## UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

**To the comments received on *19.04.2017* and *17.08.2017* from the Terminal Evaluation of the project *Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation in Mauritius, Rodrigues and the Outer Islands* (UNDP Project ID-4333)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team**  **response and actions taken** |
| UNDP IEO | 1 | Table of Contents | add “Summary of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons” which is part of the report but is not mentioned in the Table  of Contents | added |
| UNDP IEO | 2 | Page 10  Introduction | Change “UNDP/GEF Project” to “UNDP-supported GEF-financed Project” | changed |
| UNDP IEO | 3 | Page 11 – 2.1 Project start and duration | Change “….the GEF project…” to “…the UNDP-supported GEF-financed project…” | changed |
| UNDP IEO | 4 | Page 12 – 2.4 Baseline Indicators established | Include the baseline indicators in this section | List of baseline indicators taken from the logframe has been added to section 2.4 |
| UNDP IEO | 5 | Page 14 – Assumptions and Risks: | This section mentions that there were 6 risks identified in the prodoc. However, there is no discussion on the risks other than that they were considered to be low risks.  I recommend expanding the discussion on the risks outlined in the prodoc. Were the risks logical and robust? | Discussion of risks outlined in the Prodoc has been added. |
| UNDP IEO | 6 | Page 14 – Lessons from other relevant projects | In the third paragraph, change “UNDP-GEF projects” to “UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects”.  There is something awkward in the phrase “…which have also developed solid to capitalize…”.  That sentence should be re-written. Also, expand on how lessons from Africa/Asia were incorporated into the design of this solar PV project. | Changed.  Sentence rewritten.  Unfortunately, there were no indications that lessons from previous Africa/Asia projects were incorporated into the design of this solar PV project. |
| UNDP IEO | 7 | Page 15 – Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector | This section refers to the ‘Lessons from other relevant projects…’ section. However, it would be good to expand the text in this section as well. Describe the linkages made regarding project design/formulation between this project and other ongoing initiatives. | Planned synergies between the GEF EE project and the Solar PV project have been added. |
| UNDP IEO | 8 | Page 16 – Adaptive Management | I assume that the changes described in this section were approved by the project steering committee.  Be sure to state in this section that the PSC approved the changes.  It would also be useful to state that despite the cancellation of some outputs, the project still achieved/exceeded its targets. | Statements regarding PSC approvals and achievement of targets despite cancellation of some outputs have been added |
| UNDP IEO | 9 | Page 17 – Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management | Was there no significant feedback from any other M&E activity, such as the annual PIRs? | Reference to annual PIRs have been added |
| UNDP IEO | 10 | Pages 17-19 – Project Finance | Project Finance: Include a discussion on the additional co-financing leveraged for this project and how these resources were integrated into the overall project and contributed to the project’s objective. Did the significantly higher co-financing have an effect on project outcomes or sustainability? | Investment from the private sector was some 40 million USD which is over double the original target. The private sector interest and uptake of the technology is further evident in the over-whelming response to the programmes and calls issued by CEB. CEB expects that at least a further 100MW of PV will be installed by 2025. Government cofinancing in the form of in-kind support, feed-in-tariffs (32 million USD) and tax exemp-tions for PV equipment (estimated 43 million USD) has also contributed to the impact and sustain-ability of the project. |
| UNDP IEO | 11 | Page 30 – Effectiveness & Efficiency | this section could benefit from more discussion. In the TE guidance, ‘effectiveness’ is the extent to which the expected outcomes and objectives of the project have been achieved.  Therefore, include a brief discussion connecting the evidence listed in this section to the achieved outcomes and objectives of the project. Under efficiency, include more details on how projects results were able to be achieved in under 3 years. How was this done even with a 30-month delay in project start up? | Discussions have been added. |
| UNDP IEO | 12 | Page 31 – Mainstreaming | The TOR for this TE states that the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.  Gender is discussed in the report.  Did the project address any other UNDP mainstreaming priorities? | The project addresses the UNDP priorities of clean and affordable energy, responsible consumption and pro-duction, climate action and sustainable cities and communities. Further, industry, inno-vation and infrastructure were supported as were decent work and economic growth |
| UNDP IEO | 13 | Page 31 – Sustainability | Please refer to the TE Guidance document, which states that sustainability should be assessed by looking at four types of risks: financial risks, socio-economic risks, institutional framework and governance risks, and environmental risks.  Each of these four types of risks should be discussed in the report and given a rating of Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), or Unlikely (U). | Discussion and ratings of 4 types of risk have been added. |
| UNDP IEO | 14 | Page 31 – Impact | Were there any unintended impacts? | No |
| UNDP IEO | 15 | Annex | Be sure to attach the ‘Audit Trail’ as an Annex in the final TE report. Attached is a draft Audit Trail template.  It should capture all comments to the report plus responses to those comments by the evaluation team.  In the ‘Author’ column, enter the name of the commenter’s organization (rather than the name of the commenter) | Audit Trail has been completed and attached as Annex |
| UNDP IEO | 16 | Page 7 - Project Results | In the first sentence, remove the “d” in “achieved” so that the sentence will read, “…., the project has been able to achieve most of the planned activities and targets.” | removed |
| UNDP IEO | 17 | Page 9 – Recommendation 6 | Change “It is recommendation that…” to “It is recommended that…” | changed |
| UNDP IEO | 18 | Page 10 – Introduction | Change “…was carried in two parts:” to “…was carried out in two parts:” | changed |
| UNDP IEO | 19 | Page 10 | Change “…, the local consultant team had extensive working sessions were held  with the project management team and…” to “…, the local consultant team held extensive working sessions with the project management team and…” | changed |
| UNDP IEO | 20 | Page 13 – 2.6 Expected Results | Remove “was” in the sentence, “The project was intended to…” | removed |
| UNDP IEO | 21 | Page 14 – Lessons from other relevant projects… | In the second line, change “…including UNDP GEF project Removal of Barriers…” to “…including the UNDP-supported GEF-financed project Removal of Barriers…” | changed |
| UNDP IEO | 22 | Page 15 – UNDP comparative advantage | Remove “has” in the first sentence | removed |
| UNDP IEO | 23 | Page 19 – UNDP and Implementation Partner… | In the second paragraph, change “20216” to “2016” | changed |
| UNDP CO  Programme  Officer | 24 | Tracking tool | the tracking tool has to capture all emission reductions  - I note from the tracking tool that the Lifetime direct post-project GHG emissions avoided wasn’t filled. | The calculation of GHG ER in the Project Document (p.15), differentiates between ER from PV generation realized by the end of project (**13295 tCO2**), and the cumulative ER of PV generation over the 20 year lifecycle of the equipment installed under the project (**98400 tCO2** labeled ‘Direct post-project without replication (20-year equipment projected life)’ in Table 3 of the Prodoc). These figures have been entered in the Tracking Tool under ‘CEO Endorsement Target’ respectively as ‘Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided’ and ‘Lifetime direct post-project GHG emissions avoided.’ However according to the *Manual for Calculating GHG Benefits of GEF Projects: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Pro-jects 2008*, Direct ER arethe cumulative ER over the lifecycle of the equipment installed under the project (in this case 98400tCO2 target in Prodoc) and Direct Post-Project ER result only from investments supported by financial mechanisms (e.g., revolving funds) put in place by the project that continue operating after the end of the project. As this PV project did not plan or implement such a mechanism, the Direct post-project ER (targeted and achieved) should be considered as zero. |
| UNDP CO Programme  Officer | 25 | Table 7 | Also in the log frame, only direct emission reductions are mentioned whereas the log frame approved at CEO endorsement mentioned indirect emission reductions as well namely:  ***Direct reduction*** *of* ***13,295 tons of CO2*** *over the 4-year FSP project life cycle and* ***98,400*** *over the full lifetime of the plants. Estimated cumulative* ***indirect GHG emission reduction*** *of at least* ***350,000 tons of CO2eq*** *by 2025 on the basis of a conservative policy scenario and a GEF causality factor of 80%.*  Hence, please ensure that the different categories of emission reductions are well captured in the report. | Based on data from CEB about ongoing programmes and expected installations after the project close, (over 100MW additional PV capacity by 2025) indirect ER (bottom up) is estimated at 1058 ktCO2 which is 3 times the original target.  Conservative top down indirect ER is estimated at 2562 ktCO2 |