

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Overall Project Rating:** Needs Improvement (The lessons learned report is required for all projects. See question 25)

**Project Number :** 00062498

**Project Title :** Promoting Sustainable Biomass Energy Production and Modern Bio Energy Technologies. Promotion of the usage of biomass generated energy as a substitute for imported fossil fuels and reduce carbon footprint.

**Project Date :** 01-Jan-2012

## Strategic

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

### 1. Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 which best reflects this project)

- ☒ 3: The project team regularly completed and documented a comprehensive horizon scanning exercise to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that required adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board considered the scanning and its implications, and documented changes to the project's RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 2: The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning over the life of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option should also be selected if no horizon scanning took place during project implementation.

#### Evidence

The project took advantage of the price difference between biomass and fossil fuels to help promote switching from fossil fuel to biomass energy. Also the awareness and the willingness of the industries to switch to cleaner fuels was an opportunity for the project and the promotion of renewable energy options through the energy policy. With the international commitments of the government to climate change and the national policy to increase the renewable energy share the project will be continued as biomass phase II to upscale the project activities under phase II. The project will help strengthen the local rural economy and protect forests. Please the attached project document for phase II.

### 2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☐ 3: The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. It addressed at least one of the proposed new and emerging [areas](#) and implementation was consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 2: The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 1: While the project may have responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan, it was based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators were included in the project's RRF. This option is also selected if the project did not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

#### Evidence

The project aligns with the sustainable development pathways of the UNDP strategic Plan by promoting renewable energy in a sustainable manner and providing equal opportunity to all especially focusing on the marginalised groups and reducing gender inequality. The project has focused on SMIs who have the least opportunities is getting financial assistance from banks and technical assistance in deciding the most suitable equipment. Also the project has given priority to women entrepreneurs to reduce gender

inequality and improve livelihood. Even though, none of the relevant SP indicators are directly included in the RRF, many of the indicators of RRF are related to SP Output 1.5.1 on renewable energy.

### 3. Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change during implementation.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

#### Evidence

Evidences from the projects were generated through the project MTR in 2015 . Findings were informed to the CPD MTR too. CPD RRF or theory of programme design was not adjusted based on the findings of the CPD MTR due to inadequate time to execute the proposed changes.

#### Relevant

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

### 4. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected regularly from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted group were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informed decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected.
- ☐ Not Applicable

#### Evidence

The large, small and medium scale industries (SMIs), biomass growers (farmers, private, regional plantation companies, government agencies/departments), suppliers, technology providers, end users are the key stakeholders of the project. The project gives special attention to the SMIs considering the MTR recommendation. Majority of the beneficiaries are SMIs. The target groups are engaged through workshops, site and field visits, awareness and training programs. Regular site and field visits are made to SMIs to monitor progress and provide assistance. Representatives of these beneficiaries are actively engage in the project's governance system through the technical advisory committees appointed by the project. The technical advisory committees directly involve in the project's decision making process. A study on gender inclusiveness was carried out. The TOR of these technical advisory groups have been uploaded previously

### 5. Did the project generate knowledge, particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course corrections to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☒ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis and monitoring were regularly discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change was adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)

- ☐ 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

### Evidence

The project had commissioned a number of external studies to gather and support the evidence base of the Biomass Energy sector in general. These are outside of the project's mid term review process. A study of thermal energy needs in the industry and a study of rural supply chains have both informed the restructuring of the project. This is in addition to a component of the project managed by FAO, which deals with sustainable biomass cultivation and supply. Other studies carried out by the project include

- Transport arrangements for Biomass
- Pricing of biomass
- Back ground study for the development of solid biofuel standards

## 6. Were the project's special measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produce the intended effect? If not, were evidence-based adjustments and changes made? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☒ 3: *The project team systematically gathered data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments made, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence that adjustments and/or changes were made, as appropriate. This option should also be selected if the project had no special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to project results and activities.

### Evidence

The project carried out an assessment of gender inclusiveness for sustainable development of biomass energy. In promoting biomass energy technologies due consideration was given to the gender to assure that women entrepreneurs were not discouraged. These findings were incorporated into the activities of the phase II of the project

## 7. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☐ 3: There is credible evidence that the project reached a sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- ☒ 2: *While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the initiative in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage in a second phase or using project results to advocate for policy change).*
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the initiative in the future.

### Evidence

A second phase has been developed to upscale the successful pilots by building on the private public partnerships of phase 1. Government cost sharing for the second phase has been obtained and cabinet approval has been granted for the 5 year project for Rs 550 million.

**8. Did the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- ☐ 3: There is credible evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights, on the basis of applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *There is some evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were identified and adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks. (both must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: There is no evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. There is limited to no evidence that potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were managed.

**Evidence**

With the evidence gathered from the gender inclusiveness report the project has addressed gender issues identified and these recommendations are also incorporated in the second phase of the biomass energy project. Further, project provides differential energy options to conform to access to energy which is a human right.

**9. Were social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans? (for projects that have no social and environmental risks the answer is "Yes")**

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

**Evidence**

Environmental impact and risks are managed by ensuring that the activities meet or exceed minimum legal requirements. Impacts of gender equality have been studied by a study undertaken by the project and these impacts and risks have been identified. These impacts and risks have been used to manage project activities and for future activities during project sustainability. A standard for sustainable fuelwood production has been developed (SLS 1551) to enable consumers of biomass to trace back to the source.

**10. Were any unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arose during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for projects that did not experience unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is "Yes")**

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

**Evidence**

Such grievances are managed by regularly updating management plans accordingly. Such an issue arose in 2016 during the inauguration of a biomass energy terminal in Kurunegala. The issue was assessed and the reason for the issue was resolved. This issue was incorporated into management plans and was part of criteria for following biomass energy terminals.

**Management & Monitoring**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

**11. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

☐ 3: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using highly credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Evaluations, if conducted, fully met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards, and management responses were fully implemented. Lessons learned, including during evaluations, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true to select this option)

☒ 2: *Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may have been some slippage in following the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan and data sources were not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted meet most decentralized evaluation standards; management responses were fully implemented to the extent possible. Lessons learned have been captured but not used to take collective actions. (all must be true to select this option)*

☐ 1: Progress data either was not collected against the indicators in the project's RRF, or limited data was collected but not regularly; evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards; and/or lessons learned were rarely captured and used.

#### Evidence

The post MTR action plan has a comprehensive results framework with baselines, indicators and targets. The costs of M&E are also included in the project budgets. Please see the attached PIR.

### 12. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ The project's governance mechanism operated very well, and is a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)

☒ *The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*

☐ The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document, and/or the project board or equivalent did not function as a decision making body for the project as intended.

#### Evidence

The project board meeting minutes is attached for reference. The board has met at the agreed frequency and as planned. The project progress covering results, risk, challenges and opportunities were presented at these board meetings and minuted.

### 13. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 3: The project actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least annually to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk, and some evidence that risk mitigation has benefitted performance. (all must be true to select this option)

☒ 2: *The project monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by a regularly updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures. (both must be true to select this option)*

☐ 1: The risk log was not updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that could have affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks. The project's performance was disrupted by factors that could have been anticipated or managed.

#### Evidence

Apart from the risks identified in the Post MTR Action Plan, project has monitored risks every quarter. Some changes were made to management and implementation plans as well as mitigation measures were implemented to address these key risks. ATLAS Risk log has been updated.  
The risks for identified are

- Climate ( Inclement weather patterns) - the unpredictable weather patterns have often delayed field activities for growing and installation of equipment
- Government Red Tapes - The lengthy procedures have often been in the way of project progress
- Political situation - the current political situation in the country has led to many decision making process hanging in the air
- Private sector procurement - To the nature of some technologies, they have to be imported and as such these involve s lengthy periods which also leads to delays
- Transferring funds to Government Institutions: Due to the complex procedures involved in the government sector, financial transactions with government institutions are often delayed. ATLAS risk log is duly completed.

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

**14. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.**

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

**Evidence**

The project has achieved most of the target outputs and to achieve this adequate resources were allocated and mobilized. The project has sufficient resources to meet the rest of the planned outputs. This is reflected in budget delivery and PIR of the project.

**15. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. Implementation of the plan was generally on or ahead of schedule. On a quarterly basis, the project reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them. This option is also selected if operational bottlenecks were not reviewed during the project in a timely manner.

**Evidence**

Procurement plans are updated and reviewed annually. Procurement has been carried out according to plan and delays and bottlenecks from previous procurement exercises have been avoided by planning appropriately. The procurement plans for UNDP and FAO are attached

**16. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- ☐ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project communicated with a few other projects to coordinate activities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules. It is not clear that the link between cost savings and quality of results was made.



## Evidence

The project monitors its own costs giving anecdotal examples of cost efficiency in implementing proposed activities. The project was able to exceed the project targets for biomass technology demonstrations from target 12 numbers to present 27. The project has also exceed targets on direct GHG emissions reductions by leveraging co financing from the private sector.

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

### 17. Is there evidence that project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

## Evidence

The project has exceeded the main target on GHG emissions reductions. the project has delivered a majority of the outputs as per the revised MTR.

However some targets had to be revised due to increase in prices/costs seen since the original budgeting for targets.

The project is on track to meet its objectives and expected outputs. The post MTR project review also revised the results framework to reflect some of the concerns raised. As such certain outdated indicators on policy environment and target groups were reviewed and revised. The project shifted focus from large industry to support more small and medium industries. As such the project has invested in a larger number of small scale BETs since 2015 than earlier targeted. In Component 2 research and development on fuelwood species has now been converted to investments in to growing models. The project's revised results framework adequately measures cumulative progress towards the original objective and outcomes of the project. In that light the progress against the revised indicator framework (post MTR) is commendable to deliver most of these achievements.

The project will be unable to meet the 2229 hectares of fuelwood plantations due to the limited budget available. The budget for establishment of fuelwood plantations was underestimated during the project inception. With the current budget it is estimated that 1000 hectares will be established by EOP.

The project will also be unable to meet the target of setting up six pilot supply chains. Here again the cost of establishing terminals had been underestimated during project inception and with budget available for three major supply chains will be setup and three satellite supply chains. These three satellite supply chains were established to promote fuelwood processing at smaller scales suitable for SMIs

### 18. The project delivered its expected outputs.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

## Evidence

The project has delivered on a majority of its outputs and has obtained a highly satisfactory rating from the terminal evaluation. Please refer the terminal evaluation report.

### 19. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☒ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 2: There was at least one review of the work plan each year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There is no evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s).

- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once per year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no regular review of the work plan by management took place.

### Evidence

Quarterly board meetings are held to review and monitor the progress of the project activities and outputs as per action plan developed for the period. Recommendations from the board meeting are used to revise action plans and budgets are also revised accordingly.

## 20. Were the intended targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☐ 3: Targeted groups were systematically identified using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence to confirm that targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups to assess whether they benefitted as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries were members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected. (all must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups, or there is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries have capacity needs or are populations deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected, but not regularly.
- ☐ Not Applicable

### Evidence

After the MTR, one specific recommendation was to target SMEs who were not originally in the project target group. The project then targeted SMEs who were not able to finance their conversions to renewable energy technologies. These target groups were given priority as evident from number of SMEs supported by the project. Specifically SMEs were visited regularly to assess and monitor their progress and in some cases the project facilitated regular visit by technology suppliers to the pilot SMEs sites to ensure that the SMEs adapted to the technologies comfortably. The gender study carried out also provided insight on the gender inclusiveness for sustainable biomass energy development.

## 21. Were at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

### Evidence

The female percentage of the working staff is 40 %. Please see attached

## Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

## 22. Were stakeholders and partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (all must be true to select this option)



☒ 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as needed. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true to select this option)*

☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.

☐ Not Applicable

### Evidence

The project is implemented using assisted NIM modality. As such both national and country office support is used for implementation. All stakeholders and partners actively engaged in decision making through Technical Advisory Committees, Project Board meetings, Workshops etc. The Technical Advisory Committee meeting minutes are attached

## 23. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems, and were the implementation arrangements adjusted according to changes in partner capacities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were regularly and comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources. There is clear evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)

☒ 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources. There is limited evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)*

☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.

☐ Not Applicable

### Evidence

Implementing partner capacities were comprehensively assessed during the mid term review of 2015 and necessary implementing capacities and systems were put in place by both FAO and UNDP. This included additional staffing for the project management unit that includes both technical and administrative support. UNDP full NIM support was converted to a supported-NIM arrangement, Yearly assessment of implementing capacities are not conducted, but gaps in capacities are regularly discussed at project board meetings and technical advisory committees of the project.

## 24. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made to the plan during implementation? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☒ 3: *The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)*

☐ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)

☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan that specified arrangements for transition and phase-out, but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

## Evidence

The phase II of the project was developed to upscale the successful pilots and make biomass energy a prominent energy source in the country inline with the national energy policy of the country. Government cost sharing for the second phase has been a major achievement and cabinet approval has been obtained for the 5 year project.

**25. Please upload the final lessons learned report that was produced for this project.**

## Summary/Final Project Board Comments:

The Project was able to address critical issues in the fuel wood supply and application sides boosting the biomass energy market and establishing bioenergy technologies within the industrial sector in Sri Lanka in economically and environmentally acceptable levels by demonstrating the fuel supply potential through fuel wood plantation models and augmentation of by-product and waste wood streams, and the feasibility of bio-energy applications in small and medium scale industries.