

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	1340		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	307	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.95	0.95
Project Name:	Promoting Industrial Energy Efficiency through a Cleaner Production/Environmental Management System Framework	IA/EA own:	0.18	0.18
Country:	Global (China, India, Vietnam, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovak Republic)	Government:	0.0	.60
		Other*:	1.59	0.99
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	1.77	1.77
Operational Program:	OP5 Removal of barriers to energy efficiency	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	2.72	2.72
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	NCPs/CPCs (National Cleaner Production Centers/Cleaner Production Centers in each of 6 countries)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		August 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: May 2005	Actual: June 2007
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 34 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 58 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 25 months
Author of TE: Dr. Naval Karrir		TE completion date: May 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: September 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 4 months

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

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

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

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	S	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	L	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	-	MS	MS	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	MU	MS

#### 2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

No. The terminal evaluation is not comprehensive and does provide sufficient information on project activities to be

considered a “good practice”. As reported in the terminal evaluation, the evaluation faced budget constraints and there were other bottlenecks in terms of quality of information provided to evaluators on project implementation and results.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?  
No.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

**3.1 Project Objectives**

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

According to the project document:

“The project objective is to reduce the emissions of carbon dioxide by improving energy management practices and indentifying investments in SMEs through a structured approach. The structured approach will be built on and consistent with the Environmental Management System framework embodied in UNEP’s Cleaner Production programme. Project services are to be delivered through selected National Cleaner Production Centers, drawing on their extensive networks in industry and experience in promoting environmental management with a preventive, cost-effective focus.”

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?**

According to the project document the following are the development objectives of the project:

- Estimated annual reduction of 225,000 tons of carbon dioxide
- A minimum of 15 energy audits conducted by each of the six participating NCPC (a total of 90 audits)
- For each audit, at least one financing proposal for “medium-cost” energy efficiency investments (a total of 90 proposals, one proposal for each audit)
- National versions of the UNEP/UNIDO CP-Energy Audit manual that can be integrated with the CP and environmental management systems (EMS) materials already being used by the six NCPCs.
- Train personnel in the six NCPCs capable of conducting an energy audit, either as a “stand alone activity” or as part of CP-EMS audit
- Personnel in the global network of NCPCs and other in-country stakeholders aware of opportunities that environmental management systems can provide if integrated into the NCPC business advisory practices.

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
<b>If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change in objectives</b>				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

**4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY**

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

<b>a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S</b>	
A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:	
(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?	
The objective of the project is to reduce carbon dioxide emission through the improvement of energy management practices through the application of energy efficient and cleaner production (EE-CP) practices. Cleaner production of energy is critical as it helps to reduce pollutants which can have negative environmental and economic impacts. Efficient use of energy is crucial to the reduction in the amount of natural resources that are consumed during production, which combined with cleaner production, helps to promote growth and development that is economically and environmentally sustainable.	
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?	
According to the project document (and the TE) even before the start of the project all 6 participating countries had demonstrated a need for improving industrial energy efficiency in their national environment policies and programs either through revisions to national energy policy and/or adoption of government programmes and investments that support industrial energy efficiency. All six countries had National Cleaner Production Centers established with government support and operating under the UNEP/UNIDO framework prior to the project's implementation. Additionally the NCPC directors in each participating country address the specific informational needs of SME's within their country in the pursuit of the project's objective of improving energy management practices.	
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?	
According to the terminal evaluation the project has effectively integrated energy efficiency and cleaner production practices in the SMEs and has demonstrated this through CO <sub>2</sub> emission reduction of 219, 000 tons and training of 126 people-across 6 participating countries-to manage and conduct energy efficiency audits, and created awareness regarding environmental management systems amongst professionals belonging to the global NCPC network and other in-country stakeholders. These project's outcomes and results are in line with the GEF OP5 removal of barriers to energy efficiency goals.	
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)	
The project's emphasis on cleaner production and energy efficiency and the reduction of GHGs will help participating countries in meeting their obligation under the Convention on Climate Change.	
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership <sup>1</sup>	
Yes. The project was successful in establishing a knowledge exchange network through an intranet site which was created to submit the CP-EMS audits and share information amongst participating NCPCs (across the 6 countries). However this site no longer exists as it was only created for exchanging information during the project's implementation. One of the project objectives was to generate awareness of the opportunities regarding CP-EMS services amongst the global network of NCPCs. This was achieved by the organization of the "Latin American Dissemination Meeting" which was held in Mexico which was attended by 43 representatives from the global network of NCPCs, including the six countries participating in the project. Additionally, the UNEP-DTIE and the National Productivity Council (NPC) of India organized a two-tier, training program which was attended by representatives from each of the six NCPCs across the participating countries to assist them in carrying out CP-EMS audits.	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
The terminal evaluation concludes the project has effectively integrated energy efficiency and cleaner production practices in the SMEs and has engaged in capacity building through the following:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participating NCPCs have been able to conduct 87 audits compared to 90 audit target</li> <li>• By project's end, 219, 000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction was achieved compared to the project's target of reducing the emission of carbon dioxide by 225,000 tons<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• While the project's target was to train 18 people across the six NCPCs to become capable of managing/conducting energy efficiency audits in industry, by project's end, a total of 126 persons across the six NCPCs are capable of managing/conducting audits.</li> <li>• All of NCPC's in the six participating countries translated and adapted the Energy Audit Manual available to</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

<sup>2</sup> Although the TE reports that the data is for per year achievements; the working notes of the project document clarify that this figure refers to the total achievements and not per year achievement.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the national conditions/languages</li> <li>Created awareness amongst professionals belonging to the global NCPC network and other in-country stakeholders through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) meetings which representatives from the six participating countries and non-project countries attended: i.e) Latin American Dissemination Meeting held in Mexico for the UNEP-GEF Cleaner Production (CP)-Energy Efficiency (EE) project, 10-day “Cleaner Production and Energy Efficiency Training Program” conducted for NCPCs from Africa and Latin America</li> <li>b) A project intranet site was created to submit the CP-EMS audits and share information amongst participating NCPCs during the duration of the project.</li> <li>c) 9 “Business Cases Brochures” were published containing information on EMS methods that can be used as case references in the UNEP Industry bulletins and used to widely promote CP-EE approach and methodology.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) <span style="float: right;">Rating: MS</span></b></p> <p>Originally the project duration was planned to be about 20 months, however due to revisions (a total of 6 revisions) the project duration was extended to 63 months. According to the terminal evaluation, these revisions were undertaken to allow for coordination of outreach activities, for the completion of GHG verification activities, in promoting awareness of EE-CP technology, as well as organizing two regional workshops.</p> <p>The number of budget revisions may be seen as a poor financial planning issue rather than a cost-effectiveness issue. Despite the fact that six budget revisions were made through the project’s lifetime, the total cost of the project to the GEF Trust Fund and co-financing remained unchanged. This was a considerable achievement considering this project was conducted amongst six countries, across 2 continents.</p> <p>GEF’s level of investment was \$.95m and the total project investment was \$2.72 million. By project’s end, a total 219,000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction was achieved. If only GEF investment is taken into consideration then cost of CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction is \$ 5 per tonne. If total project investment is taken into account that then the cost per tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction is \$13. Although not on the lower side, the cost per tonne seems to be reasonable.</p>
<p>d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated)</p>
<p>From the TE, the project did not result in trade-offs between the environment and development priorities.</p>

**4.1.2 Results / Impacts<sup>3</sup> (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)**

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

<p><b>a. Financial resources <span style="float: right;">Rating: ML</span></b></p> <p>According to the TE, NCPCs in all of the participating countries, except Hungary and Czech Republic, are using the experience they obtained from the project to conduct energy efficiency and cleaner production audits in SMEs on a “chargeable basis” which helps in sustaining the project beyond the initial project funding. Additionally evaluation visits to participating SMEs in Hungary, Slovak Republic and Vietnam revealed that enterprises have created their own teams to perform audits and implement the project’s recommendations regarding EE-CP activities on a “regular basis”.</p>
<p><b>b. Socio-economic / political <span style="float: right;">Rating: ML</span></b></p> <p><b>a. Socioeconomic and political:</b> According to the TE, factors external to the project, such as increased energy prices and the rising concern for GHG at the national level has fostered an “enabling environment” which will help to sustain energy efficiency and cleaner production practices within the participating countries. Additionally, the TE mentions that there is significant recognition and awareness of the benefits surrounding EE-CP across participating SMEs. This awareness in turn may lead to support from participating governments to pursue and tailor EE-CP policies to their specific industries.</p>
<p><b>c. Institutional framework and governance <span style="float: right;">Rating: ML</span></b></p> <p>The NCPCs in India, Vietnam, and China have provided expert advice to various government groups in the formulation</p>

<sup>3</sup> Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

of national policies and frameworks on energy efficiency and cleaner production practices. Additionally, at the national level, policy frameworks within these participating countries have been created to foster energy efficiency and cleaner production and many institutions within these nations have been mandated to pursue EE-CP programs. However, according to the TE, it is difficult to attribute these policy changes as a consequence of project.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
There are no risks to the environmental sustainability of the project's achievements.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The project's objective is to reduce the emissions of carbon dioxide by improving energy management practices through the EE-CP EMS framework and delivered through NCPC personnel. The greatest risk to technological sustainability of this project is if NCPC's experienced personnel leave. Without continued training of NCPC personnel to conduct energy audits or the dissemination of EE-CP knowledge across NCPC personnel and other stakeholders the continuation of the project's benefits may be in risk.	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role<sup>4</sup>

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders</b>	
The TE document indicates, prior to the project's inception, participating countries demonstrated their commitment to improve industrial energy efficiency through the development of various government programs, policies and the establishment of NCPCs. This was prompted by a combination of factors external to the project such as the rising cost of energy, the trend towards reduction of GHGs and the ratification of the UNFCCC. The project's objective to improve energy management practices and integrate EE-CP practices across SME's falls in line with the existing energy efficiency-oriented national agenda of these countries and helps to promote growth and development that is economically and environmentally sustainable.	
<b>/b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors</b>	
At the national level, policy frameworks within participating countries have been created to foster energy efficiency and cleaner production and many institutions within these nations have been mandated to pursue EE-CP programs. Even though NCPCs in India, Vietnam and China have provided advice to their governments in the formulation of national policies and frameworks on EE-CP activities the TE indicates due to the "lack of correlated evidence" policy changes cannot be considered to be direct result of this project. Other contributing factors, external to the project, such as rising energy prices and GHG emission reduction trends may have played a more significant role.	
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>	
See 4.3b.	
<b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)</b>	
There is no follow-on financing from the government or other donors for this particular project. Instead, NCPCs are using experience gained from project to conduct EE-CP audits in SMEs on a chargeable basis in China, India, Vietnam, and Slovak Republic. Also, based on the CP-EE approach and the lessons that were learned from the project, a new regional project proposal regarding industrial pollution and CO <sub>2</sub> emission abatement in Arab countries was prepared and submitted to the Finish Government which has agreed to finance the new project.	
<b>e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?</b>	
The project outcomes would not have been achieved without the participation of NCPCs in the six participating countries.	

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

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?	
According to the TE and project document there is no difference in the amount of actual and expected level of co-financing. Based on the information provided in the TE it is difficult to asses if the co-financing was essential to	

<sup>4</sup> Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

achievement of GEF objectives.
<p><b>b. Delays.</b> If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p> <p>The project was originally planned to extend 20 months, however due to revisions (a total of 6 revisions) the project duration was extended to 63 months. According to the terminal evaluation, these revisions were undertaken to allow for coordination of outreach activities, for the completion of GHG verification activities, in promoting awareness of EE-CP technology, as well as organizing two regional workshops. The delay did not have an adverse affect on the project's outcomes or sustainability since, according to the TE, the project achieved its objectives to a significant extent (see 4.11b). A failure that was identified is that project had not conclusively created "significant transformational effect" on the policy frameworks within the participating countries. However it is uncertain whether this can be attributed to the project's delays.</p>
<p><b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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.</p> <p>According to the TE, the project has been in line with the national priorities and plans of all of the 6 countries participating in the project from the project's outset. This is demonstrated by the fact that prior to the beginning of the project all 6 countries had developed National Cleaner Production Centers with government support. Additionally, the increasing cost of energy helped foster an "enabling environment" which encourages the development of energy efficiency and cleaner production regulations at the national and regional levels. However, even with the "enabling environment" governments of the 6 participating countries have not committed co-financing for these activities.</p> <p>According to the TE, the information and tools provided by the project has helped in integrating EE-CP activities within SMEs's "Core Business Activities". The TE also mentions that various national stakeholders within the participating countries have been involved with providing feedback on the project; however it does not specify what affect their feedback has had on project outcomes.</p>

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

<p><b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating (six point scale): MU</b></span></p> <p>The project document identified a key list of indicators and targets with respect to CO2 emissions reduction, trainings, and the number of energy audits to be conducted, etc. to guide the project's implementation. From the outset, significant emphasis was placed on information dissemination with regards to project results, especially amongst the NCPC network. However the project failed to specify a data collection or an analysis system and did not provide a logframe or a timeline of when and by whom M&amp;E activities would be conducted.</p>
<p><b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating (six point scale): MU</b></span></p> <p>As the project progressed, the UNEP-DTIE tried to integrate M&amp;E efforts, one of the main elements being a list of success indicators. The UNEP-DTIE used these indicators to evaluate the progress of the project however the TE notes the means of verifying these success indicators were not described. The UNEP-DTIE also engaged in several M&amp;E activities to evaluate the progress of the project such as monitoring the audit activities in participating SMEs, evaluating and receiving feedback on the energy efficiency manual from SME units and personnel trained from NCPCs and recording the achievements of the project. Additionally, an independent review of EE-CP assessments were conducted by NCPCs in the six participating countries. However, the project lacked a Steering Committee to review the project outcomes and gather feedback at the various stages of the project's implementation. The lack of a committee to react to the complications arising during implementation may have prompted the project's six revisions.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document? No. A review of the budget provided in the project appraisal document shows that separate budget for M&amp;E had not been provided.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation? No. According to the TE, no funding was allocated for M&amp;E activities from the project's design phase and no funding was allocated for long-term monitoring of the project.</p>
<p>B.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? As previously mentioned, since the project's inception the project lacked a comprehensive M&amp;E system with a timeline of when M&amp;E activities would be conducted and when the findings would be reported for the purpose of providing feedback. Although an M&amp;E system was eventually integrated as the project progressed, according to the TE many of the M&amp;E activities UNEP-DTIE carried out to evaluate the progress of the project were executed when PIRs were conducted. However, it is difficult to assess from the TE document to what extent the UNEP-DTIE utilized the</p>

information from the M&E activities to provide real time feedback and if the information was used effectively.

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

No. From the project's outset, the project lacked a comprehensive M&E system with the necessary targets, baseline indicators, data collection system and logical framework. Although M&E activities were integrated to monitor the project's progress such as a list of success indicators which were a highlight of the project's M&E system, the means of verifying these success indicators were not described. Even though a series of M&E activities were eventually conducted by UNEP-DTIE, many were conducted unsystematically which is not optimal for the purposes of providing consistent and real time feedback. The lack of an overarching M&E system during the project's implementation compromised the quality of evaluation efforts and its ability to be used to gauge the project's progress across countries. For instance, although NCPCs in each of the six countries conducted independent reviews of the project's progress, the absence of an overarching M&E system led to NCPCs utilizing differing methodologies to monitor the implementation and progress of the project within their country.

#### **4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution**

##### **a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S**

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

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

Overall project implementation was effective. The UNEP-DTIE was credited in the TE for providing consistent and valuable technical support on most project activities. Amongst many other tasks, UNEP-DTIE helped coordinate the development of the CP-EE enhanced manuals as well as other tools which allowed NCPCs to conduct CP-EE audits. UNEP also helped NCPCs prepare audit reports and increased the usage of and improved the CP-EE Intranet site which was critical in facilitating information exchange amongst project partners. One of the main shortcomings of the project was lack of a structured M&E approach in the project's design which led to inconsistencies across the various evaluation methods. However the UNEP-DTIE did manage to integrate and helped to perform many M&E activities, such as monitoring of audit activities, as the project developed which was useful in assessing the project's progress.

##### **c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>5</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): S**

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

The executing agencies in this project were the National Cleaner Production Centers/Cleaner Productions Centers (NCPCs/CPCs) in the participating countries. The TE indicates effective project management at the NCPC and the UNEP-DTIE levels was critical to achievement of project's objectives across 6 countries and 2 continents. It is important to note all six countries had established NCPCs, with government support, and were operating under the UNEP/UNIDO framework before the project began which helped to facilitate the implementation of project's activities.

### **5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

i) The establishment of a comprehensive M&E plan which includes key performance indicators from the project design stage is vital in avoiding potential project revisions.

ii) The success of project involving SMEs requires the involvement of all stakeholders from the design, planning, and implementation of the project.

<sup>5</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

iii) In general, in SMEs, the implementation of Energy Efficient-Cleaner Production (EE-CP) audit recommendations result in three types of investment actions: 1) housekeeping actions with small investments (payback of <1 year) 2) short-term investments (payback of 1 year or less) 3) long-term investments (payback >1 year)

**b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

i) GEF has created a manual to calculate GHG benefits of energy efficiency and renewable energy-related GEF projects. The guidance outlined in this manual can be used to calculate the level of GHG benefits of future GEF projects.

ii) Future GEF projects should include a component to build the capacity of Bankers/Financial Institutions (FIs) to understand financing with respect to energy efficiency and cleaner production which will help in financing EE-CP projects in the SMEs.

**6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

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

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

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Although the report provides an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts, it could have provided more detail.</p>	MS (4)
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> For the most part, the TE is internally consistent. While report could have provided more information regarding the implementation of M&amp;E activities, it does provide a substantive analysis of the project design, implementation, achievement of outcomes and ratings are substantiated by the evidence provided in the TE.</p>	MS (4)
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The evaluation report provides an adequate but not thorough assessment of the project's sustainability and exit strategy.</p>	MS (4)
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> While some lessons are comprehensive and applicable to other GEF projects, others are specific to the project. Also few of lessons presented were not supported, at all, by the evidence that was presented in the TE.</p>	MU (3)
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The report includes actual co-financing used and the actual project costs but does not parse the costs by activity.</p>	MS (4)
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> Given the limitations of evaluation study, the report provides an adequate assess the shortcomings of the monitoring and evaluation system especially the initial absence of an M&amp;E system from the project design phase, the later integration of M&amp;E activities as well as the lack of a Steering Committee to review project outcomes.</p>	S (5)

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



**8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)**

--

**9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)**

--