

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF ID:	1280		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Passive Solar Rural Health Clinics	GEF financing:	0.775	0.775
Country:	China	IA/EA own:	0.146	0.146
		Government:		
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	0.809	0.809
Operational Program:	5	Total Project Cost:	1.584	1.584
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	MOH's foreign load office	Work Program date		N/A
		CEO Endorsement		06/01/2001
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		01/15/2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2003	Actual: 12/31/2004
Prepared by: Tarek Soueid	Reviewed by: Antonio Del Monaco	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 2 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 3 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 year
Author of TE: Anonymous		TE completion date: N/A	TE submission date to GEF OME:4/19/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: N/A

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	N/A	N/A	UA
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	N/A	N/A	UA
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	N/A	N/A	UA
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	U

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?
 No. The report submitted by the world bank as a terminal report for this project is just a “grant reporting and monitoring summary.” Ideally it should not even be considered a TE because it does not assess performance during the whole period for which project was under implementation.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?
 No follow-up issues mentioned in the TE

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the Project Appraisal document the Global Environmental Objective is to “reduce CO2 emissions.” The TE does not inform us on whether there have been any changes in the global environmental objective of the project.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the Project Appraisal document the development objectives of the project were “

- to stimulate health sector and other community facility planners to adopt passive solar building designs;
- to strengthen capacity of architectural and engineering design institutes to design;
- to demonstrate the life cycle cost advantages of energy efficient passive solar buildings in China; and,
- build energy-efficient passive solar buildings and to reduce CO2 emissions. .

The objectives listed by the TE do not include the objective “to demonstrate life cycle cost advantages of energy efficient passive solar buildings in China.” The TE doesn’t take cognizance of this difference in the listed objectives. Thus, it seems, this objective could have been dropped during the implementation of the project or else it could simply be a case of omission by the TE.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

According to the project achieved following outcomes and impacts:

- At least 30 new township health centers incorporate energy efficient passive solar design features
- Health and community facility planners and architects have become familiar with efficient passive solar building designs
- Energy efficient passive solar designs have been replicated in other sectors
- New township health centers use significantly less coal, are more popular, comfortable, and have a healthier indoor environment
- The capacities of architectural and engineering design institutes to design and build energy-efficient passive solar buildings have been enhanced. This will stimulate adoption of passive solar designs, which could be expected to contribute to CO2 emissions reduction.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance Rating: S

- **In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

As per the information provided in the TE the outcomes of the project have led to adoption of energy efficient design features in at least 30 new township health centers. This is expected to contribute to reduction of CO2 emissions, which is consistent with the strategy of the climate change focal area.

B Effectiveness Rating: UA

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes**

(as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?	
The TE assesses the project outcome to be satisfactory. However, only indirect evidence has been cited in support of this conclusion. For example, although TE reports that 29 passive solar clinics in Qinghai, Gansu and Shanxi provinces were constructed and put into operation in 2004 and sufficient training has been done for engineering and management staff from 10 provinces, it does not quantify the extent to which these activities have led and will lead to reduction in CO2 emissions. In absence of a quantitative analysis it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the project.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: UA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness? <p>No assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the project cost – effectiveness, or comparison to other projects has been carried out in the TE.</p>	

Impacts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? <p>Since no information of on GHG emissions reduced or likely to be reduced by the listed outputs of the project has been provided, it is not clear to what extent the CO2 emission will be reduced. This said, the listed activities could be expected to contribute to reduction in CO2 emission.</p>	

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	UA
This question was not addressed in the report	
B Socio political resources	L
According to the TE, officials from planning and financial department of MOH are very interested in the cost-effective passive solar designs, so there is less socio political risk to sustainability.	
C Institutional framework and governance	UA
This issue has not been adequately addressed. The TE just indicates that the project has strengthened capacity of architectural and engineering design institutes to design and build energy-efficient passive solar buildings in and beyond the project areas. While this is indicative of the capacities of the relevant departments it by itself is not sufficient to know whether to what extent the project faces institutional and governance related risks.	
D Environmental	L
The TE provides little information on the environmental risks that may affect project benefits. However, given the nature of the project such risks are unlikely.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

A Financial resources	Rating: UA
B Socio political	Rating: L
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: UA
D Environmental	Rating: L

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good As per the information provided in the TE, the project led to incorporation of energy efficient passive design features in 30 township health centers, and replication of energy efficient passive solar designs in other sectors. Such outcomes are likely to lead to reduction in CO2 emissions.
2. Demonstration
3. Replication The TE indicates that energy efficient passive solar designs are now being replicated in other sectors as well.
4. Scaling up

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

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities) The TE has not assessed the quality at entry of the M&E system. The project appraisal document includes a separate section on M&E. Although the document does not include a log frame it does describe indicators for assess project effects, risks and specifies a separate budget. Rating: MU
B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure? No information has been provided in the TE. Rating: UA
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? The information provided in the project appraisal shows that US \$ 175,000 were allocated for the M&E component of the project. However, since there is little information in the TE on actual implementation of the M&E so it is difficult to know whether the budgeted amount was sufficient and whether the project was properly funded during implementation. Rating: UA
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? Not enough information has been provided in the TE to help conclude either way.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?
No substantive lessons have been listed in the TE.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
N/A

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The TE provides inadequate information on the outcomes and impacts of the project. Although it does mention that the expected outcomes and impacts were achieved, it does not adequately assess and describe the extent of achievement. There has been no attempt to quantify reduction in CO2 emissions although such quantification was feasible.</p>	MU
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</p> <p>While the report is internally consistent, the evidence cited is incomplete and the IA ratings have often not been substantiated.</p>	U
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>When assessing project’s sustainability the TE just mentions, “overall, the project has strengthened capacity of architectural and engineering design institutes to design and build energy-efficient passive solar buildings in and beyond the project areas” and provides a “Likely” rating on sustainability. This is clearly insufficient.</p>	HU
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>Instead of summarizing the lessons learnt from the project, the TE just provides a recommendation that the project should be extended to other sectors such as education where buildings form an important part of the service delivery.</p>	U
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>Cost figures have not been provided – only total project grant figure has been listed.</p>	U
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?</p> <p>Information on project’s M&E systems is absent.</p>	HU

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.	Yes: X	No:
Explain: Yes, a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE is recommended because the TE does not cover any technical aspect of the project.		

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)
Project Appraisal Document