further, the need for site visits in the course of the implementation phase is required to fully appreciate the difficulties on the ground.
6. *Management* – good and proactive project management would have taken corrective measures following issues raised during reviews and steering committee meetings. The absence of such management also contributed to the project not adequately addressing the barriers as outlined in the project document.
7. *Project Document* – any changes to the activities or approaches over the implementation phase of the project should also be reflected in a revised project document (or an amendment to certain sections of the original project document) with detailed reasons. This will enable the tracking of amendments to activities /scope when projects are evaluated.
8. *General* – the Fiji RESCO project has paved the way for similar future projects where design, activities and anticipated deliverables are to be impact oriented and practically achievable within a reasonable timeframe and, specifically address barriers.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are provided in the TE (pg. 36):

1. Re-examine the Charter [and the draft Rural Electrification Bill] in the context of the rural electrification policy, national energy policy, other current legislation and regulations to promote the use of renewable energy and, the proposed Fiji Sustainable Energy Bill. This will allow for the opportunity for the RESCO concept to be re-considered in the operational context of current rural electrification initiatives.
2. Further review the project documents including the draft outline of a Rural Electrification Fund, business model(s) for RESCOs, and training programs, among others so as to provide the basis for current proposed similar initiatives such as the Fiji Renewable Energy Power Project and the Sustainable Financing for Renewable Energy Project.
3. Re-examine the modality of the RESCO Project Management Unit and consider an arrangement that would encourage and allow for a better participation of the private sector in the implementation of similar energy initiatives.

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 presents a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE does not present all the evidence required and it does not provide ratings for most aspects of implementation.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE does not provide complete information on sustainability.	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are derived from all parts of the project and are presented with evidence from the project.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not include details of actual co-financing.	**U**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not provide a good overview of M&E implementation.	**U**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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