

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5146	
GEF Agency project ID		120096	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Cleantech Program for SMEs in Malaysia	
Country/Countries		Malaysia	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CCM-1	
Executing agencies involved		Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology (MIGHT), in cooperation with Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water (KeTTHA), Ministry of Science Technology and Innovation (MOSTI), Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE), MITI, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), TPM, Green Tech Malaysia, University Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers (FMM)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		12/11/2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		04/08/2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		04/07/2016	
Actual date of project completion		08/31/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.99	0.99
Co-financing	IA own	0.01	0.01
	Government	2.7	0.43
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	0.2	1.83
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.99	0.99
Total Co-financing		3	2.27
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.99	3.26
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		06/30/2017	
Author of TE		UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division	
TER completion date		December 2018	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Cody Parker
--	-------------

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	NR	S		S
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML		ML
M&E Design		MS		MU
M&E Implementation		MS		MU
Quality of Implementation		S		S
Quality of Execution		S		MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-		S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the CEO Approval Request, the Global Environmental Objective of the project is the ‘promotion and adoption of innovation in clean technologies in Malaysia that will have lasting effects on the global environment as it will allow tackling environmental problems at the source by simultaneously avoiding or reducing pollutant emissions and the optimum use of natural resources and energy’ (Approval Request, Pg 8).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the CEO Endorsement, the Development Objective of the project is the ‘promotion of clean technology innovations and innovative clean technology entrepreneurship in Malaysia through Clean Technology Innovation Competition and Entrepreneurship Acceleration Program’ (Approval Request, Pg 19).

Component 1: Policy and regulatory framework – specific outputs included strengthening the existing policy and regulatory environment and preparation of guidelines on cleantech competition.

Component 2: Institutional capacity building – specific outputs included host institution capacity strengthened; wide platform for stakeholders of the competition established and Experience shared with other countries and exploration possibility to expand the program to Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) region.

Component 3: Organization of cleantech competition and acceleration program – specific outputs included two to three national cleantech competitions organized; associated entrepreneurship acceleration program conducted and participation in regional and global networking activities, advocacy, and outreach.

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

The TE does not report any changes in the Global and Development Objectives of the project.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assessed the relevance of the project as ‘highly satisfactory’. This TER rates relevance as ‘satisfactory’. The project aligned with the key sectoral and development priorities and plans of Malaysia. The project was in line with the implementation of the National Green Technology Policy (NGTP) which sets development priorities for the energy sector, building sector, water and waste management and transportation sectors. The project was in conformity with the 10th Malaysian plan (increased role of Small and Medium Enterprise (SMEs) in application of green technology) as well as the 11th plan that emphasized the importance of development of green products. The project was also developed to adopt and assist Malaysia’s efforts in reaching the goals and objectives of UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and other relevant conventions and agreements.

The project was in line with the GEF focal area strategy under Climate Change Mitigation, which supports developing countries and economies in transition toward a low-carbon development path, and in particular with Objective 1 of the GEF Climate Change Mitigation Framework, namely ‘Promote the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies.’ (Approval Request, Pg 5).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE assessed the effectiveness of the project as ‘satisfactory’. This TER rates project effectiveness as ‘moderately satisfactory’. Overall, the project was successful in networking with related organizations, mobilizing the local ecosystem and building capacity at the host institution, the Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology (MIGHT), which enhanced their knowledge and experience in the field of cleantech. The project also facilitated the successful organization of competitions and accelerator programs and made significant progress in nurturing clean technology innovation in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) region through experience sharing and participation at various events at the regional level. However, some of the interventions required for institutionalization of clean technology innovation in the country were not undertaken. For instance, the project didn’t lead to the creation of a formal policy and regulatory environment for the promotion of cleantech business in Malaysia. The TE also highlights that most of the staff of the host institute (MIGHT), who were responsible for continuation of competition and accelerator program, were transferred to other positions. Moreover, lack of formal agreements with the partners on their roles and responsibilities could also impact their long-term involvement in organizing the cleantech competition program in the future, due to which the effectiveness of the project is rated as ‘moderately satisfactory’.

Component 1: Policy and regulatory framework

The output under this component regarding review of the existing policies and regulations related to promotion of clean energy technologies was not achieved. Hence, the project was not able to create and strengthen a formal policy and regulatory environment for the promotion of cleantech business in Malaysia. However, the second outputs expected under this component of the development of the guidelines for applicants and jurors of the cleantech competition was completed satisfactorily.

Component 2: Institutional capacity building

The expected outputs of strengthening the host institute, the Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology (MIGHT), responsible for the organization of the competition and accelerator program during the project, was completed with partial success. As per the TE and PIRs (2015 and 2016), 3-4 staff of MIGHT were trained during the project who organized the competition and accelerator program successfully. However, at the time of the TE, the staff of MIGHT was reduced to one full time employee, the Project Coordinator, with the remaining staff moved to other positions outside MIGHT. Hence, the expectation set out in the project document that MIGHT staff, with support of other institutions, will continue the organization of the competitions after the project completion was not met. With the MIGHT staff moved to other institutions, the TE notes that 'although the built-up knowledge and capacity of these staff is not lost for Malaysia, but the focus on Cleantech has been diluted' (TE, Pg 19).

Another expected output under this component related to the establishment of a wide platform of stakeholders and partnership agreements with project partners to define their contribution to the organization of the competition, their role and responsibilities, was completed with partial success. As per the TE, the project established a wide platform with relevant partner organizations and ministries, in which the Project Management Unit played a crucial connecting role. However, most of these arrangements were not formalized, and according to the TE could fall apart after project funding ends. The output related to developing a mentoring program through recruitment and training of mentors and specialists and acquainting them with the competition methodologies, rules, and criteria, was completed successfully. The project facilitated building the capacity of 6 general mentors and 18 specialists who were still working in the last year of the project, enriching the program with the growing local knowledge and experience in supporting entrepreneurs. This was seen as a very valuable improvement to the local entrepreneurship and innovation system in Malaysia.

The last output under this component of sharing the experiences with other countries and exploring the possibility to expand the program to ASEAN region, was also achieved. The project successfully hosted the Association of Southeast Asian Nations' Cleantech Innovation Hub, a long-term strategy to the institutionalization of clean technology innovation nurturing in the region, while also encouraging cooperation amongst the countries through participation during the 1 ASEAN Entrepreneurship Summit; Asian Development Bank hosted the Cleantech event in the Philippines and conducted a visit to Myanmar to promote local knowledge sharing on cleantech innovations.

Component 3: Organization of cleantech competition and acceleration program

The expected outputs under this component of organization of two to three national cleantech competitions and associated entrepreneurship acceleration program were completed satisfactorily. The project organized 3 National competitions with 60 'semi-finalists' or alumni who entered the yearly

accelerator training program. As envisioned in the project document, the project provided assistance to the winners and runners-up of the program to participate in regional and global events for networking and outreach. The winning companies participated in the yearly international Cleantech Open Forums in the US and International Genetically Engineered Machine Competition (IGEM) exhibition, with various other meeting and events organized to provide networking and learning opportunities to the participants.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assessed the efficiency of the program as ‘satisfactory’ and this TER concurs with the assigned rating. The project was implemented within the planned time period with counterpart co-financing and other disbursements provided in a timely manner. Cost efficiency was ensured through coordination with other cleantech programs in the country that reduced costs and increased the impact of project interventions. The TE notes that the project was delayed during initial stages due to delay in staff recruitment but no significant delays were encountered once the project management was up and running in 2013. As the project budget was not yet spent by 2016, the project was granted an extension to accommodate its participation in International Cleantech Open Forum in 2017.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the likelihood of sustainability of the project as ‘moderately likely’. The project created an enabling institutional environment through capacity building of the host organization, identification of trainers and mentors, conducting the competition and accelerator program successfully as well as networking with the relevant stakeholders and getting their support for the promotion and nurturing of cleantech innovations in Malaysia. The project also received a significant amount of co-financing from the alumni organizations indicating their strong interest in continuation of the project activities. The host organization also showed interest and keenness through submission of a proposal for continuation and promotion of the project activities. However, due to lack of specific policies and regulatory framework to promote the cleantech innovation in Malaysia, lack of formal partnership agreements with stakeholders, mentors, etc., and no firm long-term commitment from the government beyond 2017, the likelihood of sustainability is rated as ‘moderately likely’.

Financial – Moderately Likely

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to financial sustainability of the project as ‘moderately likely’. The host institution Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology(MIGHT) and Project Management Unit (PMU) submitted a proposal to the Government of Malaysia via the Economic Planning Unit and the Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water (KeTTHA) to secure continuous developmental costs from 2016-2020. Although the proposal was not approved, the PMU was allocated a budget amounting to RM750,000 for 2017 to initiate Technopreneurship Excellence (a program on rebranding of MIGHT development on cleantech initiatives) and to extend similar project initiatives and enhancement activities. The project secured a co-financing of almost 2 M USD from the alumni organizations implying continuation of the project and its sustainability. However, there was no indication of funding of a similar program beyond 2017 from the relevant ministries and the government agencies. Mentors interviewed during the evaluation showed support with the incentives via an ad-hoc fee/honorarium. However, the TE notes that the mentoring relationship and their involvement was not made clear or formalized for the future programs and

beyond the project, due to which the overall risk to financial sustainability is assessed to be ‘moderately likely’.

Sociopolitical risks – **Likely**

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the socio-political aspect of sustainability as ‘likely’. The project had good support as evidenced through the participation of 5 ministerial engagements, 18 government agencies, 9 universities and numbers of judges and mentors from private sectors and NGOs, indicating a level of commitment and support at the political level. The project was also able to mobilize support from the financial institutions to be part of the ASEAN Cleantech Innovation Hub. The TE confirms that some of the cleantech competition winners were offered investment from a local venture capitalist and corporate investors after the project’s closure, indicating support from the financial institutions.

Institutional – **Moderately Likely**

According to the TE, the existing policies for the promotion of clean energy were supposed to be identified and strengthened during the project, but no action was taken on this output. However, according to the TE, the policies are being reviewed now and a guideline for the Global Cleantech Innovation Program for Small and Medium Enterprises (GCIP) was also established. At the time of the TE, the project management unit had only one staff member as the others had been moved to the different departments. But The project was also part of the International Green Technology & Eco-Products Exhibition and Conference 2016 as one of the task forces for the largest green technology congregation in South East Asia. The technology categories promoted through the project were aligned with national priority areas of renewable energy, energy efficiency, waste to wealth and water efficiency. According to the TE, the program continues to receive endorsement under the Science to Action (S2A) initiative and the PMU established Technopreneurship Excellence (rebranding MIGHT development) to extend similar GCIP initiatives, indicating an enabling institutional environment for the continuation of the project activities.

Environmental – **Likely**

The TE doesn’t note any environmental risks to the project outcomes.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Against the pledged co-financing of \$3M, the project had received a co-financing of \$2.26M at the end of April 2016. Based on the information provided by the Project Management Unit at the time of the TE, the total co-financing of \$3M was expected to materialize by the end of the project. While the host institution, MIGHT, provided its full pledged amount in a timely manner, the counterpart funding from other government bodies mentioned in the Project Document doesn’t seem to have materialized as per the original plan. The sources of co-financing given in the TE are different than the ones in the Project

Document. The largest part of the co-financing was raised by the project alumni and reported to be almost \$2M. It is likely that the co-financing from UNIDO also materialized but the corresponding amount was not included in the breakdown in the TE (TE, Pg 3). As per the evidence in the TE, although the sources of co-financing differed from the ones mentioned in the Project Document, the progress of the project was never hampered due to shortage of funds, as the overall goal of mobilizing \$ 3M was almost achieved by the end of the project.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Project implementation commenced later than planned due to start up delays and staff recruitment delays. But, once the project was up and running in 2013, no significant delays were encountered during the rest of the implementation. As the project still had some remaining funds at the time of the planned closing in 2016, an extension was granted to accommodate the participation in the International CleanTech Forum in 2017.

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

The project received good support from the government during the implementation which was crucial for the achievement of outputs under various components. The government provided support through participation of its representatives in the project Steering Committee and the jury of the competition and accelerator programs. Their involvement helped the project in building strategic linkages with other initiatives such as the International Green Technology & Eco-Products Exhibition and Conference 2016 in Malaysia (IGEM2016), where the project served as one of the taskforces for the largest green technology congregation in South East Asia. The project was also included as a flagship program under government initiatives such as Science 2 Action and in the Global Science Innovation & Advisory Council for the green future of Malaysia. Although, the project didn't lead to any changes in policies or regulatory frameworks, but such networking opportunities facilitated the successful organization of 3 consecutive competitions and accelerators programs (TE, Pg 18) as well as helped in mobilization of resources and support from various private sector organizations. But more support and ownership from the government would be required so that the focus on cleantech technologies is not lost in the future. For instance, the project management unit was hosted by MIGHT, an organization operating under the purview of the Prime Minister's office with members from government, academia and industry. Staff of MIGHT trained to organize accelerator programs and competitions after the project completion, were moved to positions outside MIGHT, with only one full time staff at the time of the TE. Support from the government is crucial to retain the staff at MIGHT in order to sustain the initiatives taken under the project in the future.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	--

This TER has revised the rating assigned by the TE to the M&E design from ‘moderately satisfactory’ to ‘moderately unsatisfactory’. The Prodoc included a generic M&E plan with indicators and responsibilities assigned to the project management unit and Steering Committee for review and regular monitoring. However, as the TE notes, there was no provision for establishing the baseline for GHG emission reduction. The indicators set in the Prodoc were not ‘SMART’, and did not indicate to what extent the outcomes were achieved. For instance, indicators were defined as ‘numbers of’ – improved policies, staff trained; experts participating, etc., without informing whether the results on outputs and outcomes (like policies needed, capacity developed, success of competitions and accelerator program) were actually achieved. Moreover, the Prodoc didn’t include or suggest approaches to measure the emission (indirect, lifetime) reduction for the key indicator ‘tons of GHG emissions avoided’, due to which the quality of M&E design at entry is rated as ‘moderately unsatisfactory’.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rates the M&E implementation as ‘moderately satisfactory’. But based on the evidence in the TE, this TER rates it as ‘moderately unsatisfactory’. The responsibility to review M&E implementation rested with the Project Steering Committee (PSC). The PSC reviewed the progress of the project through presentations from the Project Coordinator, but it is not clear how effective this platform was in reviewing the M&E implementation. The TE notes that ‘no substantive documents, progress and financial report were submitted to the PSC before their annual meeting’ (TE, Pg 29). The TE notes that the project management followed a ‘practical and ad-hoc’ approach to M&E, which helped in day to day functioning of the project. However, the project didn’t develop a baseline and data was also not compiled to review the progress systematically. Moreover, there was no provision to document and monitor the long-term changes such as GHG reduction assessments, due to which M&E implementation is rated as ‘moderately unsatisfactory’.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

This TER concurs with the rating assigned to the quality of project implementation as ‘satisfactory’. The project benefitted from the timely inputs from UNIDO during key periods/events as well as through their

representation in the Project Steering Committee that facilitated the project implementation. The project also benefitted from the other 7 projects within the Global Cleantech Innovation Program that UNIDO was implementing for GEF through international networking between the global participants. The project also received adequate support from the UNIDO's regional office in Bangkok, Thailand. The TE also notes that the changes in the position of the project manager at UNIDO HQ in Vienna during the implementation challenged the continuity of the project management at times. But the project implementation was not affected as this issue was 'addressed in a correct and professional way' (TE, Pg 28).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
---	--

The TE rates quality of project execution as 'satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the TE, this TER rates the quality of execution as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project management and coordination were entrusted to the project management unit hosted within Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology (MIGHT), which was the main executing body for the project. The project staff at MIGHT were trained to organizes the yearly competitions and accelerators program that they achieved successfully. The unit was responsible for day to day management of the project which was assessed to be 'adaptive and agile' by the TE (TE, Pg. 28). The project had satisfactory financial and administrative management and the project team worked well with the other stakeholders (private sector, Universities and government departments), contributing to the satisfactory and timely completion of project activities. However, the project management unit was also entrusted with monitoring and evaluation of the project activities which had various loopholes such as lack of organization of data systematically for periodic reviews and monitor long term changes, due to which the quality of execution is assessed as 'moderately satisfactory'.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The cleantech innovations developed by winners and semifinalists of the competition were at various stages of technical and commercial development at the time of the TE. The TE notes that none of the companies had commercialized their technologies fully, although some were close to the stage of introducing their products to the markets at a large scale. However, the estimations of technological life-time direct or indirect CO₂ equivalent emissions reductions based on projections of commercial developments could not be made due to the lack of reporting and monitoring of the relevant data by the project or the companies involved.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not report any socio-economic changes brought about by the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

6 general mentors and 18 specialist mentors were recruited and trained during the project to acquaint them with the competition (held annually) methodologies, rules, and criteria. According to the TE, the mentors were still working in the last year of the project with in the overall framework of Cleantech Open and enriched the program with local knowledge and experience on supporting entrepreneurs. This was seen as a valuable improvement of the local entrepreneurship and innovation system in Malaysia.

b) Governance

The TE does not report changes in the governance brought about by the project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not report any positive or negative unintended changes brought about by the project.

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

As per the PIR, 2015, the Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology management strongly supported the program with interest in continuing implementation of the competition and

accelerator program beyond 2016. MIGHT submitted a proposal to the Government of Malaysia via the Economic Planning Unit and the Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water to secure continuous developmental costs from 2016-2020. However, in 2016 the PIR noted that MIGHT's submission to the Government of Malaysia was not endorsed. As per the TE, MIGHT was now rebranding the GCIP as GCIP 2.0 and to be named as Sustainable Technology for Resilient, Innovative and Knowledgeable Entrepreneur (STRIKE). The new model focusing on thematic areas such as Smart City, Electric Vehicle and Biodegradable Industry, was an immediate spillover effect from the current project.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The key lessons listed in the TE are given below:

1. This project can be seen as the start of a longer-term transition of local SMEs and start-ups in Malaysia in the direction of green, clean and innovative technologies and products. Its development, upscaling and mainstreaming will take multiple related efforts in the country, region and global context.
2. Linkages with other related concepts such as Resource Efficiency and Cleaner Production (UNIDO Environment, UNEP), Eco-Innovation (UNEP) Climate Innovation (World Bank), Sustainable Consumption and Production (EC and UNEP), Eco-Industrial Parks (UNIDO and others), etc., should be strengthened and taken into account in future project and program development.
3. For future initiatives, the input and role of Clean Tech Open (CTO) as the key international hub and consultant of the project should be reconsidered, given that the capacity that is currently available in the national Malaysian entrepreneurship network which can deliver the same services, knowledge and training. The added value of the CTO forum participation in California was not very high according to the Malaysian participants.
4. International networks can also deliver similar information, training and services on an open source basis, which is preferable for public funded projects. As an example, the European Climate KIC network is the largest global Cleantech entrepreneurship network and is an open source since completely funded with public funding.
5. Since several of the first batch of UNIDO GEF Global Cleantech Innovation Program (GCIP) projects are coming to an end, UNIDO has an excellent opportunity to organize a program wide evaluation for GCIP, focusing on systems thinking as a guiding principle to guide the development of future projects in this area, with focus on the long-term transformations that the projects should contribute to, and the design and implementation elements that are needed to accomplish this.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The key recommendations in the TE are given below:

For Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology (MIGHT) and Malaysian Government

1. MIGHT either improves their own technical/environmental knowledge and experience in the specific area of Cleantech to increase the effectiveness of future Cleantech project, or liaises more intensely with other ministries and organizations that can deliver that expertise.
2. For future projects, MIGHT should design, adopt and implement a solid M&E program and report on this to the donor, next to the internal M&E procedures that are in place.

For Project Management Unit (PMU) and UNIDO

1. The project should produce a final report using the remaining project funding to cover analysis of the potential indirect GHG emissions reduction over the technology lifetime; analysis of the accelerator program through case studies of the project's alumni, covering both successful and unsuccessful cases.
2. Pledged co-financing as well as the new sources to be tracked regularly with implications of budget and expenditure.

For UNIDO

1. UNIDO can increase the effectivity of future projects by managing and influencing more strongly on project outcomes that have a higher change and impact on environmental outcomes in general, and in the case of this project on GHG reductions specifically. Ensure that a good baseline study is performed.
2. Gender mainstreaming topics should be considered and managed systematically in future projects, following the UNIDO and National guidelines, rules and regulations that are in place.
3. UNIDO should pay closer attention if national implementing agencies do not arrange for M & E implementation and take timely corrective action in this.
4. UNIDO is recommended to improve the transfer of tasks and information from one Project Management to the next during project implementation, to optimize the continuity and quality of project management
5. Since several of the Global Cleantech Innovation Program (GCIP) projects are coming to an end, UNIDO should organize a GCIP program evaluation focused on the long-term transformation process required.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE made a comprehensive assessment of the relevant outputs and impacts wherever possible as it was constrained by the lack of monitoring and evaluation data on outcomes or long-term change that the project was supposed to collect.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was internally consistent and the evidence complete, with ratings well substantiated.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The assessment of the sustainability aspect of the project was satisfactory.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons listed were supported by the evidence in the main report	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE carried out a detailed analysis of the quality of the M&E design and systems, identifying the shortfalls and its impact on the project.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.