



To Do

Projects

Reports

Administration

Help

Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: [Select](#)

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	<input type="text" value="862"/>
Project Title	<input type="text" value="Improved Household Stoves in Mongolian Urban Centers"/>
Project Type	<input type="text" value="Medium Size Project"/>
Funding Source	<input type="text" value="GEF Trust Fund"/>
Focal Area	<input type="text" value="Climate Change"/>
Agency	<input type="text" value="World Bank"/>
World Bank ID	<input type="text" value="68108"/>
Country	<input type="text" value="Mongolia"/>
Project Status	<input type="text" value="Project Closure"/>
Duration	<input type="text" value="4"/> years
CEO Endorsement	<input type="text" value="09/07/2000"/>
Agency Approval	<input type="text" value="2/6/2001"/>
Project Effectiveness	<input type="text" value="03/01/2001"/>
GEF Agency Execution Partners	<input type="text" value="(Select Execution Partners)"/> Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	<input type="text"/>

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	Arturo S. Rivera
TE Reviewer	Pallavi Nuka
TE Peer Reviewer	Neeraj Negi

 **Completion, Submission & Delays**

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	3/31/2005
Project Actual Completion	3/31/2007
Project Completion Difference	24 Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	10/24/2007
TE Submission to EO	11/30/2011
TE Submission to EO Difference	49 Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	03/06/2012
TER Submission to EO	03/06/2012
TER Submission to EO Difference	0 Months

Comments on Delays 

Based on information in the TE report (ICM) the delays were due to several factors. (i) Institutional arrangements for implementation were not clearly defined from at the start. (ii) A parallel stove program was implemented for political motives making it difficult market the project's stoves. (iii) Building relations with stakeholders and artisanal stove producers, and changing the public perception that improved stoves should be freely available, required much more time and effort than expected.


 **Funding and Co-Financing**

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US\$)	750,000	750,000	100.00 %
Cofinance Amount (US\$)	797,363	1,100,000	137.95 %
Total Amount (US\$)	1,547,363	1,850,000	119.56 %

Comments on Cofinancing 

According to the TE report, estimated counterpart funding was USD 1.1M (sources not specified) which was applied toward the production cost of the stoves. From the 2004 PIR, funding was leveraged from WHO, CDC, local microfinancing and the Ulaan Baatar municipality (amounts not specified).

 **Logical Framework**

Quality of Logical Framework 

Project Objectives -







From the Project Document, the project's goal was to "reduce Mongolia's emission of greenhouse gases."

Project Objectives:

1. Reduction of coal and wood consumption and consequent steady reduction of CO2 emissions.
2. To help create a market-based energy service industry working with household dwellers in the improvement of indoor [heating] stoves.
3. Transfer experience to 'Aimag' [secondary municipalities] centers.

Comment on Changes

There were no changes to project objectives during implementation. But one of the project components, the New Product Facility, was restructured to focus on the introduction of improved stoves among small artisans, thorough the Output Based Approach (OBA) which subsidized sales of stoves.

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
1. Social marketing activities and support for a credit mechanism.	1.1 Consumers reached and positively influenced to purchase improved kits and stoves. 1.2 Credit available and accessible for consumers	1.1 Awareness of different cost effective options to reduce coal consumption and improve heating of Gers. 1.2 Consumers aware of financing vehicles.	- Credit remains available.	- Manufacturers respond to demand by producing equipment for improving stoves.	1.1 Widespread adoption by households of improved stoves and best practices	Reduction of coal and wood consumption and consequent steady reduction of CO2 emissions	 Edit  Delete
2. Activities to develop a quality assurance program, certification process, and a post-sales service program.	2.1 Quality control guidelines and certification process implemented by manufacturers 2.2 Guarantee and post-sales service program operational; technicians trained	2.1 Increased consumer satisfaction and confidence in improved stoves.	- Latent consumer demand for improved stoves exist. - Fuel prices remain at current levels. - New technology or innovation may supplant the use of these stoves.	- Manufacturing capabilities are set to expand	2.1 Increased demand for improved stoves. 2.2. Manufacturers respond to demand by producing equipment for improving stoves.	Reduction of coal and wood consumption and consequent steady reduction of CO2 emissions.	 Edit  Delete
3. Activities to promote stove production.	3.1 Manufacturers educated and trained on fuel efficiency and stove design. 3.2 Financing available for investment in	3.1 Manufacturing capabilities/capacities expanded and improved.	- Manufacturing input costs remain fairly constant.	- Availability of credit to manufacturers for capital investments. - Increased consumer demand for improved stoves.	3.1 Wide range of manufacturers producing and selling improved stoves. 3.2 Functioning market for fuel efficient stoves.	Reduction of coal and wood consumption and consequent steady reduction of CO2 emissions.	 Edit  Delete

	production facilities.							
								Edit Delete
+ Add New Row...								

Project Performance


[Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFO Ratings](#) [Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFO Comments](#)





Overall Project Rating:





Comment


The project has achieved essential elements of the original objectives, despite a slow-start up and some difficulties developing appropriate market channels. The project has positively influenced consumer demand for improved heating stoves and developed a burgeoning market for these stoves by the time of closure. The project distributed approx. 17,000 stoves (about 8,000 freely and another 8,000 at reduced cost) which are already contributing to environmental impacts. The TE report estimates that the this will reduce coal consumption by 24,000 to 40,000 tons/year, and lead to 58,500 t of CO2 emissions avoided annually. The project's target was distribution of 56,000 stoves, so the results fall short of expectations in this regard. The production of the stoves also needs continued subsidies, as the stoves have not yet been sold at market prices. Further awareness raising is required to overcome the perception that the stoves should be distributed free-of-charge. Nevertheless, the project at the time of closure is focusing on scaling-up efforts, promoting more private sector participation in the distribution system, and replicating the project in secondary municipalities. The project has leveraged co-financing from various international donors to continue activities.





















Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes	Last PIR:	<input type="text" value="4 - Moderately Satisfactory"/>	The Project did achieve its central objective, that is, to introduce market based solutions to reduce coal emissions among consumers who use improved heating stoves. This has been demonstrated by the existence of an improved heating stove market even as the project has come to a closure. However, even though over 16,000 improved stoves were distributed, this figure fell short of the original targets of 56,000.
	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFO Review:	<input type="text" value="4 - Moderately Satisfactory"/>	As both effectiveness and efficiency are rated MS, the overall outcome rating is MS.
	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	No rating provided. But the relevance of the project is clearly noted in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFO Review:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	

















Relevance 			<p>The project developed and distributed more fuel efficient heating stoves. The project outcomes and objectives are directly relevant to the Climate Change focal area and OP 5 – Removing Barriers to Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency. The project is also closely aligned to national priorities for improving urban air quality (indoors and outdoors). The improvement of urban household stoves was identified as a high priority action in the 1995 National Environmental Action Plan. The Ministry of Nature and Environment’s Program on Energy Efficiency (1997) conducted a pilot project with 100 households. The improvement of urban stoves was also identified as a high priority in the Mongolian volume of the Asian Low-cost Greenhouse Gas Abatement Strategy (1998). The reduction of respiratory afflictions caused by air pollution is one of the two top health priorities of the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.</p>
---	--	--	--







Effectiveness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Based on the information in the TE report and final PIR, the project's outputs have mostly been in line with expectations. The project developed a quality assurance system to ensure that good quality certified stoves are available on the market, provided after-sales guarantees/support, and provided financial support through loans and reduced cost programs (Output Based Approach). The project also provided training and assistance to the manufacturers of such good quality stoves, and established marketing and retail channels. The project's marketing and communication efforts were hampered by a government promotion highlighting "free stoves." This campaign created the public perception that stoves would be freely available to households, and dampened the development of a market.







Efficiency 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	The project's closed 2 years later than expected and did not fully achieve expected outputs, for the reasons described under effectiveness.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Last PIR:	3 - Moderately Likely 	Arrangements for sustainability rated S. Activity risk rated Modest. "The Risks during the review period were modest. The PIU and staff from the Ministry of Nature and Environment adopted an OBA approach to the production and distribution of stoves during the 2006/07 winter. It proved to be highly successful both in terms of rapid distribution of improved stoves, but also in the involvement of Small and Medium enterprises."









Sustainability 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. The TE notes that the project will need continued financial support, until stoves consumers are willing to buy stoves at market prices.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	The primary risk to sustainability is financial. Until the market for the stoves is developed and consumers are willing to pay market rates, stove production will have to be subsidized by government or by external donors.
Financial 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. "Some financial support is necessary, and the OBA approach turned out to be a good mechanism to use. This was started late but showed nevertheless what can be done to give a serious push in the right direction of obtaining universal use of improved heating stoves. Although maybe half of all heating stoves sold in Ulaanbaatar now, the production mechanism is not yet sustainable and still depends on the support mechanisms created under the project "
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	The OBA program which provided stoves at reduced cost was funded through ADB and based on the information in the TE report, it seems that continued funding for price supports is likely. This would help to scale up project results.
Socio-political 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	Government support for the project is strong. The MNE remains involved in stove production and is very interested in the social and environmental aspects of the project. While the cost barrier remains, consumer demand for the stoves is likely to grow as their use expands. The barrier to cost is based purely on the idea that they would be free, rather than the economics (the stoves pay for themselves in fuel savings over one year)
Institutional and Legal 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely 	No institutional or legal risks to sustainability were noted in the TE report or PIR.
Environmental 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely 	No environmental risks to project outcomes were noted.





















Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. The TE report does not provide an assessment of the project M&E system. The final PIR report rates M&E as HS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information to assess M&E implementation.
M&E Design 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. The TE report does not provide an assessment of the project M&E system. The final PIR report rates M&E as HS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	The M&E plan in the Project Document includes a detailed M&E plan for both impacts and execution. M&E activities are budgeted as a 5th project component. While the M&E plan at entry does not include a logical framework, the indicators for objectives and outcomes provided in the project summary are well formulated. Most of the indicators are measurable and objectively verifiable.
M&E Plan Implementation 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. The TE report does not provide an assessment of the project M&E system. The final PIR report rates M&E as HS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information to assess.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. The TE report does not provide an assessment of the project M&E system. The final PIR report rates M&E as HS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information to assess.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. The TE report does not assess the quality of implementation and execution, but it does note that implementation arrangements were not clearly defined at the start of the project. The final PIR rates Project Management, Financial Management, and Procurement as C.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Both quality of implementation and execution are rated S.
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.




Quality of Implementation - IA 	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on the PIRs, Bank oversight of the project was good. Financial management and project management are both rated S in the final PIR. Evaluations and missions were carried out as planned. Based on information in the TE report, the Bank could have provided more guidance in establishing the institutional framework for implementing the project. The choice of the MNE as EA was appropriate, but given the MNE's focus on production and technological aspects, the project could have benefitted from more technical assistance in market development.
Quality of Execution - EA 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on the information in the TE report, the PIU's handled execution well. Despite the slow start-up, and some mis-communication with government partners, the project did achieve intended outputs (following revision). The recommendations of the MTR to focus on the Output Based Approach and artisanal producers were implemented. There is also evidence that execution was managed adaptively. The project team used results from testing different stove models, and customer satisfaction surveys in developing the final model, and it initiated new programs (i.e. post-sales service and guarantees) to promote sales.

 **Agency Specific Project Criteria**


Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. But the TE report clearly notes relevance to country priorities.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project was well aligned with national priorities and goals for reducing urban air pollution. Given the wide acceptance, and demand, for lower cost improved heating stoves the Government has proposed to follow-up the project with a larger OBA project, which will address issues related to lower cost production and proper subsidy targeting. The Government, together with the Bank, is undertaking preparation for a larger Air Pollution project(US\$ 15 million) including a scale-up version of the OBA program.
Financial Planning 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No financial assessment in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	



			The original budget (ProDoc) was adequate for project activities as originally envisioned. However due to the unexpected consumer demand for "free" stoves, the project has had to re-allocate funds among various components and leverage significant external resources to ensure sustainability.
Preparation and Readiness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. Not assessed in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	The project objectives were clearly formulated in the ProDoc. The outlined activities were achievable with the allocated resources. The project could have been strengthened if the the MNE's lack of experience in developing markets and financial mechanisms had been taken into account at the project preparation stage.
Stakeholders Involvement 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided. Not specifically assessed in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on the TE report and ProDoc, stakeholder involvement was significant. Manufacturers, artisanal producers, consumers, women's group, municipal governments, Health ministry, and external donors all contributed to project design and achievement of project results.
Need for Follow Up 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	Noting in the TE report indicates a need for follow-up.
Gender Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess 	The project did not contribute to mainstreaming gender issues, but the Project Doc. does note that the Mongolian Women's Federation contributed much to project preparation.
Effects on Local Population 	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes 	Not specifically assessed, but this is implied based on project activities.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes 	The project held trainings and workshops for local artisanal stove producers. The project helped raise consumer awareness and increase demand for more efficient heating units.

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
--------------------------------	----------	--------------	---------

Poverty Reduction 	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	Not mentioned in TE report. This was not part of project design.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	This was not part of project design.
Crisis Prevention and Recovery 	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	Not mentioned in TE report. This was not part of project design.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	This was not part of project design.
Democratic Governance 	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	Not mentioned in TE report. This was not part of project design.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	This was not part of project design.

 **Progress to Impact**

Progress to Impact 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No rating provided. The TE notes that use of the stoves will reduce coal consumption and reduce CO2 emissions, leading to "tremendous impacts."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - High Progress <input type="button" value="v"/>	Although the project has not yet monitored air quality to determine impacts, use of the stoves already distributed will mean reduced coal consumption for those households. As the project is scaled up, this will lead to CO2 emission reductions and noticeable improvements in local air quality.



Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	The TE refers to awareness raising activities as well as training and workshops for producers.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	As a result of project activities, consumers and producers are more knowledgeable about fuel efficient stoves
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks 	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No <input type="button" value="v"/>	No mention of legal, regulatory, or policy frameworks.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No <input type="button" value="v"/>	














			No changes to legal, regulatory, or policy frameworks. The project focused on market development and quality assurance through the private sector and civil society groups like the Ger Stove Association (GSA).
Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The Open Market Center (OMC) and Output Based Approach were used to develop a market for improved stoves.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project used several structures to distribute stoves including loans through a private micro-credit facility, the OBA which subsidized production costs, and the OMC to retail the

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The project has demonstrated the effectiveness of improved stoves as "a relatively easy way to reduce air pollution.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The technology was new for Mongolia and as noted in the TE report, the project has shown that use of the improved stoves reduces indoor

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The Output Based Approach was applied to promote adoption of the stoves. Micro-credit facility accessible to consumers.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The Output Based Approach (essentially a subsidy) was applied to promote adoption of the stoves. The project also steered consumers to a micro-credit facility (independent of the project) to finance stove purchases.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The Output Based Approach to distributing stoves is being replicated in Ulaan Battar using funds from ADB.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	

			Following the adoption of the Output Based Approach for production and dissemination of heating stoves in the 2006/07 winter, the ADB committed additional resources (close to US\$ 350 K) to follow on the same business model. There is potential for the project to be replicated elsewhere in Mongolia.
Upscaling 	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No <input type="checkbox"/>	The TE report only notes the need for upscaling.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	The final PIR notes that given the wide acceptance, and demand, for lower cost improved heating stoves the Government has proposed to follow-up the project with a larger OBA project, which will address production costs and subsidy targeting. The Government, together with the Bank, is undertaking preparation for a larger Air Pollution project(US\$ 15 million) including a scaled-up version of the OBA program
Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No mention of mainstreaming in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	The project is limited to a specific technology in the heating sector. There is no indication that energy efficiency/CC concerns are being mainstreamed as a result of project activities.

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document																			
Environmental Stress Reduction 	Terminal Evaluation	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y - Yes</td> <td>Demonstration Site</td> <td>Intended</td> <td>The TE report implies reductions in coal usage leading to improvements in air quality and reduction in CO2 emissions.</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ Add New Row...</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	The TE report implies reductions in coal usage leading to improvements in air quality and reduction in CO2 emissions.	 Edit  Delete	+ Add New Row...							
	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																
	Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	The TE report implies reductions in coal usage leading to improvements in air quality and reduction in CO2 emissions.	 Edit  Delete															
+ Add New Row...																				
Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.																			
GEFEO Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>UA - Unable to assess</td> <td>Demonstration Site</td> <td>Intended</td> <td>There is no information in the TE report on air quality monitoring (indoor or outdoor) or fuel consumption statistics, which would</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		UA - Unable to assess	Demonstration Site	Intended	There is no information in the TE report on air quality monitoring (indoor or outdoor) or fuel consumption statistics, which would	 Edit  Delete									
Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																	
UA - Unable to assess	Demonstration Site	Intended	There is no information in the TE report on air quality monitoring (indoor or outdoor) or fuel consumption statistics, which would	 Edit  Delete																



















					provide solid evidence of environmental stress reduction	
						+ Add New Row...
Environmental Status Change ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	Reductions in coal usage should lead to improvements in local air quality.	Edit Delete
						+ Add New Row...
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
		UA - Unable to assess	Demonstration Site	Intended	Again, lacking information on air quality monitoring or coal consumption, there is no evidence of status change.	Edit Delete
						+ Add New Row...
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
Socioeconomic Status Change ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
		N - No	Demonstration Site		No evidence of socioeconomic status.	Edit Delete
						+ Add New Row...
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
		N - No	Demonstration Site		There is no evidence of socioeconomic status change, however this is potential longer term impact, as reduced fuel consumption will increase households' net income.	Edit Delete
						+ Add New Row...
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				

Arrangements for Impact M&E	Terminal Evaluation	Visibility	Comments	
		N - No	No mention of arrangements for impact M&E.	Edit Delete
		+ Add New Row...		
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.		
	GEFEO Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.		

TE Report Quality






Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Overall TE quality is MS.
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The report assesses the level of achievement of project objectives and outcomes with respect to the indicators outlined in the Project Document.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess. No list of stakeholders consulted.
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The report briefly mentions sustainability with respect to financial inputs, but it lacks a comprehensive sustainability assessment.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The lessons learnt are drawn from the project's implementation experience. The recommendations are overly general. More specifics on how to improve the program and ensure a smooth scaling-up would be useful.
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	No financial assessment is presented.
M&E Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The report does not assess M&E.

Agency-Specific	Document	Rating	Comment
-----------------	----------	--------	---------

Criteria			
Attainment of Results based on Indicators 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The report does assess results based on the objective level indicators from the Project Document.
Consultation with Stakeholders 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess. No list of stakeholders consulted.
Compliance with Guidances 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	The ICM does appear to be consistent with the format of other WB ICMs (based on the experience of this reviewer). No ratings are provided, and most of the report focuses solely on outcome assessment.
Compliance with UNEG Norms 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	N/A for WB MSPs.
Addressing of ToR requests 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No ToR.
Independence of Report 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.






 **Lessons & Recommendations**



Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Stakeholder Involvement		One must ensure that an appropriate stove model is selected by households and the stove producing community. Although this was done, it took the PIU some time to focus on those who were really producing and selling traditional stoves. Once the responsibilities and benefits for the traditional stove producers and retailers became clear to them, they adopted the ideas and became a major thrust of the project.	 Edit  Delete
Legal and Institutional Framework		Creating market-based mechanisms is more difficult than often thought. Major interference came from public institutions still operating under the planned economic approach.	 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...			



Type of Recommendation	If other type,	Recommendations	

	please specify		
Other	Follow-up activity	It is recommended that project activities will be continued and expanded, building on the above lessons learnt, until the activity has become sustainable and traditional stoves are on their way out.	 Edit  Delete
Other	Project design	The air pollution problem in Ulaanbaatar is severe enough that an integrated strategy for reducing it may be unavoidable; such a strategy should include realizing reduced emissions from all sources (CHP, HOB, Ger, and transport), fuel substitution, fuel upgrading, and heat demand side management. Ger heating stoves should figure prominently in this approach.	 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...			

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility