

### GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		9/8/05
GEF ID:	920		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Technology Transfer Networks (progress report)	GEF financing:	1.275	1.294
Country:	Global	Co-financing:	1.275	?
Operational Program:	OP12	Total Project Cost:	\$2.550	\$?
IA	UNEP	<b>Dates</b>		
Partners involved:	UNEP / UNOPS	Work Program date		March 11 <sup>th</sup> 2001
		CEO Endorsement		Aug 26 <sup>th</sup> 2001
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		January 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: September 03	Actual: Not applicable
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: n/a	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: n/a	Difference between original and actual closing: n/a
Author of TE: Ferd Schelleman		TE completion date: 3 March 2003	TE submission date to GEF OME: 2004	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 year

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME 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). GEFME 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. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2.2 Project outcomes	PS	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2.3 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MU</b>

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No Why? – this is not a terminal evaluation but it is written in the style of mid-term review.
--

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

<p><b>3.1 Project Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What are the Global Environmental Objectives?</b></li> </ul> <p>To connect key public and private sector stakeholder groups who influence technology transfer within, between and to recipient country markets with the view to foster increased market uptake of sustainable alternatives that help to protect the global environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Any changes during implementation?</b></li> </ul> <p>No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What are the Development Objectives?</b></li> </ul> <p>Same as above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Any changes during implementation?</b></li> </ul> <p>No</p>
<p><b>3.2 Outcomes and Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome 1: SANet prototype set-up and testing completed, at least two on-line technology transfer “market places” established and linked to at least three regional support centers;</b></p> <p>The project established a website <a href="http://www.sustainablealternatives.net">www.sustainablealternatives.net</a> and this operational, together with a register of experts in the database, and number of case study briefs, and links to websites of partner organizations. An overview of financing options and organizations and their opportunities is still lacking. Regional support centers are being prepared in India and Sri Lanka. Two technology market places were established in timber certification (Brazil) and in concentrated solar power market development (Global).</p> <p><b>Outcome 2: At least 8 critical investment, management, policy or alliance building decisions influenced and directed towards sustainable alternatives;</b></p> <p>Three critical decision influenced (Janus Foundation / Heat and Power Polska and FondElec C.E.E.)</p> <p><b>Outcome 3: At least four strategic dialogues between key industry and government stakeholder supported; and</b></p> <p>Partnerships were created in areas of: sustainable forest and ecosystem management, renewable energy and energy efficiency, waste management and manufacturing (textiles), organic agriculture and carbon sequestration.</p> <p><b>Outcome 4: At least two clean technology market development alliances launched.</b></p> <p>Four technology transfer and market alliances are being developed in certified forestry products, concentrated solar thermal power, geothermal energy and pv / hydro power.</p>

<b>4. GEF OFFICE OF M&amp;E ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>4.1 Outcomes and impacts</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
<b>A Relevance</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain</b></li> </ul> <p>The progress report does not report on relevance. However, the project was consistent with OP12.</p>	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>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)?</b></li> </ul>	

To date, based on the evidence presented in the progress report, the project seems to be on target to meet expected outcomes. However, it is difficult to accurately assess the project outcomes too date as most are 'process orientated' with no definitive impact.

**C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)**

- **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?**

The project is too immature to effectively evaluate cost-effectiveness.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Not possible to rate as the project is only one year into implementation	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Same as above	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Same as above	
<b>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Same as above	
<b>E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Same as above	

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

<b>A. Effective M&amp;E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&amp;E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
The TE indicates that SaNet should implement sufficient monitoring and feedback opportunities to keep track of problems and success stories in its initiatives. This seems to imply that effective M&E is not in place after one year of implementation	
<b>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Not able to evaluate	
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice? No</b>	

**4.4 Lessons**

Project lessons as described in the TE

<b>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?</b>
No lessons included in the progress report.

**4.5 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.

**4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings**

In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

N/A

<b>4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	4
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b>	1
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b>	1
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>	1
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b>	4
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b>	4

**4.6 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:**

**No: X**

Explain: It is too early in the project implementation to consider a technical assessment. However, the progress report (MTR / TE) is not satisfactory, it is poorly structured and written, contains no ratings and no clear lessons.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

**4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

N/A